

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 12/8/2021 4:03:33 AM

First name: Emily

Last name: Alexander

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I am an avid skier and have been visiting Lutsen Mountains every year since 2017, except for the 2020-2021 season when the US-Canada border was closed. I have reviewed the draft EIS and support Alternative 3 for the Lutsen expansion proposal. I believe Alternative 3 balances the competing needs of conservation of the natural environment, and necessary expansion of the ski area. Alternative 2 might have too high of an impact on the natural environment, which Alternative 3 remedies by providing legacy forest areas and not expanding on the backside of Moose Mountain. I feel that expansion is necessary for Lutsen to be able to provide an improved skiing experience for guests, and to continue to be a destination resort for guests from not just the Midwest, but from Canada as well. Lutsen currently lacks good beginner and family terrain, which would be remedied with the Eagle Mountain expansion. Lutsen also lacks parking near the base area, which the Eagle expansion would fix.

Not allowing Lutsen to expand carries the risk of not being able to attract enough guests to keep the resort operational in the future, putting jobs at risk and severely hurting the local economy. I enjoy all of my visits across the border to Lutsen, and I believe that Alternative 3 would set Lutsen on the path for success, long into the future. Thanks.