

What changed in the public record?

Seven questions affecting land, law, energy, water, and community resources. Some have settled decisions. Others remain open.

The Pit River land-transfer bill has moved forward but is not law. Fountain Wind was denied. A possible Mt. Shasta data center is still an inquiry, not an approved project. Here's what the records establish—and what to look for next.

First, the important distinctions

Decisions are on record

Fountain Wind is denied. California's tracked bills have their 2026 outcomes.

Other decisions are still pending

The land-transfer bill awaits House action. Birthright-citizenship litigation is ongoing.

Reports are not approvals

Mt. Shasta's inquiry, Medicine Lake sampling, and funding updates require their own next checks.

FINAL 2026 ACTIONS

10 laws • 3 vetoes • 1 held

California Tribal bills: the Governor has acted

Ten of the California measures tracked here became law. Three were vetoed, and one was held.

Eight bills were signed September 25: AB 31, 1641, 1769, 1824, 1841, 2115, 2187 and 2507. AB 1581 was signed September 30, while AB 2018 had already become law in July.

AB 1881 and AB 2218 were vetoed September 30; SB 891 was vetoed September 27. SB 1326 was held. These results complete the 2026 Governor-action picture for this desk's tracked bills, not every California Tribal-related proposal.

A signed law may have a later effective date or need agency instructions. A vetoed bill did not become law.

What would change this finding?

Check the enacted text and start dates for each law, followed by agency guidance or a new bill addressing a vetoed proposal.

Sources and records to check

- [Governor: Tribal legislation signed September 25](#)
- [Governor: legislative update September 27](#)
- [Governor: legislative update September 30](#)

AWAITING HOUSE ACTION

Senate passed amendment · not law

Pit River land transfer: one more step in Congress

The Pit River Land Transfer Act passed the Senate with an amendment on September 30. It is not yet law.

The House still must decide whether to agree to the amended H.R. 2400 before a bill can move to the President. The companion measure, S. 2871, does not establish that this step happened.

Even if the bill becomes law, a completed land transfer must be documented separately. Congressional passage and conveyance are not the same event.

What would change this finding?

A House vote on the Senate amendment, any presidential action, and then the actual land-transfer record.

Sources and records to check

- [Senator Padilla: Senate passage October 1](#)
- [GovInfo: Senate-amended H.R. 2400 text](#)

LITIGATION ONGOING

Class protection · proposed passport plan

Birthright citizenship: court orders remain central

Federal action is being challenged in court. A proposed passport plan is not the same as a final rule that can override a court order.

Following the Supreme Court's June 2026 Trump v. Barbara decision, Executive Order 14418 was issued August 6. On September 2, a federal district court in CASA barred enforcement against the certified plaintiff class. A separate lawsuit, Nathan v. Trump, was filed September 28.

The court allowed agencies to publish public guidance; that permission does not cancel the injunction. The State Department describes its passport implementation plan as proposed and subject to legal obligations. The CASA ruling protects the class defined by that order; it is not a final universal decision about every individual case.

What would change this finding?

New court orders or appeals, any change in the protected class, and final legally operative agency instructions.

Sources and records to check

- [White House: Executive Order 14418](#)
- [Federal district court: September 2 CASA order \(PDF\)](#)
- [Georgetown ICAP: CASA litigation status](#)
- [ACLU: Nathan case filing](#)
- [State Department: implementation-plan notice](#)
- [State Department: proposed plan \(PDF\)](#)

REPORTED PRELIMINARY INQUIRY

Developer named in reporting · no verified filing

Mt. Shasta data center: an inquiry is not an approval

Planning contact about the former Crystal Geyser site was reported, but a formal application or project approval has not been established here.

A July 10 investigation says local planning emails identified Dunlieh Infrastructure Group in an early inquiry. That description relies on the journalist's records request; The Long Return has not independently authenticated the correspondence.

