AMADOR COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (ACTC) MINUTES
October 2, 2025 – 9:00 a.m.
ACTC Board Room-117 Valley View Way Sutter Creek, CA 95685

The Amador County Transportation Commission Board of Commissioners met on the above date, and the following proceedings were had, to wit:

Present on Roll Call:
Patrick Crew - Board of Supervisors, Chairman
Dan Riordan - City of Sutter Creek, Vice Chairman
Brian Oneto - Board of Supervisors
John Plasse - Citizen at Large
Sandy Staples - City of Amador City

Absent:
Wendy Bottomley - City of Plymouth

Also Present:
John Gedney, ACTC Executive Director
Felicia Bridges, ACTC Transportation Planner
Caitlin Kleven, ACTC Administrative Assistant
Caleb Brock, Caltrans District 10 - Deputy District Director for Planning, Local Assistance, and Environmental
April Miller, Amador Transit, Mobility Manager/Interim General Manager
Jason Cazadd, Amador County resident
Logan Carnell, Amador County Board of Supervisors (BOS) District 4
Chuck Iley, Amador County Administrative Officer
Zach Finch, Ione Public Works Superintendent

Pledge of Allegiance

AGENDA: Chairman Crew noted Item #5B will be first on the Regular Agenda to accommodate the time of the participants.

Motion: It was moved by Commissioner Oneto, seconded by Commissioner Staples, and carried to approve the amended Agenda as discussed.

Ayes: Oneto, Plasse, Riordan, Staples, Crew
Noes: None
Absent: Bottomley

PUBLIC MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA: None

CONSENT AGENDA (Items 1-3):
#1. Approve Minutes of September 4, 2025 ACTC Regular Meeting: Vice Chairman Riordan asked for two (2) minor wording additions to page 7 (seven) under item #5. Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) 2025 – "Call for Projects Submittals". First to paragraph 3 (three), process to read "Vice Chairman Riordan agreed that while purchasing equipment ***may be*** a great idea, it is a complicated one."

Second to paragraph 5 (five), process to read "It was noted that several jurisdictions, including Ione, Sutter Creek, and Jackson, already have qualified staff, making the idea of purchasing equipment for in-house use more appealing. ***Vice Chairman Riordan questioned whether or not the Sutter Creek public works staff was qualified to operate the equipment. He also noted that the Sutter Creek public works staff is already very busy, so finding the extra time to do that would be a challenge that would need to be addressed.***"

Motion: It was moved by Commissioner Plasse, seconded by Vice Chairman Riordan, and carried to approve the Consent Agenda with the additions to the minutes.

Ayes: Oneto, Plasse, Riordan, Staples Crew
Noes: None
Absent: Bottomley

REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:

#5. Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) 2025 'Call for Projects":

#5B. Paving & Grading Equipment – Acquisition: Mr. Gedney provided a brief review of his staff report and invited discussion.

Commissioner Plasse summarized the proposal, noting that in recent years, the engineering estimates for county and city road projects have been coming in at approximately $600,000 per lane mile. He emphasized that many local roadways do not require "freeway condition" standards, as they serve slower-speed traffic, and can instead be rehabilitated to match their intended use. He then explained that existing staff within the various jurisdictions possess the skills to perform this level of work, and the proposal aims for ACTC to acquire or fund the necessary equipment to establish a dedicated crew capable of handling such paving projects. By coordinating staffing among jurisdictions and utilizing in-house resources, he suggested that project costs could be reduced to roughly $180,000 per lane mile. He continued that the current approach is unsustainable, noting that the public is unwilling to increase taxes further for basic road maintenance. Commissioner Plasse stressed the importance of finding innovative, cost-effective solutions and encouraged a collaborative, solution-oriented approach to maximize the impact of limited resources.

