AMADOR COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (ACTC) MINUTES
December 4, 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
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, General Manager

Pledge of Allegiance

AGENDA: Commissioner Staples noted, with regard to Regular Agenda item #8, the attachment to the Project Study Report Equivalent (Project Application Packet) for Amador City's project is incorrect. Mr. Gedney stated he mistakenly included a previous application packet for Amador City but noted the current application packet would be included in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) submittal to California Traffic Commission (CTC). He then provided copies of the corrected information to the board and the public.

Motion: It was moved by Commissioner Oneto, seconded by Commissioner Staples, and unanimously carried to approve the agenda with minor corrections.

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

PUBLIC MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA: None

CONSENT AGENDA (Items 1-5):
#1. Approve Minutes of November 6, 2025 ACTC Regular Meeting: Commissioner Plasse raised concerns regarding the terminology used in the minutes discussing the Regional Transportation Mitigation Fee (RTMF) program, noting that the fees forwarded to ACTC are repeatedly referred

to as "contributions." He stated that this wording is misleading, as the RTMF is more akin to a tax or impact fee that jurisdictions collect from developers and forward to ACTC for program administration, rather than a voluntary contribution from the jurisdictions themselves. He suggested that staff revise the language to better reflect the nature of the fee. Ms. Bridges confirmed that the wording would be revised for clarity.

Vice Chairman Riordan stated that his primary concern was not the wording, but whether jurisdictions were properly collecting and forwarding the fees. Commissioner Plasse agreed and noted that multiple notices have been sent to the jurisdictions. He questioned whether additional steps, such as requesting permit records, may be necessary to determine whether fees were being collected and, if so, whether they were being forwarded to ACTC. Mr. Gedney explained that ACTC has no enforcement mechanism to compel collection or remittance of the fees. Commissioner Plasse noted that the jurisdictions entered into a binding Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

Commissioners continued discussion regarding the collection of fees. Mr. Gedney stated that the County has a strong record of collecting and forwarding fees and provides monthly reports to ACTC, but similar records are not consistently available from the cities. Ms. Bridges noted that Jackson and Ione remain outstanding for FY 24/25, with no responses to recent notices, while Plymouth staff is working to determine whether fees have been collected following significant staffing changes.

Mr. Gedney further explained that delays in fee remittance have occurred annually with some jurisdictions, noting this year has been particularly challenging. He noted that Ione has historically been late in forwarding fees, often not remitting any fees until December, and described recent conversations with Ione staff regarding the status of those funds.

Commissioner Plasse drew a comparison to school impact fees, which must be paid to the school district and proof shown to the County before a building permit is issued. He questioned whether a similar structure could be implemented for RTMF fees, whereby developers would pay ACTC directly and provide proof of payment prior to permit issuance. Mr. Gedney responded that school districts have entitlement authority that ACTC does not, and that such a change would need to be addressed at the local planning level. Commissioners discussed whether jurisdictions might welcome removal of the fee-collection responsibility, and whether doing so could reduce delays and inconsistencies.

Further discussion addressed the nature of RTMF fees as local and regional impact fees that, when paid, allow cities/developers to avoid more extensive traffic and environmental studies. Mr. Gedney explained that if jurisdictions choose not to participate in the RTMF program, that could lead to more extensive traffic and environmental studies required of the cities, resulting in additional cost and time for developers. He also noted there have been challenges with attendance to the RTMF Oversight Committee meetings themselves. Commissioner Staples suggested that the issue would be appropriate for discussion among city managers. Commissioner Plasse stated that any revisions to the MOU would require discussion and approval by all jurisdictions, but revisions may ultimately be necessary

Mr. Gedney outlined a potential future approach tied to coordinated paving projects among jurisdictions, whereby participation could be contingent upon current remittance of RTMF fees.

Mr. Gedney noted that some city council members have raised concerns regarding the equity of RTMF fund distribution.

Commissioner Staples stated that cities are required to report building permit activity in their council agendas, which could allow ACTC staff to review permit activity over the past year. Ms. Bridges asked whether the board wished staff to compile and present this information. Vice Chairman Riordan agreed that doing so would help quantify the issue and inform potential direction to ensure timely payment.

> **Motion:** It was moved by Commissioner Staples, seconded by Vice Chairman Riordan, and unanimously carried to approve the Consent Agenda with minor wording changes to the minutes.

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

REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:

#6. 10:00 a.m. Annual Unmet Needs Public Hearing: Chairman Crew noted that this item is time sensitive and would be tabled until 10:00 a.m.

#7. FY 2024/25 Modified Draft Regional Traffic Mitigation Fee Report: Ms. Bridges reviewed the staff report. She noted that since the last meeting, Amador County did pay their RTMF fees. Chairman Crew asked if this item requires a vote. Ms. Bridges replied no, this update is informational only.

#8. ACTC Draft 2026 Regional Transportation Improvement Program: Mr. Gedney reviewed the staff report. He apologized again for including the wrong application package for Amador City's project and reviewed the correct application that he had distributed earlier in the meeting. Commissioner Oneto noted there was a big difference between the previous application proposal and the current one, to which Mr. Gedney agreed.

Mr. Gedney reported that the Amador City project will require a more extensive environmental review prior to construction, as the other projects are limited to edge line to edge line improvements. He explained that the Amador City project is more comprehensive in nature, including roadway resurfacing as well as sidewalk, bicycle, and pedestrian safety improvements. Mr. Gedney noted that Amador City is working to develop preliminary cost estimates for the environmental phase. Once a scope of work is established, Amador City will coordinate with Caltrans District 10 Local Assistance staff to submit the environmental work for reimbursement. He added that the reimbursement process can be lengthy due to the multiple steps required for approval.

