

California Tahoe Conservancy  
Agenda Item 2  
March 17, 2016

**BOARD MEETING MINUTES  
DECEMBER 17 - 18, 2015**

Chair Larry Sevison called the meeting to order at 1:10 p.m. at the Lahontan Annex Hearing Room, South Lake Tahoe, California. Those in attendance and constituting a quorum were:

**Members present:**

Larry Sevison, Chair, Placer County  
John Hooper, Vice Chair, Public Member  
Todd Ferrara, California Natural Resources Agency  
Jeff Marsolais, United States Forest Service (ex officio)  
Sue Novasel, El Dorado County  
Lynn Suter, Public Member

**Members absent:**

Tom Davis, City of South Lake Tahoe  
Karen Finn, Department of Finance

**Others present:**

Marian Moe, Deputy Attorney General  
Patrick Wright, Executive Director  
Jane Freeman, Deputy Director  
Ryan Davis, Staff Counsel  
Diane Niland, Clerk of the Board

---

**Agenda Items**

**Agenda Item 1. Roll Call**

The Clerk of the Board called the roll at 1:12 p.m.

## **Agenda Item 2. Minutes**

Vice Chair Hooper moved approval of the September 18, 2015 Minutes (**Resolution 15-12-01**) as submitted. The motion was seconded by Ms. Novasel. The motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

## **Agenda Item 3. Chair's Report**

Chair Sevison presented former Board Member Nancy Gibson (USFS-retired) with an award for her past service to the Conservancy. An award was also presented to Christine West in acknowledgment of her upcoming retirement from the Conservancy.

## **Agenda Item 4. Attorney General's Report**

Deputy Attorney General Marian Moe had no report.

## **Agenda Item 5. Executive Director's Report**

Executive Director Patrick Wright highlighted several items. He reported on his meeting with the Chairman of the Washoe Tribe, Neil Mortimer and commitment to establishing a new, more productive relationship between the Conservancy and the Tribe and a new memorandum of understanding to clarify this partnership. A new State of California tribal consultation rule directs agencies to not only consider archeological resources but also cultural resources and so the bar is higher. In addition Mr. Wright identified a number of opportunities on the California side of the Basin for partnerships with the Tribe and the likelihood that staff will be reaffirming Conservancy's partnership with the Tribe in the future.

Mr. Wright reported that the Conservancy, along with many other agencies, developed and approved a new conservation strategy for the Tahoe yellow cress, which was sufficient to allow the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service not to list the Tahoe yellow cress on the Endangered Species List. The conservation strategy provides guidance and direction when implementing shoreline projects around the Basin. As you may hear later today, the Upper Truckee Marsh is the home to the largest population of Tahoe yellow cress in the Basin.

Mr. Wright said staff received 32 Proposition 1 proposals requesting over \$30 million for the approximate \$13-\$14 million available. A large amount of work has gone into reviewing the Prop 1 grant proposals by our internal team and Mr. Wright thanked the team lead Lisa O'Daly, along with Joe Pepi, Chris Mertens, and Whitney Brennan.

Mr. Wright summarized the next steps including an external review panel meeting and a set of recommendations to the Board in March on how to allocate Proposition 1 funds.

Mr. Wright outlined other Conservancy initiatives including a partnership with U.S. Forest Service and local fire districts on the Lake Tahoe West collaborative landscape planning process. At both the federal and state level there is greater emphasis on doing large scale, multijurisdictional projects and we hope this project will be a model for this.

On the status of previously authorized projects Mr. Wright reported that the Conservancy's Sawmill Stream Environment Zone acquisition is complete and the next planning has commenced for site clearance and restoration. This acquisition implements Tahoe Regional Planning Agency's (TRPA) Regional Plan vision of allowing commodities from acquisitions to be transferred to town centers, providing a triple benefit of: removing blight, restoring a wetland, and facilitating development in a town center rather than in an outlying area.

Mr. Wright said the TRPA Board recently adopted a new set of rules regarding excess coverage mitigation whereby the Conservancy receives the revenue from excess coverage mitigation fees with more flexibility and ability to purchase higher priority projects. Accordingly, staff intends to return to the Board with a recommendation for updates to the Land Bank Memorandum of Understanding to reflect the TRPA ordinance changes.

Finally, Mr. Wright reported that the Conservancy held a public workshop with California Department of Parks and Recreation to share information regarding one of a number of land transfers that we are working on. This land transfer covers parcels we own around Lake Valley Recreation Area and Washoe Meadows State Park. The land transfer will facilitate our respective management responsibilities where State Parks will own parcels that are adjacent to the Recreation Area and State Park that we currently own. The workshop resulted in a modest amount of public comment.