Vice Chairman Riordan expressed his agreement with Commissioner Plasse's comments but emphasized the need for a thorough analysis before proceeding with any equipment purchases. He stated that while he did not wish to delay the process, it is important to ensure proper research be completed to determine whether the proposed model would truly benefit the jurisdictions. Commissioner Plasse concurred, suggesting that a consultant with expertise in this area be engaged to assess existing equipment across jurisdictions and identify what additional equipment may be needed. He mentioned that an industry expert, who owns a paving company outside the area, had planned to attend the meeting but was unable to due to unforeseen circumstances. Based on preliminary input from this expert, Commissioner Plasse noted that certain high-maintenance equipment, such as grinders, should be rented rather than purchased. The expert also advised that purchasing a paving machine may not be necessary, as there could be other more cost-effective alternatives available. Commissioner Staples inquired whether the consulting project would need to be put out to bid. Mr. Gedney responded that there is a possibility of proceeding through a sole-source justification. Commissioner Oneto asked if there is a dollar limit associated with a sole-source justification, to which Mr. Gedney replied he would follow up with legal counsel on the appropriate process. Commissioner Staples noted that, regardless, a resolution would need to be brought before the board to authorize a sole-source process. Mr. Gedney added that one of the criteria for sole-source justification is urgency and emphasized that the current condition of Amador County's roads could warrant urgent attention.

Commissioner Oneto stated that purchasing a grinder would not be a good investment due to the high cost of both purchase and maintenance. He noted that smaller streets do not need to be elaborate—simply paved or chip sealed would do. Commissioner Plasse reiterated his comments from last month's discussion regarding funding decisions, suggesting that the project located on Buena Vista Road from SR-88 to SR-124 would serve as a good trial location since the road can be completely closed and detoured, eliminating the need for traffic control.

Mr. Jason Cazadd, a local excavating contractor, commented that the Amador County Public Works Department has a long history of completing similar projects in-house, dating back to the 1930's and 1940's and continuing through approximately 2007. He expressed confidence in the staff's capability to successfully undertake such work and sought to dispel any notion that it could not be done. Mr. Cazadd stated it would be prudent to bring in experts to retrain staff on the proper use of equipment, procedures, and techniques. He suggested assembling a core crew of two (2) to four (4) trained staff members to operate the equipment for each job, while additional personnel from various jurisdictions could assist without needing the same level of specialized training. He emphasized that having the same trained operators consistently handle the equipment would be important to prevent damage or malfunction. Commissioner Plasse emphasized that the timing of these projects would be critical. Mr. Cazadd agreed, noting that scheduling and cooperation would be the most important factors for the project's success. He cautioned that attempting to complete the work in small segments could result in projects never being fully finished and recommended that once a road is selected, it should be completed from start to finish. Mr. Cazadd also suggested that installing a sign upon completion, recognizing the work as being accomplished by local jurisdictions and staff, would help boost morale and foster community appreciation.

Vice Chairman Riordan asked Mr. Cazadd if he had any personal experience with paving projects in the county. Mr. Cazadd replied that he did not, as his background is in excavation. Vice Chairman Riordan then inquired whether there is an existing model for this type of project or if it would need to be developed through experience. Mr. Cazadd explained that no local model currently exists, as it has been many years since similar work was conducted in the county.

Commissioner Oneto noted that there were once three (3) to five (5) county road crews, but over time, as elected officials changed and funding priorities shifted, road department funds were redistributed to other areas, resulting in a reduction of staff. He emphasized the importance of reevaluating funding allocations to strengthen road crews. Noting that if current staff are diverted from essential maintenance work such as brush clearing and culvert repair for extended periods, it would be unsustainable. He concluded that rebuilding the road crews would be necessary to support multiple projects simultaneously.

Commissioner Staples responded to Vice Chairman Riordan's question regarding whether a local model exists for this type of project. She acknowledged that it was an important consideration but stated that the absence of a county-specific model should not be a deterrent. She noted that other counties with similar characteristics to Amador have successfully implemented comparable projects, and one of those models could be used as a template rather than developing a new one from the ground up. Commissioner Oneto noted that historically, the county's paving work was completed using a drag box, which, while relatively low-tech, proved effective for much of the county's roads. He suggested that utilizing newer paving equipment could simplify the process for future projects. Mr. Cazadd added that although modern paving machinery is more technical, it is also user-friendly, and with proper training, staff could effectively operate it for paving work on lower-speed roads.

Mr. Carnell stated that this is a historic moment for the county with the project opportunity ahead. He remarked that inaction equates to failure, which reflects the current situation. While acknowledging that trying something new carries the possibility of failure, he emphasized that it also brings the potential for success. He noted that ACTC is offering an opportunity to make much-needed road repairs within the county and expressed that nothing should stand in the way of pursuing it.

