



DIABLO CANYON LAND PLANNING PROJECT COMMUNITY WORK GROUP MEETING SUMMARY

Date: 4/2/26

Time: 10AM – 2PM

Venue: Port San Luis, Avila Beach

Meeting Summary

The primary purpose of this four hour session was to welcome and orient newly appointed Community Work Group (CWG) Tribal members, to introduce the draft Policy Analysis, to understand connection between the Coastal Commission Mitigation Package and this project's work, to gain feedback on our approach to the first Community Workshop, and to discuss engagement with individual CWG member networks.

Participants

Community Work Group Members:

**attended the meeting virtually via Zoom*

- Bob Hill
- Celeste Royer
- Dave Garth
- Ernest Houston*
- Frazier Haney
- Kaila Dettman
- Keith Miller
- Matt Ritter
- Mike A. Khus-zarate
- Mona Olivas Tucker
- Nick Franco*
- Pam Reading
- Tim McNulty
- Andrea Chmelik (*arrived slightly late*)
- Dawn Ortiz-Legg (*arrived mid-meeting*)
- Kara Woodruff

Staff/Consultant Team Attendees:

- Tim Duff (SCC)
- Trish Chapman (SCC)
- Hilary Hill (SCC)
- Brian Burchfield (Alta)
- Tim Bevins (Alta)
- Carolyn Berg (Koble)
- Annie Chung (Koble)

- Scott Kremkau (SRI)
- Oliviya Wyse (DDA)

Decisions & Consensus Areas

- **CWG Charter:** No changes requested to the revised Community Work Group Charter presented at this meeting
- **Community Workshop:** Do not plan an initial Community Workshop for May/June 2026 or over summer due to conflicting schedules and hard to reach community during that time. Use summer to do outreach to CWG networks and key local agencies. Postpone and plan for Fall 2026.
- **Outreach to CWG Networks:** CWG to help raise awareness of the project and workshop within their own networks, once the goals of the workshop are more defined.
- **Draft Policy Analysis Review:** Draft Policy Analysis to be sent to CWG approximately two weeks following the meeting. CWG members submit any comments or feedback to Annie Chung and Devan Gelle.

Action Items

- **Add New CWG Member Bios:** Koble to reach out to Tribal representatives/new CWG members to request bios and headshots
- **Review Comment Made Regarding Existing Conditions Report (ECR):** SCC, SRI, and Alta to check language in ECR regarding Salinan ties/heritage and consider removal
- **Coastal Commission Mitigation Decisions:** SCC to review staff report from Coastal Commission hearing to ensure correct interpretation of outcomes (i.e. South Ranch phase I land acquisition provides for option to Eureka Energy/PGE to offer a right of first refusal)
- **Advance Outreach to Key Networks & Agencies:**
 - Koble to create and send Google form to gain understanding of networks, commitments, etc.; get feedback on smaller pockets of the community (who, what would that look like, etc.)
 - CWG to give feedback on their preferences and needs for information sharing (i.e. newsletter blurb, social media post language, flyer, etc.)
 - Staff/consultant team to consider and plan summer outreach to key agencies and/or advisory body hearings, etc.
 - Consultant team to provide draft website to CWG before it goes live
- **Outreach Toolkit:** Staff/consultant team to put together a roadshow toolkit, such as slide deck, talking points, etc. for CWG members to use.
- **Community Workshop:** Staff/consultant team to schedule Community Kickoff Workshop in Fall 2026
- **Review Timing for Policy Analysis:** DDA expects draft Policy Analysis to be sent to Tribes and CWG in approx. 2 weeks, though depends on final internal review steps following today's meeting.

- **Deed Restriction Document:** Kara Woodruff to send 1,200-acre deed restriction document to Annie Chung to share with CWG
- **CWG Volunteer Roles:**
- Review draft agenda: Dawn Ortiz-Legg
- Review meeting summary: Bob Hill

Discussion Highlights

Welcome & Agenda Overview

- Welcomed new CWG members to the meeting and held roundtable personal introductions of all CWG members and staff/consultant team present at the meeting.
- New CWG members representing three of the five participating Tribes gave introductory and opening remarks to introduce themselves to the existing CWG members and staff/consultant team.
- Deep sentiment of welcome and respect shared for the Tribal representatives who are newly joining the CWG by existing CWG.

Project Updates & CWG Items

- During project updates, draft project video previewed and consultant team stated that Existing Conditions Report (ECR) and Tribal Participation Plan were both shared. The ECR has not been finalized, pending resolution of the following objection.
- Comment of objection given that in the ECR it is factually inaccurate to include mention of Salinan descendance as there has been no data or evidence linking their lineage, like there has been for the Chumash people. Chairperson Tucker recommended removal from the ECR. Staff/consultant team to review and consider comment.