#### **Agenda Item 6. Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items**

South Lake Tahoe resident Norma Santiago thanked the Conservancy and especially the staff for all the work that they do. She noted that as a board member of the Sierra State Parks Foundation, the land transfer between the Conservancy and Department of Parks and Recreation is very important for the Foundation. The Foundation is

dedicated to being a resource either financially or through volunteers to help promote programs and projects that support the mission of state parks. Ms. Santiago said the land transfer will be an additional important element to the strategic planning process. Ms. Santiago also complimented the staff on their hard work on the Upper Truckee Marsh project and indicated she thinks the preferred alternative is “awesome.”

## **Agenda Item 7. Consent**

### **Caltrans Trout to “Y”**

The Board considered authorization to transfer interests in land to the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) for the Trout to “Y” U.S. Highway 50 Water Quality Improvement Project in the City of South Lake Tahoe and acceptance of compensation in the amount up to \$50,000. (El Dorado County Assessor Parcel Numbers 23-211-44, 23-241-23, 31-061-20, 31-061-21, 31-075-22, and 31-075-23)

Vice Chair Hooper moved approval of **Resolution 15-12-02**. Ms. Novasel seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

## **Agenda Item 8. Project Authorizations**

### **a. Upper Truckee Marsh (1) Presentation (Information Only/No Board Action)**

Chair Sevison introduced Agenda Item 8a Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration (UTM) project presentation and authorizations of: the final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Statement (Final EIR/EIS/EIS) and the preferred alternative including land acquisitions and construction funding.

Senior Environmental Planner, Stuart Roll, presented the UTM project and requested Board authorizations.

Vice Chair Hooper thanked Mr. Roll for the presentation and noted that this is a prime example of where the public has had a very meaningful role in shaping the project. He asked if we know whether the single channel will remain as a single channel or if it will become a braided channel and how long it may take for the channel to become braided, if so. Mr. Roll responded that within a couple of years there will be one, primary low-flow channel but that multiple channels could be

activated in larger flows, such as during spring snowmelt. The river is also expected to start reactivating some of the remnant channels.

Mr. Ferrara noted that the contingency amount in the budget seemed significant and asked if this is a standard contingency amount. Mr. Roll responded that he checked with consulting engineers and typical contingency factors depend on the level of design of the project. At the conceptual design level phase contingencies are in the 20-30 percent range. Contingencies go down by final design phase. Since this project is at a conceptual design level, 20 percent is deemed a little low. It was recommended by the consulting engineer to include a 25 percent contingency but we believe 20 percent is more appropriate.

Mr. Ferrara noted that Mr. Roll referenced in his presentation and in the Board packet the reimbursement of federal funds and asked Mr. Roll to elaborate on this. Mr. Roll indicated that currently we have an active grant agreement with the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR), authorized by the Board in 2010. It covered all of the environmental document costs, recent expenditures on this effort, preliminary plans and permit applications. The grant was for \$1.1 million and \$400,000 remains, to be used for further planning and design work as part of the \$2.1 million in the budget presented today. The Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) provided funding for some studies. Mr. Roll said staff anticipates a partnership and cost share agreement with the ACOE in the near future to help with construction costs and indicated the BOR may also be able to assist with some construction funding.

Chair Severson asked how long the impacts from the project on fish passage and sedimentation are expected to last. Mr. Roll indicated that the fish passage impacts are anticipated to go beyond the two to three year time frame following construction and are a bit of an unknown, largely because of the mouth closure. Mouth closures happen because of a natural process and so that could continue like it occurs on other naturally functioning streams in the Basin. Mouth closures are a natural impact and have been occurring for eons and could continue, in theory, forever. The key concept to consider is whether the impacts are seasonal and short term and if they are similar to what was occurring prior to disturbance. Mouth closures happen during dry seasons and under certain drought-like conditions. In higher precipitation years, the mouths are opened by the high flow, so fish will be able to pass at these times.

Ms. Suter asked Mr. Roll to describe what happens when you wash the sediment. Mr. Roll said that they use giant firehoses and they walk up and down the channel and as the water goes down the channel it is pulled out of the channel and treated until it reaches certain levels of turbidity. Another way to wash sediment is to

sprinkle the water on to the flood plain so the dirty water doesn't make it downstream. There's a couple different methods but it can typically take upwards of a week or two of nonstop washing to get the water running clean enough to let it go back in to the river. It is one of the interesting challenges of building rivers in Tahoe.