Chairman Crew noted that successfully completing these projects would serve as an excellent way to boost morale among the crews. He added that while establishing a dedicated crew—potentially across jurisdictions—may initially seem challenging, it would become manageable once in place. Commissioner Plasse commented that staffing salaries and coordination across projects would likely present the greatest challenges. He then asked Mr. Iley to briefly describe any potential funding concerns related to the effort. Mr. Iley agreed that additional staff would need to be hired, and stated that a staffing plan could be developed once the number of required positions is determined. Regarding cross-jurisdictional work, he noted that such practices are already in place within other departments and counties. Usually, costs are billed directly for wages—an approach that could be applied to this project. He added that if this arrangement proves ineffective, alternative methods could be explored and implemented. However, he cautioned that assigning personnel to a dedicated "road crew" would create vacancies within existing staff and projects, resulting in opportunity costs. He concluded by noting that the board would need to consider how to fund the additional staffing to ensure that other essential county work is not neglected. Mr. Gedney noted that this topic was discussed at the recent Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting, emphasizing that while the county may find it relatively easy to establish cross-jurisdictional funding, the process may differ for the cities. He shared that the idea of forming two separate crews had been raised—one dedicated to county projects and another composed of city staff to be shared among the jurisdictions. Although uncertain of the feasibility, he acknowledged it as a possible solution and mentioned that ACTC has a funding stream available for transportation-related projects that could also help offset personnel costs. Commissioner Plasse added that in prior years, this same funding source had been distributed to local jurisdictions based on factors such as road miles maintained and population, with those funds used to supplement public works budgets. He noted that this approach aligns closely with the current project proposals and invited input from the local city representatives in attendance. Mr. Carnell expressed support for purchasing equipment to complete paving projects in-house, noting that with several retirements occurring within the county's Public Works Department, this is an opportune time to implement new strategies.

Mr. Zach Finch, City of Ione Public Works Supervisor, stated that prior to his current role he worked as an underground contractor and has experience in the industry. He expressed concern regarding the proposal to rent a planer or grinder for in-house paving projects, noting that in his experience, renting such equipment ultimately costs more than purchasing it outright. While acknowledging that ownership includes maintenance expenses, he emphasized that potential repair costs would still be significantly lower than ongoing rental fees. Commissioner Oneto asked if he was referring to a small, skid steer-type machine, to which Mr. Finch clarified that he was speaking about a full-size grinder. He explained that a skid steer grinder would be ineffective on most of Ione's roads, which are in such poor condition and Mr. Finch stated, regarding the learning curve for operating the equipment, most modern grinders are relatively easy to use with proper training and feature GPS technology that allows for semi-automated operation. He added that with such a large equipment investment, manufacturers like Caterpillar would likely provide operational training for staff. Mr. Finch noted he was not fully familiar with grinder maintenance but shared that he previously owned a paving machine and was able to perform its maintenance himself.

Commissioners continued discussion regarding ongoing maintenance, funding, and interjurisdictional collaboration related to training and crew operations.

Commissioner Plasse inquired about the grinder's cost relative to its potential usage, noting that rental rates are approximately $5,000 per day—significantly less than purchasing if the equipment would only be needed around ten days per year. Vice Chairman Riordan agreed, emphasizing that utilization is a critical factor when deciding whether to lease or purchase, and that a clear financial analysis is necessary to determine long-term feasibility. He also noted the importance of distinguishing how many RTP Tier 1 roads would require a full grind-out and overlay versus those suitable for chip seal treatment. Mr. Finch reiterated that rental costs continue to increase annually and that the limited availability of grinding contractors and equipment during peak seasons could delay project schedules. Chairman Crew concluded that the first year of the program would likely be the slowest and suggested that renting the equipment initially may be the most practical approach until actual usage levels can be better evaluated to support a future purchase decision.

Mr. Iley noted that previous tax measures had been voted down but suggested that visible progress in road repairs could improve public support for future initiatives. Commissioner Plasse remarked that it would be insightful to analyze how many constituents supported jurisdiction-specific tax measures while rejecting countywide proposals. Commissioner Staples added that Amador City's Measure K passed with 87% voter approval; however, she clarified that the previous countywide tax measure applied only to unincorporated areas, meaning Amador City residents could not vote on it and would not have directly benefited from it. Commissioners collectively agreed that gaining approval for any future tax increases would be challenging, given recent voting trends.

