AMADOR COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (ACTC) MINUTES
November 6, 2025 – 9:00 a.m.
ACTC 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
Wendy Bottomley - City of Plymouth

Absent: None

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

Pledge of Allegiance

AGENDA:

Motion: It was moved by Commissioner Plasse, seconded by Commissioner Staples, and unanimously carried to approve the agenda as presented.

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

PUBLIC MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA: None

#1. Caltrans Report with Caleb Brock:

- On October 17, 2025 the California Transportation Commission (CTC) approved $4.9 billion to improve safety and mobility on local streets, highways, and bridges. More than half of the allocation will provide 600 local governments and regional transportation agencies with annual funding to fix roads, bridges and other transportation needs statewide. $1.2 million has been allocated to support Amador County Transportation Commission Buena Vista Road reconstruction project. This project will rehabilitate approximately two (2) miles of roadway by cold planing the existing pavement, then resurfacing and restriping the entire roadway. This project will take place from the Calaveras County line to Camanche Parkway North.

- Caltrans recently opened the Gateway Trail in Plymouth as part of the Clean California Initiative. This will improve safety for community members and visitors. The new separated

bike path along SR 49 provides added protection for people who walk and bike in the area. This project included improved drainage, new signage, striping and added safety upgrades. Including a crosswalk with flashing beacons near a local park.

- The Regional Planning Team is looking forward to receiving ACTC's Overall Work Program Amendment

- The Request for Reimbursement for quarter one (1) Rural Planning Assistance funding was approved for payment on October 21, 2025.

Follow up from last month's meeting:

1) With regard to the question on the shortened striping on the merge/passing lane on SR 88, a review of the area was performed, and it was determined that the total merge length remains unchanged and continues to comply with the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) and the California Highway Design Manual. The apparent reduction on affects detail 12, the skip line delineation, which now terminates approximately 300-400 ft sooner than before, does not shorten the functional merge or taper length.

2) Regarding the Drytown Safety Investigation request, the traffic operations team is still in the final stages of getting the safety analysis finished. Once completed, it will be sent to headquarters for final review and approval. Once approved, it will be sent to Mr. Gedney and his team who will disperse it to the board. Mr. Brock noted at a future meeting he will bring a traffic operations engineer to discuss the report and answer any questions that may arise. Additionally, the maintenance crew has made two (2) small repairs in the Drytown area on SR 49 ahead of the report.

Commissioner Oneto reported the presence of an invasive plant, known as "stinkwort," is appearing along numerous roadways in Amador County, and inquired about the possibility of Caltrans spraying its right-of-way to address the issue. He noted significant community concerns, stating that stinkwort is considered more problematic than starthistle. Mr. Brock asked whether the weed had been identified in other areas, and Commissioner Oneto responded that he was unsure but suspected the problem may be more widespread. Mr. Brock stated he would have the maintenance crew investigate the matter before next month's meeting and asked if there were specific locations that should be examined. Commissioner Oneto replied that the plant appears to be pervasive and recommended that crews travel along SR 49 from Sutter Creek into Jackson, where it is clearly visible. He added that the weed is small and green with yellow flowers, making it identifiable for field crews.

Commissioner Oneto inquired whether Mr. Brock was aware of any recent tree planting—specifically bull pines—at the junction of SR 16 and SR 124. He expressed concern that these trees have appeared in the area despite being known for hazardous limb breakage and poor growth conditions at that location, which would likely lead to future removal costs once the trees inevitably fail. Mr. Brock stated that he was not aware of any planting activity but would investigate the matter.

CONSENT AGENDA (Items 2-6):

#2. Approve Minutes of October 2, 2025 ACTC Regular Meeting: Commissioner Staples noted two (2) corrections to the minutes. The first on page five (5), paragraph two (2), as follows: "Commissioner Staples added that Amador City's tax Measure K passed with **87%** voter approval...".

The second correction located on page nine (9) in both the second and the third paragraphs, instead of "Mayor's Select Committee", it should read: "**City's** Select Committee".