Ms. Novasel noted she appreciates all the hard work and especially the collaboration. Listening to the public comments and incorporating it into the planning was key to make this a successful project. She asked whether the Conservancy has a master plan for ongoing management and maintenance. Mr. Roll responded that the Conservancy is working on developing a more structured plan to deal with ongoing maintenance and this project will be incorporated into it. There are two elements to the maintenance and management for this project. The first is the public access features. We would be extending the accessible trail down to the lake, approximately  $\frac{1}{4}$  -  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile. That would be an increased maintenance cost. There are also some new viewpoints and educational facilities which would require some maintenance. What we did to estimate annual maintenance costs is we compared these improvements to other similar Conservancy sites. Based on that comparison, the estimated cost is approximately \$15,000 per year. The second element would be the maintenance of the river portion and we looked at the City of South Lake Tahoe's airport reach restoration project maintenance costs as a comparison. We estimate approximately \$20,000 per year will be needed to maintain the river portion of the project.

Mr. Marsolais asked about the collaboration between the lead agencies on the environmental documents and if there were any challenging issues that arose and/or design features that were modified to address agency input. Mr. Roll responded that there are differences among the agencies regarding terminology, mitigation measures, and preventative measures. Also the different environmental processes (i.e., CEQA, NEPA and TRPA) have different criteria for significance. We addressed this in the document by listing all the significance criteria and under each impact there are notes to which criteria from which applicable law it pertains to. It was a creative way of addressing some of the differences but also making the same shared analysis work for all varying requirements.

Mr. Wright added several points:

- The Department of General Services (DGS), not the Conservancy, will be overseeing the construction of the project since the Conservancy is a small state agency. The Conservancy will be there every step of the way but that's why there is a significant amount of funding for DGS in the budget.
- The alternatives don't address the ongoing management issues that we know are going to continue. We are well aware of the management issues in the Marsh and

are trying to work on solutions, such as hiring a ranger, but the management issues are not the focus of today. They are an ongoing issue regardless of what action the Board takes today.

- There is a lot of excitement about this project in the scientific and agency community as well as the public as to where the river actually goes after restoration. We are hopeful we can take advantage of new technology to use cameras to watch where it goes. This is going to be a tremendous laboratory. Also the restoration could create a huge potential for sediment to over top the banks and settle out and not go out into the lake, which impacts the TMDL and our water quality efforts around the Basin. We anticipate coming back to the Board to discuss how we evaluate success, monitor, and coordinate this project with the other reaches.

Chair Sevison announced the opportunity for the public to comment on the proposed actions.

Ms. Carolyn Lohman had a question regarding where certain fill would be located and if it would impact private property owners in that area.

Mr. Tom Rosenberg expressed that he and his wife wholeheartedly support the project and the preferred alternative. He noted that his remarks are designed to help the project move forward and point out things that can be addressed early. The five areas he identified were: 1) on-site construction noise, 2) the river rafting take-out, 3) management, 4) west bank haul road, and 5) the flood analysis.

Mr. Rosenberg suggested that to address the construction noise near the residential neighborhoods, the project should add a commitment to identify and employ any noise reducing types of machinery and methodology to the extent to which those exist even if there is added cost. He noted this is a long-term project that's in the middle of residential neighborhoods, and even if there isn't a legal or environmental requirement to do so, it would be good policy to go to the extra step if possible to reduce noise.

Mr. Rosenberg said the preferred alternative removes the existing river rafting take-out at East Venice, right at the edge of the western recreation area that's been identified and does not replace it or address take-out in the document. He noted that he had pointed this out previously and the loss of an identified take-out point has a very high likelihood of complicating the rafting experience and also introducing management issues on the Conservancy's property and private property. He

suggested as a mitigation that the preferred alternative include a take-out at the lower Highway 50 Bridge. He asked the Board to assist the staff in obtaining whatever it takes to have a take-out at the bridge.

With regard to management issues at the Marsh, Mr. Rosenberg stated that the project will exacerbate management issues if you don't find a take-out point for the boating.

Mr. Rosenberg expressed concern about a proposed haul road route up the west side of the river near the TKPOA property yard to the Highway 50 Bridge. He is concerned about the impact of the haul road on wetlands and nearby residences, questions whether it is environmentally feasible, and if it could be adequately removed and restored.

