


public comment
BOS Revd 11/4/25 #2

 Outlook

11-4-23 Agenda Item #2. Legistar #25-1826 Fee-to-Trust Project

DISTRIBUTION
DATE 11/4/25

From Walking in the light buhler <real1611@hotmail.com>

Date Tue 11/4/2025 8:12 AM

To BOS-Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

This Message Is From an External Sender

This message came from outside your organization.

Report Suspicious

Board of Supervisors pull this from the Consent Calendar. Board must modify the letter with stronger language to not support anything but option C.

This should have gone to the Planning Commission since the property is currently under the County's jurisdiction

Nora and Allen Buhler
Georgetown ca

Public
Comment
#2

LATE DISTRIBUTION

DATE 11/4/2025

Tyler Hartsell

From: Jason Friese <jsfriese@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 3, 2025 9:20 PM
To: BOS-Clerk of the Board
Subject: Re: 11-4-23 Agenda Item #2. Legistar #25-1826 Fee-to-Trust Project

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Report Suspicious

Dear Board of supervisors,

Please pull this item out of the consent agenda and require further public input and possible amendments. I know that time is running short for comments on the BIA letter because of their deadlines. First, I want to thank you that you did note that there are some things that are incompatible, like having Shingle Springs Dr be an alternative route into the casino/event center area. I think that the county should include a few more things:

1.) A request to have more time for further input from the county and the local residents. When this fee-to-trust proposal was first presented it did not include additional commercial activities beyond the event center. This prevented the county from fully assessing and commenting on the impact of the project on its financial impact. Since that projected impact has increased potentially dramatically, it makes sense that they should go back a step and have to go back through that assessment if they are to land on any option that includes commercial and retail development. The county is in a deficit and can hardly afford an erosion of its sales tax base; in fact, the tribe (via the chamber of commerce) represented that the project would benefit the county by bringing business to other county businesses. More time is needed, and potentially a fresh start. Please ask for that, even if there's no protocol for it; the tribe skipped a step by omitting facts that had a direct impact on the things that you were invited to comment on with regards to tax revenue.

2.) I think that the language regarding Shingle Springs Dr could be strengthened, potentially. At a previous board of supervisors hearing we were assured that the tribe could not connect to Shingle Springs Dr without consent from the county. This letter makes it sound like you are asking for that to not happen rather than telling them that it will not happen. I'm not sure what changed.


3.) Since the tribe has a history of claiming that they need land to develop additional housing and then changing their position once the land has been conveyed to trust, I believe that the county should suggest that the BIA do a study on how much housing they have proposed to build and how much they have actually built before granting more land for housing purposes. Perhaps they would already have enough housing if they actually built houses on the lands that were conveyed into trust. And we're seeing this pattern again where the initial report was housing and an event center and already some of the housing is being recast as commercial space. I think that the support for the development of tribal housing should be conditioned on a study that shows there would be a need if they had developed the previous parcels designated for tribal housing for housing. And then they should only be able to develop as many new houses as they would have needed if they had developed the houses they claimed they planned to develop.

4.) As a nearby resident who relies on well water, I'm deeply concerned that the project could deplete the groundwater or cause damaging runoff as it will move a parking garage into the watershed that feeds our groundwater. At least as far as I can tell, this isn't really addressed in the environmental impact report, but it could have a deeply negative impact on my life if I'm unable to have access to clean water. Possible mitigations include the tribe paying for our neighborhood to have EID water, or to individually treat the wells and be on the hook for deeper wells if ours fail due to their increased water needs. Perhaps none of that is actually necessary, but I want it looked at.

Thank you for your time.

Jason Friese

#2 BOS Kevid 11/4/25

 Outlook


Suggested letter modification for Consent Calendar Item #2

LATE DISTRIBUTION
DATE 11/4/25

From Sue Taylor <suetaylor530@gmail.com>

Date Tue 11/4/2025 8:40 AM

To BOS-District I <bosone@edcgov.us>; BOS-District V <bosfive@edcgov.us>; BOS-District II <bostwo@edcgov.us>; BOS-District IV <bosfour@edcgov.us>; BOS-District III <bosthree@edcgov.us>; BOS-Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

 1 attachment (20 KB)

November 4.docx;

This Message Is From an External Sender

This message came from outside your organization.

Report Suspicious

November 4, 2025

Ryan Hunter, Acting Regional Director
Bureau of Indian Affairs, Pacific Region Office
2800 Cottage Way, Room W-2820
Sacramento, CA 95825

RE: Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians 295.7-Acre Fee-to-Trust Project
Support C

Dear Mr. Hunter,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians (Tribe) 295.7-Acre Fee-to-Trust Project. In this project, the Tribe proposes to develop Tribal housing, an arena, other general commercial uses, a multipurpose emergency shelter, a maintenance operations building, parking garages, and associated infrastructure, while including two other alternatives.