#6. Sutter Creek Ranch Development Referral and ACTC Response Letter: Vice Chairman Riordan raised concerns with the Response Letter (Item 6-B) from Ms. Mona Ebrahimi, ACTC legal counsel. He stated that he would like to go on record as being unable to approve this item in the Consent Agenda and would like to discuss it. Mr. Gedney responded that he has invited Ms. Ebrahimi to the meeting today, however she is delayed. He asked if it would be appropriate to table this item until she arrives. At that time, she can address questions directly. Vice Chairman Riordan agreed that would be appropriate.

Chairman Crew noted that Item 6 would be moved to the regular agenda and asked the board to vote on Consent Agenda items #2-5.

> **Motion:** It was moved by Vice Chairman Riordan, seconded by Commissioner Plasse, and unanimously carried to approve Consent Agenda Item #2-5 with the minor wording correction to the minutes.

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

> **Motion:** It was moved by Commissioner Plasse, seconded by Commissioner Staples, and unanimously carried to table item #6 and move to the Regular Agenda when time permits.

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

REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:

#7. ACTC/Amador Transit January 2026 Meeting Date Conflict: Ms. Bridges review the staff report.

Commissioners agreed to cancel the January 1, 2026 ACTC/AT meetings. Vice Chairman Riordan stated that ACTC staff could inform the board if something important comes up requiring the meeting to take place.

#8. FY 2024/25 Draft Regional Traffic Mitigation Fee (RTMF) Report: Mr. Gedney reviewed the staff report. He noted that on page two (2) of the report, highlighted in red ink, there have been no fees collected from Ione, Jackson, and Plymouth. Additionally, $129,651 from Amador County was invoiced but not yet received.

Commissioner Oneto inquired whether any new housing construction was occurring within the jurisdictions. Mr. Gedney responded that Plymouth is believed to have ongoing housing development but added that recent administrative turnover, including the appointment of a new city manager, may be affecting communication. He further noted that the City of Ione has multiple projects underway and acknowledged Ione's City Manager, Mr. George Lee, who was present at the meeting. Mr. Gedney reported that ACTC has issued three (3) reminders to the jurisdictions without receiving any responses, and, as a result, staff proceeded with publishing the draft report.

Commissioner Oneto asked what had been received in prior years, and Mr. Gedney referred him to Attachment A, which outlines the fees collected since the program's inception in 2002/03 through present year. Mr. Gedney added that interest earnings on the RTMF fund now exceed current year

fees collected because the fund was moved into a more favorable account. He noted that one (1) month remains before the report is distributed to the jurisdictions for agendizing and approval, allowing some additional time for reminders to be issued again and fees collected to be submitted. Mr. Gedney emphasized that participation in this program is voluntary and that ACTC does not intend to pressure jurisdictions into contributing.

Commissioner Plasse asked whether signing the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) obligates the cities to contribute. Mr. Gedney explained that the MOU establishes the required fee structure and that jurisdictions are responsible for collecting those fees at the time permits are issued. He referenced a past issue identified by Commissioner Oneto in which an Ione city audit revealed approximately $500,000 in fees that were never transferred between building developments and, to his knowledge, remain outstanding. Mr. Gedney also noted the Prospect Drive and Bowers Road cost reimbursement matter, which is an outlier connected to the Gold Rush Ranch correspondence regarding project repayment. He emphasized that the binding agreement requires jurisdictions to seek direction before initiating projects. Commissioner Oneto added in support of the City of Plymouth that its new City Manager, Mr. Cameron Begbie, is actively working to address outstanding concerns, though recent leadership changes mean it will take time to bring all matters current.

Mr. Gedney recommended that the board review the annual report and select an ACTC representative to serve on the RTMF Committee, noting that Commissioner Plasse has historically filled this role. He further requested to provide gentle reminders to jurisdictions that have not yet submitted the fees they collected, and authorization to distribute the final report at the end of the calendar year.

Commissioner Plasse asked whether any of the city representatives present could clarify how RTMF fee collection is handled, including who is responsible for collecting the fees and who receives the notices—such as the building department or the city manager. Commissioner Staples responded that, although her jurisdiction is small, she could speak to the process: the fee is noted on the building permit, and when payment is received, the funds are set aside, then the Treasurer issues a check to the RTMF fund for the amount collected on that permit. Commissioner Plasse then asked whether notices are reaching the correct staff or if they are being sent to city managers, who must then forward them to building officials. Ms. Bridges explained that ACTC's practice over the years is to send notices and a reporting sheet to the board clerks and city managers. She added that ACTC has made three (3) attempts to gather this information since July.