Mr. Rosenberg stated that the new flood analysis is very impressive and is a great step forward in increasing the confidence that this project will not be harmful to the community in terms of flooding. That said, he is concerned that the analysis does not eliminate the possibility of isolated instances of residences that may have damage even though the floodplain boundaries and elevations in the floodplain haven't changed. He feels the scale of the analysis is not sufficient to address isolated instances of flooding. His other concern is with the reactivation of the two west side floodplains, the river flow will move to the west towards the residences in to remnant channels. By reactivating these two floodplains on the west he believes there's a possibility that over time the flood risk could change. He noted that the two floodplains were not included in the flood analysis because they were viewed as beneficial and not a necessary part of the project since they are on private property. He thinks this should be looked at very carefully and that the Conservancy should try to armor or do something to contain the water if these floodplains are restored. Mr. Rosenberg summarized that the analysis compares the current situation to the post-project situation and shows the change in floodplain areas in depth. But the analysis does not show what will happen over a long period of time after two or three high water flows, the river has gone back to a more natural flow, and some sedimentation has occurred along the river banks and maybe at the mouth, raising the elevation at the mouth and the average slope.

Ms. Connie Latham noted that she was representing herself and her wife Christy Schroeder who is one of the owners of the Dunlap Ranch, the 17-acre ranch that is directly and indirectly affected by the project. She noted that where the diversion channel takes place is on their property boundary. Ms. Latham provided a history of the Ranch and the family's connection to the Marsh. She agreed with Mr.



Rosenberg's comment that the document takes a macro look and lacks specificity. Ms. Latham also noted with regard to the easement that would be needed on their property that she did not think it would happen. She also noted that since the design is at only 35 percent the Conservancy can't answer some of the questions being raised by the public commenters. She suggested that if some of the details can be lined out that that would help. She also noted they have quite a trespass issue on their ranch because of the rafters and the hikers trying to access the Conservancy property and that they feel strongly this needs to be addressed. She asked the Board to look at long-term funding needs for signage, monitoring, and enforcement. Ms. Latham expressed concern about flooding, given the way in which their structures are built and their experience during the 1997 flood. She noted that they think the restoration of the meadow is fantastic and they support the project. She also stated they would like to be part of the monitoring, mitigation and adaptive management aspects of the project.

Ms. Candy Young stated a concern that if the river fills in pre-existing channels that their home may be flooded, as it was previously.

Ms. Laurel Ames, representing the Tahoe Area Sierra Club and as a local resident indicated she has a comment letter that accompanies her public comment. She expressed her excitement about the project. She shared that she remembers the Marsh when it was a marsh and had wonderful broad spear-like plants that grabbed the sediment. Now there are invasive plants spreading throughout the Marsh. She believes the restoration and the re-watering will help address sediment and invasive species and benefit wildlife and bird species. Ms. Ames noted that as a California Avenue resident she was told that the preferred alternative does not identify California Avenue as a haul road and access point to Conservancy property. She is appreciative of that and glad that it's in the record.

Mr. Roll thanked the public commenters for their comments and noted that the Conservancy will carefully consider the comments and ensure they have been adequately addressed in the EIR. Mr. Roll clarified that haul roads and other improvements on private property would be subject to approval by the private property owners and that he is hopeful that they can work out agreements that would be acceptable to private property owners.

**Chair Sevison closed the public hearing portion of the meeting at 3:25 p.m.**

---

**BOARD MEETING MINUTES  
DECEMBER 17 - 18, 2015**

**DAY TWO: The Board reconvened Friday, December 18, 2015 at 9:10 a.m. and continued discussion on Agenda Item 8a, sections (2) and (3).**

Chair Sevison called the meeting to order.

**(2) EIR/EIS/EIS Environmental Certification:** The Board considered certification of the Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project (Project Final EIR/EIS/EIS, and consideration and possible adoption of findings related to each significant effect, the statement of overriding considerations, and the mitigation monitoring and reporting program. **Resolution 15-12-03**

**(3) Upper Truckee Marsh Project Approval:** The Conservancy Board considered Project authorization including: (1) approval of the Preferred Alternative; (2) authorization to expend up to \$1,538,000 for Project planning and for the purchase of fee or less-than-fee property interests in El Dorado County Assessor's Parcel Number (022-210-37, 023-700-19, 023-821-62, 031-282-05, 031-290-37, 031-290-41); (3) authorization to expend up to \$10,260,000 for Project construction and monitoring and to take all other steps to implement the Project. **Resolution 15-12-03**

Mr. Wright introduced the Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project noting that the comment period is closed and that Mr. Roll will walk the Board through what the staff has been doing since yesterday to make sure all the issues that were raised in public comment are adequately addressed.

