DIABLO LANDS PLANNING PROJECT COMMUNITY WORK GROUP MEETING SUMMARY

Date: 8/26/25	Time: 9AM – 12PM	Venue: The Wayfarer Hotel, San Luis Obispo

Meeting Summary

The primary purpose of this meeting was to review progress since kickoff; for the Community Work Group (CWG) to discuss their feedback regarding the current draft Existing Conditions Report (ECR); to review and approve the revised CWG Charter document and kickoff meeting summary; and to provide perspective on project approach to the first Community Engagement Workshop anticipated for 2026.

Agenda Items

Participants

Community Work Group Members:

- Bob Hill
- Kaila Dettman
- Nick Franco
- Dave Garth
- Celeste Royer
- Matt Ritter
- Frazier Haney
- Keith Miller
- Pam Reading
- *ABSENT: Tim McNulty*

Electeds:

- Andrea Chmelik (Assemblymember Addis, District Director)
- County Supervisor Dawn Ortiz-Legg
- Kara Woodruff (Senator Laird, District Director)

Staff Attendees:

- Tim Duff (SCC)

- Brian Burchfield (Alta)
- Tim Bevins (Alta)
- Carolyn Berg (Koble)
- Annie Chung (Koble)
- Virtual: Scott Kremkau (SRI)

Decisions & Consensus Areas

- **CWG Charter:** No changes requested to the revised Community Work Group Charter presented at this meeting
- **Deliverables**: Suggestion that deliverables ought to extend beyond "O&M (Operations & Maintenance) Plan" to reflect biological, cultural, and conservation values and plans/reports; must also align with State requirements (conservation plan, public access plan, and pre-acquisition planning).
- **Naming**: Recommend using historical/current working term "Diablo Canyon Lands" (rather than "Diablo Lands" used in draft ECR). Consensus that Tribes should be central to future phase re-naming discussions.
- **ECR Review:** The CWG seemed to have consensus around the following:
    - Strengths: Lovely design, some maps useful, recognition of environmental and cultural sensitivities.
    - Concerns: Significant data gaps, including missing PG&E data, and some errors. Report perceived as overly technical and lacking human context/storytelling, read as a pre-CEQA type report–need for audience clarification. Noted inclusion of 500 foot buffers around sensitive zones may make specific planning efforts challenging, without knowing what's protected, etc. Lacked context for how the ECR fits into the overall planning effort and the need for a better description of the relationships between the key deliverables.
    - **Recommended Next Steps**: Fill data gaps, define audience, clarify terminology, and ensure competing priorities and interests are treated with equal weight without suggested outcomes already established.
    - *Please note, 8 CWG members submitted individual written comments prior to the meeting, which are being considered during the project team review but were not discussed in detail during the meeting*.
- **Tribal Engagement:** Consensus that Tribal engagement should be iterative and approached with humility. Separate and concurrent Tribal and CWG processes to continue, with a high level of desire by CWG to build bridges between the two concurrent dialogues and connect with the Tribes over time.

Action Items

- **Follow-Up with Coastal Commission** regarding easement records, conservation areas (e.g., Point San Luis), and cultural sites along Pecho Coast Trail. *One member noted: Locating easement records affecting the Diablo Canyon Lands could be done with an inquiry to Coastal Commission, but it could also be done (perhaps more quickly and easily) with a title search / title report for the property*.

- **Data Gap Work:** Project team to circulate dataset spreadsheet for CWG members to then flag and add missing datasets/sources that they perceive as significant to the ECR, for SCC and Alta's review and deliberation.
- **Definitions and Consistency:** Project team to clearly define various types of resources upfront and use consistently throughout ECR.
- **Policy Analysis Input:** Project team to distribute draft Policy Analysis to CWG once ready for review. CWG members to provide feedback via email if timing of next CWG meeting does not align with policy analysis review schedule.
- **Community Outreach:** Plan one additional CWG meeting before launch of broader community engagement workshop; CWG members will support outreach within their constituencies.
- **CWG Volunteer Roles:**
    - Review draft agenda: Nick Franco
    - Review meeting summary: Kaila Dettman

Discussion Highlights

Charter & Deliverables

- Emphasized conservation planning must extend beyond O&M, incorporating cultural and biological protection.
- SCC clarified O&M plan may or may not be a deliverable depending on consultant scope.
- Underscored alignment with State-required deliverables.
- Noted "Diablo Lands" risks confusion (especially statewide with Diablo Range in Bay Area, CA), though "Diablo Canyon" might overly tie identity to the power plant. Someone countered that power plant association is not necessarily negative, but ought to be clarified. Noted that "Diablo Canyon Lands" reflects history and ongoing protection efforts for the project/ECR and should be maintained for now for clarity and public understanding; however, members recognized the importance to hold space for renaming of the lands to incorporate Tribal language (e.g., Pecho Coast) in future phases.

Tribal Engagement

- Some CWG members feel current separate engagement processes feels like "us" v. "them"; desire more collaborative engagement.
- Recommend considering future one-on-one or small-group "meet and greet" sessions to build relationships and trust between Tribal members and CWG.
- Questions arose as to whether and how CWG members could interact with Tribal members between meetings, as numerous CWG members have existing relationships and interactions with local Tribal members.

Draft Existing Conditions Report (ECR)

- General agreement that the draft ECR is incomplete and lacks data depth. All groups agreed additional aspects of biological, botanical, marine, and cultural resource data would benefit the report. Strongly advise going beyond publicly available documents.