Commissioner Bottomley asked for confirmation that her understanding of the RTMF process was correct and stated she would follow up with Mr. Begbie to determine whether any outstanding fees need to be reported. Mr. Gedney then directed her to Attachment D, which contains the fee schedule provided to all jurisdictions, and encouraged her to reach out with any questions regarding the fees or any unusual building project types.

Mr. Gedney highlighted several updates contained in the report. He noted that two (2) RTMF Committee meetings were held during the year, both largely centered on the Sutter Creek Ranch Project. Despite those discussions, no agreement was reached on a negotiated settlement regarding repayment of the Prospect Drive/Bowers Road project cost. He also reported that the Pine Grove Project has advanced to the construction phase, with the contract awarded to George Reed. Additionally, he noted Commissioner Plasse's suggestion of withdrawing RTMF funds from the Pine Grove project and replacing them with Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality (CMAQ) funding was completed.

Chairman Crew asked whether the item was for report only, Mr. Gedney clarified that staff is seeking approval to submit the final report to the jurisdictions, pending any additional funds that may come in before the end of the year and to appoint an ACTC representative to the RTMF Committee.

> **Motion:** It was moved by Vice Chairman Riordan, seconded by Commissioner Staples, and unanimously carried to approve the nomination of Commissioner Plasse as the ACTC representative on the RTMF committee and recommended that the report be issued at ACTC discretion pending any further payment information.

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

#6. Sutter Creek Ranch Development Referral and ACTC Response Letter: Ms. Ebrahimi gave a brief history of the Sutter Creek Ranch development, formerly known as the Gold Rush Ranch project. She reported that the City of Sutter Creek is moving forward with a development application and that Mr. Gedney was contacted by the city's contract planner approximately one (1) month ago seeking preliminary comments. She noted that despite prior requests from her and her office to be notified of any progress on the project, no notices had been received, and she reminded Sutter Creek's legal counsel that such notice is legally required. She questioned the purpose of offering comments before the environmental review process has begun, as the city appeared to be seeking input before engaging the developer or formally advancing the proposal. Working with Mr. Gedney and the Ad Hoc subcommittee (Commissioners Oneto and Staples), her office prepared and submitted a comment letter ahead of the October 31, 2025 deadline. She emphasized that the letter highlighted the difficulty of providing meaningful feedback given the extremely limited information available, reaffirmed ACTC's long-standing position that traffic impacts must be mitigated, and reiterated the agency's expectation of reimbursement for the previously advanced costs related to the Bowers Road and Prospect Drive intersection. Ms. Ebrahimi concluded by inviting questions from the board.

Vice Chairman Riordan reported on a recent discussion with Sutter Creek City Manager Tom Dubois, noting that the city is not opposed to establishing an agreed-upon repayment amount and schedule, and that Mr. Dubois prefers to resolve that issue outside of the formal comment process. Ms. Ebrahimi acknowledged this but explained that several months earlier she had provided ACTC's offer to the city's legal counsel and received no response until the recent letter, which came as a shock. She reiterated her understanding that the city had previously indicated a desire to resolve the matter separate from the development review but noted that ACTC has yet to receive a response to its proposed counter offer. Vice Chairman Riordan stated he appreciated the clarification, although it differed from the information he received from the city, and said he would bring these points back for further discussion. He added that Mr. Dubois had apologized for not sending correspondence to Ms. Ebrahimi and Mr. Gedney as intended and assured him that relevant documents will be properly forwarded to the appropriate parties going forward.

Vice Chairman Riordan expressed concern that the opening of Ms. Ebrahimi's comment letter emphasized vagueness in the project scope and other uncertainties, yet no outreach had been made from staff to the city's planning department before issuing a fourteen-page attorney letter. He stated that this approach appeared potentially antagonistic. In response, Mr. Gedney explained that following the June 9th RTMF Oversight Committee (OC) meeting, there had been several email exchanges among the city manager, the city's attorney, and Ms. Ebrahimi. The RTMF OC had been polled regarding the city's proposal, and the consensus was unfavorable. He relayed this to the city manager, and shortly thereafter—approximately twenty minutes later—received a hostile and threatening email from the

developer indicating that all future communication must occur through legal counsel. Ms. Ebrahimi added that the email also threatened personal legal action against Mr. Gedney. She further noted that in a recent conversation with Sutter Creek's legal counsel, it appeared the city was refusing to continue cooperating with ACTC.