Mr. Roll explained that the staff worked last night to review the comments received yesterday as well those received in the previous weeks since the final environmental document was printed. The intent is to make sure all the comments are addressed either in the final environmental document or the supplemental response to comments that was provided to the Board this morning. There were a couple typographical errors that were brought to the Conservancy's attention and so an

errata sheet was produced which the Board also received which clarifies some of those typographical errors.

Mr. Marsolais asked whether the project is possible without using the access roads in the alignments that were demonstrated or if there are other alternatives or design features considered. Mr. Roll responded by first steering the group to the preferred alternative map (Ppt slide #22). He noted the large-scale river restoration doesn't require any rights or access through private property as it is entirely on State lands, but there are some additional features in the southern portion of the project area on private property. The features include lowered flood plain surfaces and a section of bank stabilization, which are not mandatory to the primary river restoration but would provide additional benefits for the project.

Ms. Novasel asked a follow-up question regarding whether there will be visual or noise impacts from the project on State land and whether the road will be relatively close to private property. Mr. Roll noted that there will be some limited impacts to neighboring residents but all efforts will be included in the project to minimize those to the extent feasible. While all efforts have been made to make sure that the access and staging are far away from neighborhoods, there are still going to be trucks and equipment that people are going to see.

Mr. Roll recommended the Board approve the following actions as described in Resolution 15-12-03, the first of which is certifying the environmental document, adopting the Findings, the Statement of Overriding Considerations, and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. And then the second part of the same resolution is the approval of the Project, which includes the Preferred Alternative, over \$1.5 million for planning and acquisitions, and approximately \$10 million for working drawings and construction, and also agreements, such as grants, in support of the Project.

Chair Severson called for Board action.

Vice Chair Hooper moved approval of **Resolution 15-12-03**. Mr. Ferrara seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

**b. Firestone Property Transfer Approval**

The Board considered approval of a transfer of the Firestone property from North Tahoe Public Utility District (NTPUD) to Placer County for the construction, operation and maintenance of the Dollar Creek Shared-Use Trail Project in the vicinity of Country Club Drive, Highway 28 and Old County Road. (Placer County Assessor Parcels Number 092-010-40, 41 & 42, 093-010-037, 38 & 39)

Mr. Ryan Davis, Staff Attorney, presented Agenda Item 8b, Firestone Property Transfer Approval. Mr. Davis walked the Board through the history and location of the bike trail project and the Firestone property and the action at hand, which is to consider authorization of approval of transfer of the Firestone property from the NTPUD to Placer County and consideration of the associated environmental document for the bike trail project.

Chair Sevison questioned the title on Attachment 3, Page 1. Mr. Davis responded that appears to be a typographical error in the environmental document.

Mr. Wright summarized the history and action before the Board noting that the Conservancy gave NTPUD a grant in 1988 to acquire the Firestone property. Mr. Wright said there were a number of conditions of the grant but the two that are most important for today are that the grant was conditional on NTPUD doing maintenance for the whole bike trail and secondly if there were any change in ownership it would come back to the Conservancy for approval. And so as lead for the project shifted from NTPUD to Placer County, the County in return, is accepting responsibility for those grant commitments. Placer County has at least the first segment fully funded and the project is moving forward. Placer County is in a better position to maintain the trail if they own it so that is the intent of the property transfer. The action before the Board is related to the ownership of the property and the fact that when there is a transfer of any interest in the land or change in ownership of the land the transaction must be approved by the Board.

Ms. Novasel said she is impressed that the County is taking on the responsibilities of this trail. As a bike rider, she appreciates every Class 1 bike trail around the lake and this is another step forward.

Mr. Peter Kraatz, Assistant Director of the Placer County Public Works Department, stated he appreciates the presentation and the support by the Conservancy Board to get to this point in time. The County is excited to see a long term effort start coming to fruition with this first part of the trail being started in 2016. Mr. Kraatz noted that it

was the Tahoe Transportation District that secured federal funding for this trail, the Meeks Bay trail, and the Fanny Bridge project. This trail is the foundation to ultimately make that north shore connection all the way to the North Tahoe Regional Park. The County has local TOT funding for the next section.

Mr. Neil Eskind, representing NTPUD noted that all of the transfer documents have been signed by both Placer County and NTPUD and that all that's necessary is for the Conservancy to approve the transfer and sign the documents and the deed can be recorded.