California signed seven data-center-related laws on September 21. Those laws change the questions future proposals may need to answer, but do not confirm a project at this site. Their specific start dates and applicability require checking.

No site-specific permit, water demand, electricity use, or cooling design has been verified in the records reviewed. That is a limit of this check, not proof that no filing exists.

What would change this finding?

A filed City or County application, environmental-review notice, official decision, or independently obtained project documents.

Sources and records to check

- [SFGATE: planning-email investigation \(reporting\)](#)
- [Governor: seven data-center laws September 21](#)
- [Siskiyou County: planning application routes \(not proof of absence\)](#)
- [City of Mt. Shasta: public planning projects \(not a complete docket certification\)](#)

FINAL AGENCY DECISION

Denied · December 19, 2025

Fountain Wind: the application was denied

The California Energy Commission denied Fountain Wind. The order became effective and final December 19, 2025.

Some older Long Return text described a recommendation to deny. That was a previous stage, not the project's present permit status.

The denial resolves this application. It does not rule out a different application, judicial action, or future agency proceeding. None of those later steps is established by this correction.

What would change this finding?

A new docket filing, court decision, or official reconsideration—not another description of the old recommendation.

Sources and records to check

- [CEC: Fountain Wind project status](#)
- [CEC: 23-OPT-01 docket and signed order](#)

ORGANIZATION REPORTS ACTIVITY

Summer sampling reported · designation not adopted

Medicine Lake: new sampling, not a new designation

A local organization reports new water-quality sampling at Medicine Lake and Paynes Spring. It does not report an adopted water-protection designation.

The Mount Shasta Bioregional Ecology Center said in its October 9 newsletter that it restarted sampling during summer 2026 with Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board funding. The group says the evidence could support possible Tribal Beneficial Use or Outstanding National Resource Water protections.

The report is evidence of the organization's stated work, not proof that regulators have approved either designation. The federal monument and Forest Service land-management questions remain separate.

What would change this finding?

A formal Water Board proposal, Tribal consultation, public notice, basin-plan decision, or separate federal land-management action.

Sources and records to check

- [MSBEC: October 2026 first-party newsletter](#)
- [Central Valley Water Board: Tribal Beneficial Uses](#)

FUNDING TIMETABLE CHANGED

Grant review pending · separate provider RFP

Food resilience funding: applications have closed

Community grant applications are closed. A new technical-assistance contract does not reopen those grants or establish a Pit River award.

California extended the Community Resilience Centers Round 2 implementation deadline from September 25 to September 30, 2026. Planning applications closed September 4; implementation applications and Transformative Climate Communities Round 6 final applications closed September 30. CRC awards are expected in spring 2027 after review.

On October 13, the Strategic Growth Council opened a separate request for proposals for organizations that would help future grantees implement projects. Its provider webinar is scheduled for October 29 at 10 a.m. Pacific. This is a procurement, not another community-grant application window.

These changes do not establish a local food distribution improvement, a Tribal project award, or the current reach of food programs. In the full food briefing, the earlier study remains source R20; the provider RFP is R32.

What would change this finding?

Published state award decisions, actual Pit River-specific commitments, or evidence that food storage, transport, or household access has changed.

Sources and records to check

- [Strategic Growth Council: CRC Round 2 applications](#)
- [Strategic Growth Council: TCC Round 6](#)
- [Strategic Growth Council: TA provider RFP October 13](#)

How to read this briefing

"Confirmed" means the named source establishes the stated step—not every consequence that might follow. "Reported" identifies the source making the claim. "Pending" means a later legal or administrative action remains to be shown. A missing filing in the sources checked is not proof no filing exists elsewhere.

These are source checks dated **October 16, 2026**, not live status updates. Earlier PDFs and reports remain historical editions; this web page was revised for readability without treating any new stage as verified. The Long Return does not speak for the Pit River Tribe, any band, government, family, or organization.

[Read the original detailed PDF \(archive\)](#) → · [Send a source or correction](#) → · [Browse all Watch Desk records](#) →