Ms. Ebrahimi clarified that ACTC's longstanding approach, consistent throughout her tenure as legal counsel, has been to insist that public agencies properly analyze traffic impacts and ensure applicable fees are paid. When agencies meet these obligations, ACTC has consistently stepped back, as demonstrated with numerous projects countywide. She emphasized that ACTC does not seek an adversarial relationship and aims to work cooperatively with all jurisdictions, including Sutter Creek; however, such cooperation is not possible when requests for negotiation are met with silence or resistance. In those circumstances, she stated that her responsibility is to protect ACTC's interests unless directed otherwise.

Vice Chairman Riordan reiterated that his primary concern was not the disputed fees or completed work but rather the comments in the letter pointing to vagueness in the project scope. He felt that staff should have reached out to the project planner, Ms. Erin Ventura, if clarification was needed. Without communication from both sides, he cautioned, an adversarial dynamic becomes unavoidable. He added that although it may not always appear so, the City of Sutter Creek does share the goal of cooperating and reaching a mutually acceptable resolution. He raised an additional concern regarding ongoing references to a development agreement that, according to Sutter Creek's city attorney, has expired and is no longer valid. He stated that he had been authorized to inform ACTC that the city fully intends to comply with all California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requirements, for example preparation of an EIR and/or any necessary traffic studies and emphasized that cooperation serves everyone's best interests. Ms. Ebrahimi acknowledged and agreed with his comments, explaining that the letter sent by her office addressed two (2) key points. First, if the project intends to rely on the previously certified EIR, it must also comply with all mitigation measures contained in that document. Several of those measures include funding and constructing the intersection improvements at Bowers Road and Prospect Drive. This is work that ACTC has already completed at the request of the former Sutter Creek mayor, who cited economic development benefits. She noted that the current project will inherently benefit from those previously required improvements. Second, she explained that ACTC's initial request, made before the comment letter was drafted, sought reimbursement for those intersection costs without interest to account for inflation. Alternatively, if the city elects not to pursue this path, it must undertake a new traffic analysis, pay RTMF fees, and conduct updated vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and CEQA analyses reflecting modern standards, as the prior EIR is decades old. She concluded that either approach is available to the city, but it must select one (1) and notify ACTC of its decision.

Ms. Ebrahimi noted that if Sutter Creek chooses to repay the cost of the completed intersection improvements, the only remaining obligation would be the standard traffic improvement fees required of all developers, and ACTC would have no further comments on the project. Vice Chairman Riordan stated he would convey the spirit of the discussion to the city and emphasized that the most productive path forward would be for all parties to meet and work toward a mutual resolution. Mr. Gedney, however, expressed concern with the Vice Chairman's characterization, stating that the issue was raised by the Vice Chair more than a year ago. It was formally agendized not only at an ACTC meeting but at two (2) RTMF OC meetings. He explained that he has had extensive discussions with both Ms. Ventura and Mr. Dubois, and that the matters raised by Ms. Ebrahimi today are not new. They have been addressed at the staff level, through legal counsel, and by the Commission for an extended period. Mr. Gedney added that the Vice Chairman's suggestion that ACTC has not engaged in dialogue

is inaccurate and noted that the developer had previously threatened litigation simply for discussing the issue.

Commissioner Plasse noted that communication surrounding the project has historically involved ACTC, the City of Sutter Creek, and the developer, but emphasized that the dialogue should have been conducted agency to agency. He expressed concern that the developer was directing comments and threats of litigation toward ACTC and the RTMF OC rather than communicating through the City of Sutter Creek, which should be the entity negotiating with the developer regarding repayment obligations. He stated that the fundamental issue is whether the city will require the developer to reimburse ACTC for the advanced intersection improvements, with that repayment discussion occurring solely between ACTC and the city. Commissioner Plasse also remarked that he had been included in certain comments from the developer, which he considered wholly inappropriate. He also pointed out errors in the Conditions of Approval referencing the Amador County Recreation Agency, noting that such references should be removed for accuracy. Commissioner Staples agreed that once the matter escalated, communication shifted exclusively to attorneys, which was not the appropriate channel. Commissioner Plasse reiterated that negotiations should have been handled directly between the agencies rather than through legal counsel or the developer.