Draft Policy Analysis

- Draft Policy analysis is in development and almost ready for internal review. Document will be shared with Tribes and CWG for review and feedback once ready.
- Draft Policy Analysis: Consultant team shared high-level details about the draft Policy Analysis. This document is meant to be a programmatic tool to inform upcoming work on the Conservation and Access Recommendations Report by describing land use policies and permit requirements for future public access facility development. The land is both in and out of coastal zones, diverse in topography, and holds diverse resources. Federal, state, regional, and local policies are described in the analysis.
- CWG asked several follow up questions centered around: clarification of coastal zone boundaries on map, existing agreements and easements to understand constraints, title conditions, details on the newly added 1,200 acre deed restriction document, who was consulted for the assessment, the lens CWG members should use in their future review of the draft, whether the recent California Coastal Commission hearing's relevant decisions in December 2025 was included, and whether the CPUC tribal land back policy was included.

- Discussed CWG's desire to have more substantive input into work products out of this effort. Staff/consultant team noted that there will be more opportunities to help inform the future deliverables, such as the Conservation and Access Recommendations Report whereas the existing conditions and policy documents are more objective and do not have much room for influence from CWG.

Coastal Commission Mitigation Package

- Coastal Commission Mitigation Package: Staff shared high level details about the outcomes from December 2025 hearing. See revised summary attachment.
- CWG asked several follow up questions or comments centered around: the chronology of events and ownership clarity for Wild Cherry Canyon, confirmation that one entity must acquire both fee title and the leases otherwise it cannot be acquired; suggestion that each area within the North Ranch area does not have to be conveyed as one singular unit but that portions of the various parcels could be suitable for different uses/owners (since there are incontiguous parcels that comprise the mapped “North Ranch”); clarity on whether the \$10M is for both North and South Ranch; if ongoing maintenance is included in the \$10M; whether the conditions were negotiated or imposed upon PG&E; acknowledgement of heavy involvement by Senator Laird and Assemblymember Addis in negotiations to achieve additional conservation beyond PG&E offerings; how initial draft designs were determined for potential future trails; whether there will be more than just trails (i.e. trail infrastructure, campgrounds, equestrian access, etc.); highlighted major difference between tribal ownership v. tribal access; acknowledgement that feedback given by Land Conservancy of SLO County and others to Coastal Commission made them add “or private conservation agencies or tribal organizations” to potential options for future owners of lands; importance of not just letting PG&E determine who writes the stewardship plan – suggest robust community and CWG input on this effort; discussion of whether there is flexibility on how the money is spent (i.e. getting grants to build, but saving money for maintenance), accounting for added needs regarding public safety.
- Development of appropriate trail alignments to be supported by CWG in future sessions.
- CWG members suggested consideration of aligning the cadence and increasing the frequency of CWG meetings and the timelines of the mentioned processes and deliverables to better influence and/or inform this and other simultaneous Diablo-related efforts. Suggest discussion of priorities over the next 12 months.

Community Engagement and Advance Outreach

- Community Engagement and Advance Outreach: Consultant team gave short presentation that summarized formerly held conversations with the CWG, the need to lean on CWG networks to help spread the message, and potential timelines for Community Engagement steps.
- CWG members gave input on several workshop-related topics including: workshop activities and approach suggestions as they relate to media and flow; making explicit efforts to distinguish this project from surrounding and similar projects; before broadening scope of outreach to the broader county, inform the Avila Beach community prior to a regionwide community workshop since the impacts will primarily affect their area, their jobs, their safety; suggestions to fold in to established and existing community meetings; the need to define the purpose of this project (as related to and/or separate from other Diablo-related processes); the need for staff/consultant team to define what the intent of the first community workshop is: to inform and build awareness, to promote the project, to collaborate with the public, to consult the public on something, etc.; define the intended and desired audience; consider how

feedback will be documented before, during, and/or after the event; understand and be able to describe the end goal for this project

- CWG anticipates public engagement to reveal: tension between conflicting priorities of maximum access and maximum conservation; some reluctance to give public comment and to consider other methods of input; confusion about how this relates to work by the PG&E Decommissioning Engagement Panel and Coastal Commission; fear that the land would be disrespected and disregarded by future uses even without intending to.
- CWG suggests staff/consultant team to: help level set public, define the outcomes and what input is desired from the public; build trust with various constituencies by starting with smaller groups rather than first hosting a large community meeting; identify groups not immediately considered for outreach (e.g. Chambers of Commerce, Latino outreach, non-recreation or conservation, etc.); define what the workshop is and is not; use the Mitigation Package as a milestone to reference; be deliberate about what networks you go to and the timing and about defining Tribal presence; consider international examples of places that are highly respected and protected despite being popular destinations for tourists/visitors; get the workshop on people's calendars EARLY—recommend workshop being no sooner than Fall 2026.

Next Steps

- Review draft policy analysis
- Schedule first community workshop in Fall
- Virtual meeting to go through outreach toolkit, then in collaboration and coordination with Alta/Koble, CWG conduct coordinated outreach to his/her priority networks
- Staff/consultant team to consider and plan summer outreach to key agencies, appropriate networks, and/or other organizations.