Commissioners expressed general support for the idea of purchasing paving equipment but agreed that additional research and discussion are necessary before deciding. Commissioner Plasse proposed again consulting with an industry expert to conduct an inventory of each jurisdiction's existing equipment and develop a list of what would be required to create a fully equipped paving crew. This, he noted, would allow the board to make a more informed decision. Commissioner Plasse raised the question of where the paving crew should be based, suggesting that the county would be the most practical location. He also referenced comments from a recent TAC meeting, where support was expressed for purchasing two sets of equipment—one for the county and one for the cities to share. He questioned the need for two separate crews, given that staff would already be working cross-jurisdictionally. Mr. Finch, who attended the TAC meeting, responded that due to differing jurisdictional schedules and seasonal work windows, having two sets of equipment would be more efficient, allowing more projects to be completed without delays caused by scheduling conflicts.

Commissioner Staples noted that her jurisdiction lacks a public works department and would therefore be unable to contribute staff directly, suggesting that contracting with another city might be an option. She added that for a jurisdiction of their size, annexation for these projects could also be considered. Commissioner Plasse emphasized that the absence of a local public works department would not prevent Amador City from participating in the project.

Commissioner Plasse expressed support for pursuing a sole-source contract to expedite the process, noting that an industry expert he knows has offered to contribute his time at no cost. Both Commissioner Plasse and Vice Chairman Riordan agreed that the legal parameters of a sole-source contract should be researched, and that findings should be presented to the board for review.

Commissioner Plasse then asked whether ACTC staff could begin implementing the proposal or if it would need to wait for approval at the next board meeting. Mr. Gedney requested clarification on

whether the proposed sole-source arrangement would apply to the equipment procurement, crew assembly, and project prioritization as a whole, or if those tasks would be handled separately. Commissioner Plasse responded that they would be two distinct efforts: one for the assessment and recommendation of equipment beneficial to all jurisdictions, and another for evaluating cross-jurisdictional staffing and personnel coordination. Vice Chairman Riordan suggested that gathering data on personnel availability and capacity would help streamline implementation once the equipment evaluation is complete. He provided the example of Sutter Creek, which currently lacks available staff due to ongoing projects but remains supportive of contributing to the initiative. Commissioner Plasse emphasized the importance of a personnel inventory for this reason—to identify which cities have qualified staff available and understand their work schedules. Acknowledging the scope of this task, he asked whether ACTC had the internal capacity to complete it. Mr. Gedney responded that this function would likely be better suited for the consulting contractor. Chairman Crew concluded that the equipment inventory and assessment should occur first, as it would clarify what staffing levels and skill sets would be necessary.

> **Motion:** It was moved by Commissioner Plasse, seconded by Commissioner Staples, and carried to authorize ACTC to consult with legal counsel on the viability of a sole-source contract or Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for expert consultation on the acquisition of paving and grading equipment.

Ayes:	Oneto, Plasse, Riordan, Staples, Crew
Noes:	None
Absent:	Bottomley

#5A. Project Funding Recommendation: Ms. Bridges reviewed her staff report.

Commissioner Staples asked whether staff was requesting a formal motion or simply direction from the board. Ms. Bridges clarified that a motion would be required and noted that the 2024 RTP Tier 1 Project List would also need to be brought to the board next month to amend projects from the Tier II list into the Tier I list.

Commissioner Plasse highlighted that in prior years, this type of funding was typically directed toward State highway projects and emphasized that it has taken considerable time and effort to revise the RTP so that Amador County funds are no longer allocated to state highway projects.

> **Motion:** It was moved by Commissioner Staples, seconded by Vice Chairman Riordan, and carried to proceed with the funding recommendations for the selected Regional Transportation Plan 2025 'Call for Projects'.

Ayes:	Oneto, Plasse, Riordan, Staples, Crew
Noes:	Staples, Riordan
Absent:	Bottomley

The Chairman recessed the meeting at 10:24 a.m. At 10:34 a.m. the Chairman resumed the meeting.

#4. FY 2023/24 ACTC Draft Fiscal & Compliance Audit: Mr. Gedney reviewed his staff report.

He acknowledged that the audit was delayed due to unforeseen circumstances. He noted that one comment was received from the City of Sutter Creek regarding Note G on page 29, which pertains to

conditions of approval for a development project. He clarified that the comment was immaterial to the content or findings of the audit.