- Many noted "humanity" and motivational narrative needed, depending on the audience for the report, as this draft reads dry and won't engage the public. All agreed that the audience needs to be defined.
- ECR language needs to not presuppose outcomes of the project; language should instead present different interests and priorities as equal.
- Key gaps: unclear easement boundaries, appears to exclude ~1200 acres, missing conservation easement data, archaeological data unavailable to CWG, and absence of marine/coastal context (i.e., bluff data).
- The project team's archeologist and tribal facilitators recommended the maps include a 500-ft buffer around sensitive zones without distinguishing where cultural resources are located. Complicates land use planning.
- Need to balance environmental, cultural, and regulatory sensitivities without disclosing confidential resource locations.

Question Topic: Did anything change how you think about the Lands or this project? What did you learn or find interesting?

- ECR reveals immense land-use complexity, but lacks sufficient biological/botanical data and multi-year baselines.
- Tenuous balance between access and preservation.
- Report feels dry and lacks “humanity” or historical context (e.g., Tribal history, Japanese internment, grazing history, etc.). Suggested a more inspiring, narrative-style “coffee table” report for public communication.
- Identified missing marine/coastal data, map clarity issues, existing errors, and absence of easement/legal constraints.
- Want to know more about inholdings.

Question Topic: What felt missing or light in draft ECR? (whether new data to gather or from data sets already known)

- Across breakout groups, members agreed that without fuller environmental, cultural, marine/coastal, bluff-specific (erosion, sea caves, etc.), biological, and botanical datasets, as well as historical and legal context/constraints, the report is insufficient to guide robust land use and conservation planning.
    - Suggest need for at least 2 seasons of data collection
    - More information needed about agricultural practices on North and South Ranch
    - Need detailed data prior to making promises to the community about future use and access
- The report should be both technically comprehensive for CEQA and regulatory needs and narratively rich to inspire community and stakeholder support, depending on audience for report.
- The planning area should not be artificially constrained; adjacent lands and infrastructure connections must be factored in to ensure holistic conservation outcomes, even if outside of “project area.” Current project area might not reflect the whole project area that should be considered; some of those parcels are not labeled, yet very important to consider. Some lands are for transmission lines but could be critical in protecting lands.
    - Examples of adjacent lands needed: Marine/ocean; PG&E Parcel P; PG&E lands outside of the currently labeled contiguous PG&E and Eureka parcels (connections, transmission, etc.); Hibberd Preserve; Irish Hills (SCC planning document); Montana de Oro; parcels adjacent to

North Ranch; entirety of State Parks holdings; BLM; Squire Canyon area; Indian Knob (first place transmission lines touch down once out of lands); consider both public access and wildlife corridors.

- Waste Water Treatment Plants/Conflicts.
- Maps lack coastal/marine depictions; map scale makes data assessment difficult; too broad; lacking in subsets of ESA maps to help round out data though note sensitivity to tribal resource information; energy infrastructure of strategic importance; all easements and legal constraints should be mapped; allowed uses by zone (Table O).
- Clarify separate process from, and not dependent on, decommissioning of power plant.

Question Topic: Future Generations & Success Stories. *What would you like future generations to experience? Success stories of this nature? etc.*

- Envision inclusivity of all people and all uses (bike, horse, camp, etc.), especially centering Tribal voices and communities that have historically been left out of recreation planning in the past.
- Educational opportunities to connect communities with science and conservation on the lands.
- Emphasized landback, preservation in perpetuity, deeper connections to the lands.
- Suggested innovative ideas like a "digital twin" (like TNC, to allow remote independent research, access) or educational resource center (like Marre Property).
- Prioritized preserving the lands in as natural a state as possible while balancing multiple uses, so future generations can experience lands as they currently are.
- Creating opportunities for the public to engage with the "wild" lands while protecting highly sensitive areas, appreciate and care for nature, and carry conservation forward through understanding and volunteer projects.
- Thoughtful designation of guided process and controlled engagement, as needed. Balancing interests like access with conservation, and understanding ecological background–why there's access or not.
- Success stories to look to: Carr Lake, Big Sur Land Trust - community, Rana Creek, Pismo Preserve, Sumeg Park (formerly Patrick's Point), Windwolves.

Question Topic: Tribal Engagement. *Messages to share with Tribal partners? How to be a resource to Tribes? Or how can Tribes be a resource?*

- Consensus that engagement must be humble, respectful, iterative, and allow Tribes to define their role; separate processes are acceptable, with bridge-building ideal over time. Stated need to balance tribal interests with those of the rest of the community.
- Agreement that Tribes must have a central role, but recognition that SCC intends for the processes to remain separate from and concurrent with CWG. CWG would like the opportunity to collaborate and build trusting relationships with the Tribes over time.
- Recognition of sensitive dynamics among Tribes; collective meetings may not be feasible.
- Suggested approaches include iterative consultation, affinity-group style engagement, and a facilitated process to bridge with CWG.
- Through affinity group process and bridge building, hopefully conversations are robust enough to then lead to responsible allocations and decisions. Hoping for very clear outcomes that should then become recommendations/happen for SCC.

- Discussion around how and which Tribes were invited into the project, and why. SCC shared that the State uses the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) list and Tribes on that list self-select which counties they have an interest in receiving project information about. If a Tribe selected SLO County, then they were notified of this project.

Community Engagement

- One more CWG session planned before launching public engagement.
- Emphasized relationship-building before public rollout, so need for backward mapping of schedule and efforts.
- CWG members will help lead outreach efforts within their constituencies.
- Define the public's role in this effort and the messaging of that.
- Noted that City of SLO spaces are not well suited for public workshops, and there may be some elements of City Hall that are problematic for Tribes.

Next Steps

- Review draft policy analysis
- Provide input into first round of community outreach