The Environmental Assessment prepared by Acorn Environmental describes the proposed project (Alternative A) and two other alternatives:

- Alternative A consists of the fee simple conveyance of the project site into federal trust status for the benefit of the Tribe. This land trust action would shift civil regulatory jurisdiction over the project site from the State of California (State) and El Dorado County to the Tribe and the federal government. Federal laws, such as the Clean Water Act and the federal Endangered Species Act, would continue to apply to the project site. Alternative A includes: (1) an arena and parking garage; (2) residential development; (3) commercial development; (4) a multipurpose emergency shelter; and (5) maintenance operations buildings.
- Alternative B is similar to the Proposed Project but would include development of only the residential, multipurpose emergency shelter, and maintenance facility components. No commercial uses would be developed, including the proposed arena. All other aspects would be identical to Alternative A, including the conveyance of the project site into federal trust status, water supply and wastewater treatment and disposal, grading and drainage, and development standards. The proposed residential site plan for Alternative B would be the same as provided for Alternative A. The proposed southern development site

plan (multipurpose emergency shelter, and maintenance facility components) for Alternative B would be the same as provided for Alternative A, but would not include the commercial development.

- Alternative C is a no action alternative. Under the No Action Alternative, the land would not be taken into trust and the Project would not be developed with commercial uses. Existing single-family homes are assumed to remain. The Tribe would likely still develop the proposed multipurpose emergency shelter and maintenance facility with the land remaining in fee. The project site would remain within the jurisdiction of El Dorado County and could be developed at some point in the future consistent with federal, State, and local requirements. However, future development would be speculative. It is therefore assumed for the purposes of the EA that the majority of the project site would remain minimally utilized under the No Action Alternative.

As discussed below, the County would only be supportive of Alternative C.

In previous comment letters sent to the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), the County expressed support for the use of the subject parcels for tribal housing that is consistent with the existing zoning and neighboring homes due to the current need within the tribal community.

In order to maintain that land use and zoning the land should remain in the jurisdiction of the County. This will avail the properties the same privileges as availed to the adjoining neighbors, therefore not creating constant conflict by competing interests.

If the Tribe wishes to change the zoning or land use, the process for evaluating for impacts to adjoining properties would be guaranteed. If the Tribe's intend is to use the land as tribal member housing, as they stated in the application, there is no need to put the land into federal trust and out of the County's jurisdiction.

It is important that the development of parcels for housing maintains compatibility with the residential character of the area surrounding the Rancheria lands. It is important to note, the parcels containing the residential development and arena are currently accessed through private, gated roads that are maintained by a private road association, North Buckeye Rancheros Owners Association (NBROA). Placing these parcels into trust would reduce the revenues available to the NBROA for road and culvert maintenance.

With respect specifically to the arena and parking garage proposed in Alternative A, the County cannot be supportive of the incompatible use of residential parcels. An alternative that the County would support is that if the arena and parking garage were to be developed on a parcel or parcels that would not impact or greatly reduce the impacts to residents of the NBROA and surrounding neighborhoods. It is of the utmost importance that the private residential roads near the Casino are not used for commercial activity.

In previous Fee-to-Trust applications for the parcels included in this project, there was no mention of using the parcels for commercial activities. However, Alternative A includes commercial development for “typical neighborhood-serving retail and commercial businesses.” The parcels that include the proposed commercial development are zoned residential thus the commercial use would be incompatible with current zoning which the County does not support.

As we have previously discussed with the Tribe, the west slope of El Dorado County has two main commercial districts, El Dorado Hills and Missouri Flat Road. We impressed upon the Tribe the importance of those districts to El Dorado County’s revenue. The County urges the Tribe to work with the County to allow for commercial development that supports our residents, both on and off tribal lands, while generating the revenues needed to serve the County’s residents and visitors with public safety services, road maintenance, et cetera.

As previously shared with the BIA, the County has major concerns about the Fee-to-Trust process and how the nearby residents and general public are not notified nor engaged in the process. There are negative impacts to surrounding neighbors and communities when lands are placed into trust and no longer subject to County zoning, community standards, and/or participation in private road associations.

The proposed A & B options are not compliant with the County’s General Plan. The land is in the County’s Rural Region meaning the parcels are meant to maintain 5 to 10 acre minimums. Therefore, there are no plans to direct the water or sewer infrastructure to this location. If the Tribe chooses to use well water for this commercial venture, it will be a drain to the neighboring underground water resources, possibly draining the well water from adjacent parcels.

Moving forward, the County would like to see outreach to the neighboring communities be a part of the process for the BIA and the Tribe to ensure open communication and the development of goodwill between the Tribe and neighboring residents as well as allowing for a more

productive exchange of ideas. A great example of the collaboration between the Tribe and neighbors surrounding the Tribe's land was the gas station project. Tribal leaders engaged and sought feedback from the local residents through multiple meetings to receive input on the project.

The County of El Dorado acknowledges and respects the Tribe's sovereignty and its right to purchase and develop land. That said, the County hopes that the Tribe will continue to be a good neighbor recognizing that as two sovereign entities, we coexist on land that we mutually utilize. It is critical that the County and the Tribe continue to communicate in hopes we reach a mutually agreed upon understanding of the County's responsibilities and limited resources to provide essential services that all County residents, including Tribal members, depend on for their health, safety, and well-being. The County of El Dorado Board of Supervisors thanks you for your consideration of our comments.

Should you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact Alison Winter, Principal Management Analyst, via email at alison.winter@edcgov.us.

Sincerely,
George Turnboo
Chair, El Dorado C