Mr. Gedney addressed a comment in the management letter regarding the section titled "Transportation Development Act (TDA) Planning Allocations." He referenced Public Utilities Code §99233.2, which states that "there shall be allocated to the transportation planning agency up to 3 percent of annual revenues for the conduct of the transportation planning and programming process unless a greater amount is approved by the Director." He clarified that the "Director" in this context refers to the Director of Caltrans, represented at the meeting by Mr. Caleb Brock, Deputy District Director for District 10. Mr. Gedney explained that when ACTC submits its board-approved Overall Work Program (OWP) to the Caltrans Director and it is approved, that approval authorizes ACTC to receive an increased allocation of Local Transportation Funds (LTF). He further noted that the management letter recommends that ACTC "re-evaluate the need for these unspent LTF allocations in the planning fund." Mr. Gedney explained that the accumulation of excess LTF funds in the administrative budget began when the previous planner position was vacated but its funding was maintained. Over time, Ms. Bridges, through additional training and experience, has assumed many of the Planner's responsibilities. This arrangement has proven beneficial to the agency and resulted in cost savings, allowing funds to accumulate in the LTF trust account. Mr. Gedney concluded by offering to answer any questions or comments from the board otherwise, staff recommended that the board receive and approve the audit as presented.

Commissioner Plasse referenced page two (2) of the management letter, noting that the second paragraph states the Transportation Development Act (TDA) "requires that apportionments to the cities and county be based on the proportion of the population." He remarked that his understanding was that allocations were also determined by road miles maintained. Mr. Gedney confirmed that ACTC performs this calculation annually using an approved distribution formula, under which the county receives 70% of the funds and the remaining 30% is distributed among the cities based on a combination of population and road miles. He added that he was unsure why this detail was not reflected in the auditor's letter. Commissioner Plasse then addressed the section of the management letter titled "Interfund Loan," also on page two, and asked whether the $150,000 referenced was the original amount used to establish the agency. Ms. Bridges confirmed that it was and explained that the Fiscal Officer had moved that funding during the last fiscal year. Commissioner Plasse agreed that the matter had already been resolved in the prior fiscal year and was no longer relevant.

Vice Chairman Riordan addressed the section of the management letter labeled "Development Reimbursement," noting that clarification was needed based on a comment received from Tom Dubois, City Manager of Sutter Creek. He read Mr. Dubois' statement, which says "*I think the Auditor needs to be made aware that the Gold Rush development agreement expired years ago and that the developer went bankrupt. I'm attaching the official notice of termination of the DA from Aug, 2019. There is no current development agreement, nor is there a plan to create one. As was outlined in our referral letter of April 28,2025 and as discussed at the ACTC RTMF (Regional Transportation Mitigation Fee Program) meeting and board meeting, the amount spent was less than the $1.4 M and whether it was a loan or not is disputed. The Auditor should note this is a disputed and potentially uncollectible debt.*" Vice Chairman Riordan stated that he considered this clarification important, as such documentation may serve as a valuable reference in the future to demonstrate consensus and agreement on the characterization of this issue. He emphasized that his intent was not to reopen debate but to ensure accuracy and transparency regarding the current situation, and therefore he did not agree with the statement as written in the management letter. Mr. Gedney responded that he could not discuss the matter in depth but clarified that this item has never been recorded in the audit or agency bookkeeping as an "account receivable," rendering it immaterial to the approval of the audit.

Vice Chairman Riordan thanked Mr. Gedney for the clarification and stated that he would report back to the City Manager to relay the discussion.

Motion: It was moved by Vice Chairman Riordan, seconded by Commissioner Plasse, and carried to accept the Draft Fiscal and Compliance Audit for fiscal year ending June 30, 2024.

Ayes:	Oneto, Plasse, Riordan, Staples, Crew
Noes:	None
Absent:	Bottomley

#6. ACTC 2025 Bylaws Update: Ms. Bridges reviewed her staff report.

Commissioner Plasse raised a question regarding which sub-committee meetings qualify for commissioner compensation. He referenced past situations in other agencies where commissioners had been compensated for activities such as riding on a parade float or working at a booth during a county fair. He emphasized that compensation should apply only to board meetings and sub-committee meetings, and that voluntary participation in community events should not be eligible for payment. Ms. Bridges noted that this topic is addressed in the "Fees" section of the Bylaws, which currently states that "each Commissioner shall be paid $100 for attending each regular ACTC meeting and any other meeting." She agreed that clarification could be added to specify sub-committee meetings. Vice Chairman Riordan concurred, suggesting that the phrase "any other meeting" be revised to "sub-committee meetings" for clarity. Mr. Gedney noted that such situations have not occurred at ACTC, but Commissioner Plasse reiterated that it would be prudent to include this clarification to prevent future misunderstandings. Ms. Bridges confirmed that she would revise the Bylaws to include the wording "any sub-committee meeting."

