STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Capital Outlay Budget Change Proposal (COBCP) - Cover Sheet
DF-151 (REV 07/21)

Fiscal Year	Business Unit	Department	Priority No.
FY 2026-27	3125	California Tahoe Conservancy	001

Budget Request Name	Capital Outlay Program ID	Capital Outlay Project ID
3125-066-COBCP-2026-MR	2345	0016786

Project Title
Lake Tahoe Blvd: ADA Sidewalk Improvements

Project Status and Type
Status: ☒ New ☐ Continuing Type: ☐Major ☒ Minor

Project Category *(Select one)*

☐CRI *(Critical Infrastructure)*	☐WSD *(Workload Space Deficiencies)*	☐ECP *(Enrollment Caseload Population)*	☐SM *(Seismic)*
☐FLS *(Fire Life Safety)*	☐FM *(Facility Modernization)*	☒PAR *(Public Access Recreation)*	☐RC *(Resource Conservation)*

Total Request (in thousands)	Phase(s) to be Funded	Total Project Cost (in thousands)
$ 500	Minor Projects	$ 500

Budget Request Summary

The California Tahoe Conservancy (Conservancy) requests $500,000 from California Drought, Water, Parks, Climate, Coastal Protection, and Outdoor Access for All Fund (Proposition 68) to reconstruct and improve a heavily used sidewalk located on Conservancy property (Project). The sidewalk is severely deteriorated, poses a public safety concern, and directly abuts a newly constructed California Department of Transportation crosswalk on Lake Tahoe Boulevard/U.S. Highway 50, a major thoroughfare in South Lake Tahoe. The Project will upgrade the sidewalk to meet current Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA) and state standards.

Requires Legislation	Code Section(s) to be Added/Amended/Repealed	CCCI
☐ Yes ☒ No		

Requires Provisional Language	Budget Package Status
☐ Yes ☒ No	☐ Needed ☐ Not Needed ☐ Existing

Impact on Support Budget

One-Time Costs	☒ Yes	☐ No	Swing Space Needed	☐ Yes	☒ No
Future Savings	☐ Yes	☐ No	Generate Surplus Property	☐ Yes	☒ No
Future Costs	☐ Yes	☐ No			

If proposal affects another department, does other department concur with proposal? ☐ Yes ☐ No
Attach comments of affected department, signed and dated by the department director or designee.

Prepared By	Date	Reviewed By	Date
Department Director	**Date**	**Agency Secretary**	**Date**

Department of Finance Use Only

Principal Program Budget Analyst	Date submitted to the Legislature
Michael McGinness	**5/14/2026**

A. COBCP Abstract:

The Conservancy requests $500,000 Prop 68 funding for the minor projects phase. The Project includes reconstruction and improvements of a highly-used and deteriorated sidewalk on Conservancy land. The roughly 750 linear feet of sidewalk abuts the main thoroughfare in South Lake Tahoe. The Project will bring the sidewalk into compliance with current ADA and State standards. Total project costs are estimated at $500,000. The current project schedule estimates that Construction is scheduled to begin in Summer 2027.

B. Purpose of the Project:

The Conservancy acquired the Upper Truckee Marsh South property, which included an old motel, restaurant, parking lot, and the sidewalk, in March 2024. The purpose of the acquisition was to restore the site back to a functioning mountain meadow and wetland habitat as part of the Upper Truckee River floodplain. Following acquisition, the Conservancy initiated planning to remove existing buildings and impervious surfaces and to stabilize exposed soils to prevent erosion. Demolition and stabilization were completed in October 2025.

While restoration planning and demolition were underway, the California Department of Transportation implemented the South Lake Tahoe Safety Project. This project included installation of a crosswalk that connects to the Conservancy property and intersects the degraded Conservancy sidewalk. To protect public health and safety and provide continuous ADA-compliant access from the crosswalk across state land, the sidewalk must be reconstructed to meet current standards and the State's Access for All goals.

C. Relationship to the Strategic Plan: (relevance of problem/need to mission and goals)

The Project supports the Conservancy's Strategic Plan goal to Provide Recreational Opportunities and Access for All by reconstructing and improving this existing sidewalk to meet ADA and State standards.

D. Alternatives: (for each, describe the proposed alternative and provide a brief summary of scope, cost, funding source, program benefits, facility management benefits, and impact on support budget)

Alternative 1. Planning and Construction of Minor Capital Outlay Project

This alternative will complete sidewalk reconstruction and improvements to meet ADA and State standards. The Conservancy seeks to expedite this Project to protect public health and safety. This alternative helps achieve the Strategic Plan goal to Provide Recreational Opportunities and Access for All.

Alternative 2. No Project/No Action

This alternative would not provide authority and funding to complete reconstruction and improvement of the Project. This alternative will require the Conservancy to continue its closure of the sidewalk to protect public safety because the asphalt is severely deteriorated, masking safe public passage across the property difficult until construction is funded.

E. Recommended Solution:

1. Which alternative and why?

   The recommended alternative is the funding of the Project in Alternative 1 to ensure public safety and provide Access for All.

2. Detailed scope description.

   The Conservancy will use the minor capital outlay funding for:

   - Design of an ADA-compliant sidewalk and transitions that mitigate stormwater and complement a newly added Caltrans crosswalk at the site
   - Preparation of working drawings for implementation of the sidewalk
   - Construction of the sidewalk and associated improvements

3. Basis for cost information.

   Costs associated with the project are based on a three-page estimate provided by the Department of General Services.

4. Factors/benefits for recommended solution other than the least expensive alternative.

   The sidewalk will need to be constructed at some time in the future if the preferred alternative is not chosen. Delaying the construction will cost the Conservancy more to maintain the property in the interim and create potential health and safety and access concerns for the community.

5. Complete description of impact on support budget.

   There is no impact to the Conservancy support budget.

6. Identify and explain any project risks.

   The Conservancy does not foresee any project risks.

7. List requested interdepartmental coordination and/or special project approval (including mandatory reviews and approvals, e.g. technology proposals).

   There is no interdepartmental coordination or special approval needed.

F. Consistency with Government Code Section 65041.1:

Does the recommended solution (project) promote infill development by rehabilitating existing infrastructure and how? Explain.

Yes. The new sidewalk will rehabilitate an existing facility.

Does the project improve the protection of environmental and agricultural resources by protecting and preserving the state's most valuable natural resources? Explain.

Yes. The Project will include permanent Best Management Practices to prevent erosion into the stormwater system and into the nearby Upper Truckee River.

Does the project encourage efficient development patterns by ensuring that infrastructure associated with development, other than infill, support efficient use of land and is appropriately planned for growth? Explain.

Yes. The Project will create a safe public access and non-motorized through travel route the Project encourages development in the surrounding area.