During public comment, a question was raised regarding whether the project's tentative maps were still valid or had expired. Ms. Ebrahimi clarified that the maps have expired and explained that no project approvals can proceed until environmental analysis is completed or the city clarifies whether it intends to rely on the previously certified EIR. She noted that the project's timeline and entitlements remain unclear. She agreed with Vice Chairman Riordan that the City of Sutter Creek needs to provide further clarification to ACTC. Commissioner Plasse emphasized that ACTC's role is limited to transportation issues and does not involve land-use decision-making. Chairman Crew added that the threatening letter sent by the developer should have been directed to the city rather than to Mr. Gedney. Commissioner Oneto observed that it appears the developer is seeking assistance from the city because it does not want to repay the funds advanced by ACTC.

Ms. Ebrahimi noted that this item was just informational and requires no action. Mr. Gedney clarified the letter was approved by the subcommittee prior to its being sent.

#9. ACTC 2024 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP):

A. Draft 2024 RTP Tier I & II Project List Amendment: Ms. Bridges reviewed the staff report. Commissioner Plasse asked if the second table in the attachments, without the red-lines, accounted for all the changes and updates that have been made and Ms. Bridges confirmed this.

B. Resolution approving the allocation of $3,503,000 to roadway rehabilitation projects submitted in the 2025 RTP 'Call for Projects': Ms. Bridges reviewed the resolution.

> **Motion:** It was moved by Commissioner Oneto, seconded by Vice Chairman Riordan, and carried to approve (A) RTP Tier I & II Project List Amendments and (B) the resolution approving the allocation of $3,503,000 to roadway rehabilitation projects submitted in the 2025 Regional Transportation Plan 'Call for Projects'

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

C. Paving Equipment Acquisition Discussion: Mr. Gedney reported that, following the board's direction last month, staff has begun the process of engaging consultants to evaluate potential paving equipment acquisition and assess public works crew capabilities. After conferring with Ms. Ebrahimi, staff determined that issuing a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) is the appropriate next step to ensure proper procedure, and the RFQ will be published in the upcoming Friday newspaper. The submissions are due by December 5, 2025. In the meantime, ACTC has been holding informal discussions with local contracting experts Mr. Kenny Neu and Mr. Jason Cazadd, who have volunteered their time. Late last week, these experts met at the Amador County Corporation Yard with ACTC staff and the Amador County Public Works crew, and the discussion was productive. Mr. Gedney invited Commissioner Plasse to provide additional detail on the field meeting.

Commissioner Plasse reported that the recent field meeting was held to conduct an informal assessment of the equipment currently available for completing paving projects in-house. Based on the review conducted at the County Corporation Yard, he noted that no single jurisdiction possesses all the necessary equipment to independently undertake such work. He explained that while the County has been acquiring some machinery on its own, additional equipment would be required to fully outfit a road crew. Mr. Neu was asked to supplement the existing equipment list with the items needed to complete local paving projects, and he has since developed that list and is in the process of obtaining bids and quotes from his suppliers. Commissioner Plasse stated that once the RFQ process closes, the board will be updated with accurate cost information. He added that Mr. Neu's preliminary estimate places the total equipment cost closer to $500,000, significantly lower than the earlier estimate of approximately $1.5 million discussed in previous meetings.

Commissioner Plasse noted that he has heard of potential resistance from some local jurisdictions during recent Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meetings, with certain agencies expressing a desire to obtain their own paving equipment rather than share resources. He observed that this may reflect underlying trust issues between the cities and the county, though he does not understand the basis for those concerns. He emphasized that if the overall goal is to achieve cost efficiencies and complete roadway paving projects across all jurisdictions, purchasing duplicate sets of equipment would be an ineffective use of limited funds and would undermine efforts to maximize resources.