Commissioner Oneto inquired whether travel expenses were included as part of the meeting compensation and suggested that the wording be revised to clarify that travel reimbursement should apply only to activities outside of regular board or sub-committee meetings. He emphasized that commissioners' travel related to attending board and sub-committee meetings should be considered part of their standard meeting compensation. Commissioner Plasse agreed, adding that travel expenses should only be reimbursed for meetings or events that commissioners are specifically directed to attend, not for those they choose to attend voluntarily.

Motion: It was moved by Commissioner Plasse, seconded by Vice Chairman Riordan, and carried to adopt the ACTC 2025 Bylaws update with minor corrections as discussed.

Ayes:	Oneto, Plasse, Riordan, Staples, Crew
Noes:	None
Absent:	Bottomley

#7. Approve Monthly Claims List: Commissioner Oneto questioned why there were two (2) transactions on the revised claims list for Linda Molin-Amador Cleaning Service. Ms. Bridges noted there was an error in the name on the August payment and the original check had to be voided and a new check issued.

Motion: It was moved by Commissioner Plasse, seconded by Vice Chairman Riordan, and carried to approve the revised claims list.

Ayes: Oneto, Plasse, Riordan, Staples, Crew
Noes: None
Absent: Bottomley

#8. ACTC Commissioner Reports: None

#9. ACTC Reports: Mr. Gedney reported that ACTC is preparing a presentation, potentially for the December meeting, to showcase the agency's updated bookkeeping system. He noted that staff has been working closely with the Finance Committee (Riordan/Plasse) to implement system improvements. Additionally, he expressed interest in expanding efforts to demonstrate the agency's role and functions, acknowledging that with periodic board member rotations and occasional absences, it can be difficult for all members to stay fully informed. Mr. Gedney suggested rearranging board seating so that newer members are positioned more centrally, helping them feel more engaged in discussions. As an example, he mentioned that Commissioner Bottomley, as a new member seated at the end of the dais, might feel somewhat excluded. Commissioner Plasse commented that he did not believe seating arrangements influence a member's level of involvement.

Commissioner Staples asked whether this would be the appropriate time to discuss revising the policy that requires cities to rotate off the board. Mr. Gedney responded that such a discussion could be brought forward as a "Future Agenda Item." Chairman Crew commented that the decision might depend on who originally established the commission, which he believed was the county. Commissioner Plasse clarified that the commission was legislatively established as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA), which was originally managed under the county's Public Works Department prior to the agency's creation. When Chairman Crew asked if the number of commissioners was legislatively set, Mr. Gedney replied that he did not believe it was mandated by legislation but rather determined internally at the time. Ms. Bridges added that while she was unsure how the original structure was decided, she believed that in more recent years a committee had determined which cities or entities would serve and for how long. Commissioner Plasse confirmed that a City's Select Committee established the rotational structure, which was designed to include three (3) county representatives and three (3) city representatives. Mr. Gedney noted that the most recent change occurred approximately five (5) to six (6) years ago, when the board composition was expanded to include a county-appointed public member; previously, that position had been appointed directly by the board.

Vice Chairman Riordan referenced page two of the ACTC Bylaws, noting that while it discusses the term of office, it does not specify the actual length of the term. He pointed out that under Section C, Item 1, the bylaws state, "The City Selection Committee appoints the City's nominees to the Amador County Transportation Commission pursuant to the adopted rotational schedule of city representatives," and asked where the adopted schedule could be found. Ms. Bridges responded that the rotational schedule is maintained in the ACTC office and is provided to both the local jurisdictions and the county annually. Commissioner Staples commented that frequent rotation poses challenges, as it takes approximately two (2) years for a new representative to become fully acclimated and then their term ends shortly thereafter. This is creating a disadvantage for the cities. She also noted that Board of Supervisors appointees have remained more consistent over time. Commissioner Plasse asked if the rotation schedule allowed jurisdictions to serve three (3) years and then rotate off for two; Commissioner Staples replied that the term was longer. Ms. Bridges confirmed that she believed it to be a six-year term but would verify against the rotational list. Commissioners discussed the rotation process and how the City's Select Committee elects board members. After reviewing current and upcoming jurisdictional terms, Ms. Bridges confirmed that the rotation period is six (6) years, while Board of

Supervisors members are reviewed annually by the county. She concluded by noting that the board could add this topic to a future agenda for further discussion if desired.

