

Public Comment #2  
BOS RCVD 11/3/2025

**From:** [Sue Taylor](#)  
**To:** [BOS-District I](#); [BOS-District V](#); [BOS-District II](#); [BOS-District IV](#); [BOS-District III](#); [BOS-Clerk of the Board](#)  
**Subject:** Re: GENERAL GOVERNMENT - CONSENT ITEM #2. Legistar #25-1826  
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 3:51:36 AM

**This Message Is From an External Sender**

This message came from outside your organization.

[Report Suspicious](#)

GENERAL GOVERNMENT - CONSENT ITEM

2. 25-1826 Chief Administrative Office recommending the Board approve and authorize the Chair to sign the attached comment letter to be transmitted to the U. S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs for the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians 295.7-Acre Fee-to-Trust Project.

First, I ask that the Board remove this massive project from the Consent Calendar. It is unbelievable that this project has been located under consent.

Second, I question that since this massive project is still under the jurisdiction of the County, why was it not presented to the Planning Commission?

How could anyone be expected to digest this 969 page environmental report for the development of this tribe's 295.7 ACRE project in such a short period of time? Either modify the letter to only support C or move this item to the Planning Commission to give the public and decision makers more time to evaluate the impact of this project and whether it should be supported or not.

The letter is a weak response for what will be an enormous negative impact to the County. The letter leaves much of the burden to be placed on the adjoining neighbors to somehow mitigate the impact of this very incompatible project that will be adjacent to their large residential parcels without the teeth or support of the county. If the tribe project uses well water, what will be the impact to the wells of the neighbors? What is the impact to the county's economy due to unfair competition of similar activities? This property is in a rural region, not intended to have sewer, water or road infrastructure directed to this area. If EID and DOT move those resources that direction, what will be the impact to the rest of the County?

The letter should state that the proposed A & B options are not compliant with the County's General Plan, that both options A & B will be a drain to the County's underground water resources, the county has no intention to direct the water or sewer infrastructure to this location, and this project will cause harm to the economic stability of the County. C is the only option in which the county could support, which is to retain the current zoning and land use for single family homes on acreage.

Hopefully you will protect the residents of the county from outside influences that are working to undermine our rural way of life. Please recommend only supporting option C in your letter.

Respectfully,  
Sue Taylor

Public Comment #2  
BOS RCVD 11/3/2025

**From:** [DonnaRae Caccavo](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Clerk of the Board](#)  
**Subject:** 11-4-23 Agenda Item #2. Legistar #25-1826 Fee-to-Trust Project  
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 7:05:31 AM

---

**This Message Is From an External Sender**

This message came from outside your organization.

[Report Suspicious](#)

To the Board of Supervisors:

Please pull this from the Consent Calendar. Board please 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. Neighbors and area residents should have clear disclosures and a chance to comment.

This is a big project that will impact MANY folks in the surrounding areas.

Thank you for you attention.

Dr Caccavo