Commissioner Staples clarified that comments raised at recent TAC meetings were not rooted in mistrust between the cities and the county but were instead focused on the limited seasonal window available for paving and the scheduling challenges that could result. Commissioner Plasse responded that he had been told by two (2) individuals from local jurisdictions that concerns about mistrust were, in fact, voiced during those meetings. While acknowledging the validity of scheduling concerns, he noted that even if issues related to equipment, personnel, and coordination were resolved, funding constraints would still limit the timeframe in which projects could be completed. To address both prioritization and scheduling challenges, he suggested implementing a 'Call for Projects.' This process could be similar to the RTP model, which would allow ACTC to prioritize proposed paving projects and manage equipment scheduling and crew allocation accordingly.

Commissioner Oneto agreed that the purchase of two (2) sets of equipment would be unnecessary in the beginning. He suggested purchasing one (1) set of equipment to try for a couple of years to see if the need for another equipment set would be justified. Commissioner Staples notes that prior to moving forward with the equipment purchase, the board needs to see the reports from the consultant and Commissioner Oneto agreed. Chairman Crew stated that it is expected that the initial implementation will be clumsy. However, if the jurisdictions work together, there is more chance of success for everyone. Commissioner Staples reiterated that she has attended all the TAC meetings and mistrust has not been an issue.

Chairman Crew asked Commissioner Plasse whether the field meeting at the County Yard provided a clearer sense of current equipment costs compared to earlier estimates. Commissioner Plasse responded that the updated cost estimate is significantly lower than originally projected, largely due to Mr. Neu's recommendation that purchasing a grinder is unnecessary. Based on Mr. Neu's 25 years of paving industry experience, including ownership of a successful contracting company, grinders are extremely expensive to buy and maintain, while renting one is practical and cost-effective. Mr. Neu suggested a Sacramento based firm that routinely provides grinder rentals, which include an operator. It has a day rate of approximately $4,500–$5,000, which is far less than the roughly $800,000 previously estimated for purchasing a new grinder. Commissioner Plasse also noted that the County recently acquired a skid steer, though Mr. Neu advised that a wheeled model would have been preferable to the track model purchased. He emphasized that the updated overall equipment estimate of approximately $500,000 would effectively pay for itself within the first mile of roadway paved. With current engineering estimates ranging from $600,000 to $750,000 per lane mile, and in-house work projected at around $180,000 per mile, the savings from just one project would offset the full equipment investment.

Commissioner Staples noted that Commissioner Plasse appears to have information that has not yet been shared with the full board and stated she looks forward to reviewing the formal report when it is presented. Commissioner Bottomley asked for clarification on the source of the $180,000 in-house paving estimate. Mr. Gedney explained that the figure was prepared by Interim Public Works Director Jeff Christman and is based on his assessment of county crew labor, equipment rates, and material costs. He further clarified, in response to a follow-up question, that the estimate reflects the cost of a two-inch overlay rather than a full reclamation.

Commissioner Plasse reported that, based on information from Mr. Neu, a similar paving approach is currently being used in El Dorado County involving a technique referred to as "micro-grinding." This method removes only the top layer of the roadway to address settling or heaving before applying a rubberized chip-seal, which is more cost-effective and provides good long-term durability. He also reiterated the usefulness of the StreetSaver program, which jurisdictions have historically used to evaluate Pavement Condition Index (PCI). The program includes a feature that recommends appropriate rehabilitation treatments, helping determine whether a roadway requires full reconstruction or a less costly alternative. Commissioner Plasse suggested using this tool to guide project selection and funding decisions for the Tier 1 list. Vice Chairman Riordan agreed that the StreetSaver program would be valuable for assessing roadway conditions and identifying the appropriate treatment levels.

Mr. George Lee, City Manager of Ione, thanked the board for exploring innovative approaches to advancing local paving projects. He shared that a prospective 1,100-unit development in Ione appears likely to move forward soon, which would provide the city with funding for long-needed improvements at Howard Park. He emphasized that Howard Park functions as a regional facility, drawing thousands of vehicles every weekend, and that this paving initiative could help improve parking areas the city is responsible for maintaining. Mr. Lee noted that the city is also exploring ways to monetize the park to generate additional funding that would benefit the entire county. Commissioner Plasse agreed that paving improvements would greatly serve county residents and added that grindings generated from paving projects could be repurposed as a base material at the park, helping reduce dust and avoiding the need to haul the material out of the county. Mr. Lee shared that several improvements are planned for Howard Park and invited the board to visit once work begins. He highlighted that a new irrigation project for the soccer fields is about to start and noted that Simmons Landscaping, a local business, has been selected to complete the work.