Ms. Bridges informed the board that the January meeting is currently scheduled to fall on New Year's Day. She advised that if the board wishes to reschedule or cancel the meeting, the matter could be discussed at the next board meeting. She noted that any change or cancellation would need to be made with sufficient notice to properly inform the public.

#10. Caltrans Report with Caleb Brock:

- Clean California Community Clean Up Grant: $25 million is available to help with litter cleanup, graffiti and establish workforce pathways for vulnerable populations in local jurisdictions. The applications are competitive and due by November 1, 2025.
- Caltrans Program – Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant Program: An ongoing Caltrans program that provides local jurisdictions with money for planning studies. The Call for Projects will start September 8, 2025 and the deadline is November 21, 2025. Information on statewide as well as individual jurisdiction workshops will be available. Any additional questions regarding the program can be directed to Ashley Cooper, who is the district liaison.
- The California Transportation Commission (CTC) annual meeting will be held in October in Merced.
- Mr. Brock announced that he was informed last week that he will now be the permanent Deputy District Director.
- Drytown Safety Investigation Update: The study has been completed, and the team is finalizing the financial components. Given the extensive prior discussion on this topic, he stated that he would be happy to present the full report at a future meeting and bring a traffic safety engineer or one of the report's authors to provide a detailed explanation of the findings.

Commissioner Plasse asked Mr. Brock to elaborate on the meaning of the term "sustainable community." Mr. Brock explained that the term was adopted in the early 2010's and broadly refers to initiatives designed to benefit local cities, counties, transit agencies, and tribal governments. He noted that one of the key challenges in securing funding for projects is the lack of preliminary studies, and that this particular program is focused on providing planning grants to address that issue. Commissioner Plasse then asked whether any entities are excluded from applying if they do not meet the definition of "sustainable." Mr. Brock clarified that eligibility is limited to incorporated cities, but other communities may participate as sub-applicants under a city, county, or agency such as ACTC. While the process may seem complex, he emphasized that no cities or counties are excluded from participation. Commissioner Oneto inquired about qualifying criteria for the grant, and Mr. Brock stated that applicants must meet certain financial requirements, such as maintaining an internal accounting system. He added that, to his knowledge, there have been no issues with past applicants meeting these requirements.

Commissioner Oneto raised concerns regarding the SR-88 paving project completed by Bay City's Paving and Grading, noting that a significant amount of re-grinding appeared to have been required. Mr. Brock confirmed that the additional work was necessary because the road surface did not initially meet the required smoothness standards for that roadway type. Commissioner Oneto also pointed out that the merging lanes on two (2) sections of the project were shortened by approximately 300 to 400 feet due to striping changes, expressing concern that this could create a safety hazard for motorists.

Additionally, Commissioner Oneto reported that a vehicle accident had occurred the previous week on SR-49 in Drytown, noting that the driver had survived the incident. He displayed photographs of the accident scene and described how the crash occurred, directing attendees to observe the images showing the vehicle's direction of travel and final resting position. He highlighted concerns with the road's edge conditions, explaining that the type of gravel and installation methods used create hazards, and in some areas, the drop-off from the pavement edge can be as deep as one foot. While acknowledging that the issue is not under Mr. Brock's direct responsibility, Commissioner Oneto stated he would continue raising the matter as long as it remains a safety concern. He added that he looks forward to reviewing the forthcoming traffic study report.

#11. Future Agenda Items:

- RTP amendment
- RTIP Project Programming
- Financials
- Unmet Transit Needs Public Hearing at the December Meeting

#12. ADJOURNMENT: At 11:23 a.m. the Chairman Crew adjourned the regular meeting to Thursday November 6, 2025 at 9:00 a.m. at 117 Valley View Way, Sutter Creek, CA 95685.

Patrick Crew, Chairman
Amador County Transportation Commission

ATTEST:

Recording Clerk

Note: Copies of referenced documents are available at the AT and ACTC offices.