

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 10/14/2021 12:33:16 PM

First name: Phil

Last name: Forst

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Lutsen Mountains Ski Area Expansion Project

This is a follow-up to my phone conversation with Mr. Jimenez and my e-mails of September 15th and October 4th. If you've sent a response, it has not come through my email.

A copy-and-past from my September 15th email:

Some excerpts of reference:

* Acrobat page 8: An 8,947-foot-long (1.7-mile) portion of the Superior Hiking Trail/North Country National Scenic

Trail (SHT/NCNST) within the proposed Moose Mountain area of the SUP would be realigned to avoid project components and decrease the trail grade on the backside of Moose Mountain.

* Acrobat page 9: Approximately 5 miles (26,307 linear feet) of new permanent access roads and 1 mile of temporary

access roads (5,154 feet) would be constructed. This would include paved base area roads, unpaved mountain access roads, and unpaved temporary mountain access roads.

* Acrobat page 278: Figure 8...the "L-shaped roadway"

Our review leaves us with impression there are two potential scenarios:

(1) There is no foreseeable FHWA nexus...which would lead to say 'no comments'

(2) There is a foreseeable FHWA nexus with that 'L-shaped' roadway coming directly off of TH 61

Assuming the 'L-shaped roadway' (my characterization) coming directly off of TH 61 and any permanent roadways is the roadway referenced in the first two bullets, the following questions would help inform the discussion of (1) versus (2):

* What known federal funds (in hand or reasonable foreseeable) are going to be used for construction any portions of the permanent roadways? Include source and agency.

* Will any parties at the table or foreseeable parties pursue Federal Lands Access Program (FLAP) funds for any portion of the roadways?

* Are any Federal land transfers foreseeable?

o You answer this one during the phone call: "no."

* Who will own the roads (constructed with foreseeable pots of federal funds) once constructed?

Any assistance you can provide on this front is appreciated. If there is a FHWA nexus, part of the discussion would include the scenario of incorporating FHWA information needs into the EIS process so that an adoption of the USFS EIS could happen via FHWA issuance of a FHWA ROD.

If there is a FHWA nexus, then the document is short on select points of analysis, such as Section 4(f). We need to know if there is a FHWA nexus to justify expending resources on review and comment (which would include those select points of analysis) of an EIS. It's very challenging to make the October 25th comment date work without answers to the above questions.

Philip Forst
Environmental Specialist
Federal Highway Administration
Minnesota Division
180 East Fifth Street, Suite 930
St. Paul, MN 55101-4802
Phone: (651) 291-6110
Fax: (651) 291-6000