Ms. Debbie Mackey, Fire Marshal for the City of Ione, echoed Mr. Lee's appreciation for being included in efforts to develop a sustainable and affordable pavement management program benefiting both the City of Ione and the county as a whole. She expressed support for Commissioner Plasse's suggested 'Call for Projects' approach and asked about the criteria that would guide project selection, specifically whether jurisdictions that secure partial grant funding would receive higher priority. Commissioner Oneto agreed and clarified that ACTC could potentially provide the remaining funds needed for such projects. Chairman Crew noted that grant funding could indeed serve as a qualifier in the prioritization process. Mr. Gedney added that while the current funding cycle is complete, incorporating grant funding as criteria for next year's cycle would be possible with board approval. In response to Commissioner Oneto's inquiry, Mr. Gedney explained that annual Regional Improvement Program (RIP) Shares funding varies with gas tax revenue, noting that the most recent two-year cycle provided approximately $600,000 to $700,000.

#10. ACTC FY 2025/26 Overall Work Program & Budget Amendments: Ms. Bridges reviewed her staff report. She noted a typo in the report specifically, the amount of carry-over funds was $57,500, not $57,000.

> **Motion:** It was moved by Commissioner Staples, seconded by Commissioner Bottomley, and unanimously carried to approve the FY 2025/2026 Overall Work Program and Budget Amendments.

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

#11. Approve Monthly Claims List: Mr. Gedney noted that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission transaction is for the yearly subscription to the StreetSaver program.

> **Motion:** It was moved by Commissioner Oneto, seconded by Commissioner Staples, and unanimously carried to approve the revised claims list.

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

#12. ACTC Commissioner Reports: Commissioner Oneto noted a couple of projects that are currently occurring in the county. The first on Ridge Road in Pine Grove was completed satisfactorily and there are some residual funding.. He added there is the possibility of performing asphalt rubber chip seal along that roadway. Additionally, the project on Martin Lane in Ione is progressing and going well. Commissioner Oneto then noted he recently went to the worksite and spoke with Jeff Christman the current Public Works Director. He learned that the county is trying two (2) pavement rehabilitation options to see how they work long term. One is a fog seal, and the other is rubberized asphalt.

Commissioner Plasse noted that many years ago in the high country roads, like those near Silver Lake, were paved using the rubberized asphalt. It was noted that the roads were considerably quieter to travel on. That rubberizing helps the road absorb some of the effects of freezing conditions like heaving. The asphalt does not crack as significantly as the old asphalt did. Commissioner Oneto commented that he learned that the use and application of the rubberized asphalt will actually help

bind the road together to a certain degree. He notes it may not be as good as a full asphalt treatment, but it does work well, and it is substantially more cost effective.

Chairman Crew stated that with all the work currently being done in the county, it is an excellent way to determine the actual cost per mile of roadwork. This is beneficial to the local jurisdictions in planning for future road projects. Commissioner Plasse added that you will get the cost of each procedure. Chairman Crew noted that this will allow comparison on similar roadways.

#13. ACTC Reports - Verbal Reports:

- FY 24/25 AT Fiscal & Compliance Audit Kick-off: Mr. Gedney reported that a meeting was held the previous day with the audit consultants, ACTC staff, AT staff, Ms. Castillo-AT CPA, and Commissioner Plasse (Finance Committee member).He stated that the discussion went beyond introductory matters and brought clarity to several ongoing questions, particularly regarding the practice of transferring funds from the reserves accounts to the operating account. It was clarified that historically these transfers have been held as a "placeholder", referred to as a "cash flow statement," rather than being booked as current-year operating expenses. The funds held as a "placeholder" are intended to be reconciled with the prior year's budget by the audit consultant. He further noted that concerns have been raised during previous audits about transfers or "loans" from reserves being identified as operating funds without subsequent repayment to the reserves accounts. As a corrective measure, Ms. Miller and Ms. Castillo agreed that, beginning with the current audit cycle, a fully reconciled budget reflecting all such transfers will be brought to the board for approval before being submitted to the auditor.