Ms. Suter moved approval of **Resolution 15-12-04**. Ms. Novasel seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

**c. Tahoe City Public Utility District Land Exchange**

The Board considered authorization for the exchange and transfer with Tahoe City Public Utility District (TCPUD) of approximately 6.49 acres of Conservancy land in return for 6.5 acres of TCPUD land in the vicinity of Tahoma/Chambers Landing and Quail Lake. (Placer County Assessor Parcels number 098-330-004, 097-050-018-part and 097-050-27-part)

Ms. Aimee Rutledge, Acquisitions Staff Services Manager, presented the proposed property exchange between the Tahoe City Public Utility District (TCPUD) and the Conservancy. The purpose of the exchange is to facilitate an effort to replace a temporary water treatment plant that is located along Chambers Landing beach. The temporary treatment plant was put in ten years ago and was only intended to last three to four years. The preferred location for the new plant, after a study of several locations in the area, is the Conservancy property near the Chamberlands. The parcel the Conservancy would receive in the exchange is slightly larger and is more environmentally sensitive.

Vice Chair Hooper asked whether the TCPUD has any plans other than the relocation of the water treatment plant on the proposed exchange property. Ms. Rutledge noted that the TCPUD had originally included a parking lot and restrooms for beach and bike trail users that were removed from the project due to neighborhood opposition. At this time, there are no other plans beyond the West Lake Tahoe Regional Water Treatment Plant on the property.

Mr. Matt Holmolka, Assistant General Manager for TCPUD, stated the water treatment plant is very important to the TCPUD. When it is completed it will serve over 550 customers immediately with the potential to serve up to 2500 West Lake Tahoe customers with safe, reliable, year-round drinking water.

Chair Sevison called for Board action.

Mr. Ferrara moved approval of **Resolution 15-12-05**. Vice Chair Hooper seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

**d. Visitor Information and Environmental Interpretation Project Planning Grant**

The Board considered authorization for an \$85,000 planning grant to the Tahoe Fund for visitor-based environmental interpretation and exploration concept development.

Mr. Wright presented the Visitor Information and Environmental Interpretation project planning grant. Mr. Wright explained the background and purpose for the grant, which is to determine the best ways to provide information and interpretation to Tahoe visitors. The Conservancy grant to the Tahoe Fund of \$85,000 will be matched with \$10,000 from the Tahoe Fund as well as technical support from multiple entities including the U.S. Forest Service and U.C. Davis.

Mr. Marsolais expressed his appreciation to the Conservancy for stepping up to address this long-standing issue.

Ms. Novasel agreed with Mr. Marsolais and reiterated she thinks it is a perfect time to start the dialogue and look at different models for providing visitor information and environmental interpretation. She is excited to see what results from the great people in the community who have stepped up to be a part of this effort with the Tahoe Fund.

Ms. Bonnie Turnbull noted how thrilled she is to be here today. A small group had been meeting for months, discussing the idea of a Tahoe Discovery Center. They invited 20 different organizations to a meeting to discuss this idea and to their amazement, all came, which affirmed the need to take a closer look at how to do this well. She still loves this idea of an iconic center that attracts people like the aquarium in Monterrey. She is thankful that the Tahoe Fund has taken the initiative to lead this forward and encouraged the Board to support it.

Ms. Novasel moved approval of **Resolution 15-12-06**. Vice Chair Hooper seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

### **Agenda Item 9. Presentation (Information Only/No Board Action)**

**Tahoe Fund Status Update:** Tahoe Fund CEO Amy Berry provided an update on the status of the Fund's work to support priority Environmental Improvement Program projects following the Conservancy's \$200,000 grant to the Fund in September 2010.

### **Agenda Item 10. Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

### **Agenda Item 11. Board Member Comment**

Ms. Suter praised staff for their work on the Annual Report and requested copies for interested parties. Vice Chair Hooper concurred. Both encouraged involvement on any level with the Tahoe Fund.

Chair Sevison expressed his appreciation for the many years of efforts put forth by the staff and he extended his best wishes to all for a great holiday season and happy new year.

### **Agenda Item 12. Adjournment**

Chair Sevison adjourned the meeting at 10:54 a.m.

California Tahoe Conservancy  
Resolution 16-03-01  
Adopted: March 17, 2016

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the minutes of the December 17-18, 2015 meeting of the California Tahoe Conservancy adopted on March 17, 2016.

IN WITNESS THEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 17<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2016.

---

Patrick Wright  
Executive Director