  Vice Chairman Riordan asked whether this financial information would now be provided during the board's initial budget review rather than after the fact. Mr. Gedney responded that some confusion may still exist regarding the process and explained that the board-approved AT budget has usually been adjusted through reconciliation by the CPA before being presented to the auditor. He noted that when the budget was approved, excess expenditures had already occurred, which should have prompted an amended budget to be brought back to the board for full transparency.

  Commissioner Oneto observed that the approved budget was therefore not truly reflective of the actual budget. Mr. Gedney clarified that the intent is to present a clearer comparison of Budget vs. Actuals, allowing the board to see where unanticipated expenditures occurred. He stated that this amended budget will provide the level of transparency ACTC aims to achieve by showing, at year-end, the specific areas where additional spending took place. Commissioner Staples added that she had previously inquired with Ms. Miller about the related journal entry, and Mr. Gedney confirmed that this transaction has indeed been handled through a journal entry.

- Amador County Unified School District Consolidation Proposal Update: Mr. Gedney provided a brief review of the history surrounding the Amador County Unified School District (ACUSD) consolidation plan and ACTC's involvement. He explained that several years ago ACTC's legal counsel had informed the district that it was proceeding with approving the consolidation plan without completing the required Environmental Impact Report (EIR). He noted the unique situation in which ACUSD serves as both the project proponent and the approving authority. Recently, in response to the district's request, he met with Superintendent Jared Critchfield and some school board members. He reported that the meeting was highly positive and resulted in a strong shared understanding of the proper process for a project of this scale. He

stated that ACUSD initially intended to present the plan at their most recent board meeting and approve the grade realignment—sending 7th–9th grades to Argonaut High School and 10th–12th grades to Amador High School—through a resolution under a Negative Declaration. He advised them that this approach was not permissible, emphasizing that a traffic mitigation plan must first be submitted to and approved by the board. He recommended that ACUSD prepare and submit a traffic mitigation plan under a Negative Declaration for review. Once approved, the school board could then take action on the project itself. He further noted that an existing resolution adopting the previous consolidation plan remains in effect, and therefore, ACUSD will rescind that resolution at its November 12th meeting, effectively nullifying the prior plan while keeping the existing EIR open. The district's intent is to add the new consolidation proposal as an alternative to be studied within that EIR.

Mr. Gedney acknowledged that the history of the school consolidation plan has been contentious within the community. He emphasized, however, that ACTC holds no position regarding where or when the consolidation should occur. He clarified that the agency's sole concern is ensuring that the proper procedural steps are followed, including completing the required analysis before any approval of the plan is made. Commissioner Oneto asked about the parking capacity at Amador High School and whether it would be sufficient to support the proposed consolidation plan. Mr. Gedney responded that parking concerns have already been part of the discussions and that several scenarios and potential mitigation measures have been considered. He noted that these issues will be fully addressed before any approval of the consolidation plan is brought forward. Mr. Gedney reported that during a recent Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) meeting, Sutter Creek City Council member Julia Sierk mentioned the city's anticipation of moving forward with the Gopher Flat Corridor project. He stated that ACTC referred her to the Caltrans Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant Program and noted that the corridor could be incorporated into a larger effort to address pedestrian and bicycle gap closures in Sutter Creek, particularly if the school consolidation plan advances. He also provided historical background on the Sutter Creek Bypass project, explaining that a former Caltrans District 10 supervisor had informed the ACTC Executive Director that the intersection of SR 49 and Sutter lone did not meet the safety warrants for installation of a traffic signal and therefore could not be included in the original bypass design. However, a change order was later issued that allowed the intersection to be equipped with the necessary infrastructure for a future signal if warranted. Mr. Gedney added that Superintendent Critchfield has been informed of this history and that it may prove useful in addressing future traffic mitigation needs related to the consolidation plan.

#14. Future Agenda Items:

- Regional Transportation Improvement Program
- Annual Unmet Transit Needs public hearing on December 4th at 10:00 a.m.
- ACTC financial system
- Presentation on the StreetSaver Program

#15. ADJOURNMENT: At 10:47 a.m. the Chairman Crew adjourned the regular meeting to Thursday December 4, 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.