Commissioner Plasse asked whether Commissioner Staples was surprised to learn that only $175,000 in funding was available due to the administrative fee. Commissioner Staples responded that she was previously aware of the required 25% jurisdictional match. However, she stated she was surprised by the additional fee charged by the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration (CDTFA) to establish the ¼-cent sales tax increase. She explained that Amador City was initially charged $43,000 to set up the fee, despite the original agreement stating that no

entity would be charged more than $175,000. Commissioner Staples then noted that prior to signing the agreement, she spoke with CDTFA staff regarding proportionality between larger and smaller entities and was informed that smaller entities would pay a lesser share. She stated that she subsequently wrote a letter to the Department of Finance disputing the fee, emphasizing that while the program is an incentive from Caltrans, the CDTFA fee was disproportionately burdensome for small jurisdictions. She provided the example that $175,000 would represent approximately 0.07% of Los Angeles County's budget, whereas the same amount equated to approximately 35% of Amador City's budget. Commissioner Staples commented that following submission of the letter, the fee was reduced and Amador City was refunded the difference.

Commissioner Plasse asked how the fee is handled in relation to the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) and State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), noting that jurisdictions are entitled to a minimum of $200,000 per year. Mr. Gedney responded that Amador City is utilizing state funding sources, explaining that the Amador Region's Road Improvement Program (RIP) funds are being used for rehabilitation projects while Amador City is using Senate Bill 1 (SB 1) funds for its project. He clarified that any project using state and/or federal funds must be included in the STIP, and that inclusion does not imply endorsement or nomination of projects by ACTC. Commissioner Plasse then asked for confirmation that no regional funding from ACTC is being provided, and Mr. Gedney confirmed that this was correct.

Vice Chairman Riordan asked whether the $25,000 in matching funds represented actual funds that Amador City would be required to contribute during the construction phase. Commissioner Staples responded that Amador City has an ongoing 25% matching requirement each year, and that the ¼-cent sales tax revenue is restricted to this specific project. She stated that the revenue cannot be deposited into other accounts, such as the General Fund, and is instead a dedicated line item that is fully encumbered for the project.

Commissioner Oneto asked how much funding Amador City may be requesting from ACTC. Commissioner Staples responded that she does not believe this project is eligible for funding through ACTC. She continued that Amador City understands that many of this projects' components included in the application may not ultimately be funded, but they are being included, nonetheless. Commissioner Oneto then asked whether Amador City's approach was to develop a "shovel-ready" project and subsequently seek funding. Commissioner Staples explained that Amador City is eligible for funding through the Local Partnership Program (LPP). By passing the sales tax measure, completing the required documentation, and presenting a project approved by the CTC, Amador City would be eligible to receive $200,000 annually, subject to a 25% local match. Commissioner Staples also clarified that the $1 million project referenced earlier by Commissioner Oneto pertained to a previous edge line to edge line project that was submitted from 2023.

Commissioner Plasse commented that if the total project cost is $4 million and Amador City can only fund $200,000 per year, the project would take a considerable amount of time to complete. Commissioner Oneto asked whether the amount of available funding through this tax measure to Amador City would decrease if additional entities apply to use it.

Further discussion took place regarding elements of the application, including whether beautification projects were included. Commissioner Staples stated that no beautification projects are included.

Chairman Crew commented that it is likely ACTC will be involved with the project at some point. Commissioner Plasse expressed concern that, once funding has been expended, the argument may be made that the project cannot be stopped, noting that this would be similar to the situation experienced with the Pine Grove Project. Commissioner Oneto referenced a previous email regarding the Pine Grove Project in which the project was described as "on time and under budget," stating that this characterization was inaccurate as the project remains ongoing. He further expressed concern regarding the overall value of the project in relation to its cost.

Commissioner Staples commented that, given the projected 10-year timeline for completion, the project will likely extend beyond the tenure of the current city administration. She noted that the current City Council and Citizens Advisory Committee selected components in accordance with Caltrans regulations, identifying the section from the bridge south/southwest as the most critical area in need of repair. Commissioner Staples stated that Amador City understands this segment may be the only portion ultimately completed among all components included in the application. She added that, as long as Amador City remains eligible and the program guidelines allow, the city will continue to include project elements beyond roadway rehabilitation, such as sidewalks and infrastructure components that contribute to a state of good repair. She acknowledged, however, that final decisions on which sections of the project are completed will depend on the funding available at the time.

Commissioner Oneto asked for clarification regarding Amador City's anticipated primary funding source, noting that the sales tax measure is expected to generate approximately $175,000 annually and inquired whether the city intends to pursue additional funding sources. Commissioner Staples responded that she is not currently aware of any other funding sources but noted that over the projected 10-year life of the project, additional opportunities may become available. Mr. Gedney commented that there are numerous competitive funding programs offered through the state. Commissioner Staples replied Amador City is eligible for both funding programs under LPP. Mr. Gedney added that the competitive program is rigorous.

Commissioner Oneto then referenced prior challenges related to funding and committee processes associated with the Pine Grove Project and expressed concern that this project could follow a similar path. Commissioner Staples stated that while she understands the Commissioners' concerns, she would like this project to be evaluated on its own merits rather than compared to a previous problematic project. She invited the Commissioners to attend one of the required Citizens Advisory Committee meetings to meet with members and discuss concerns directly with them.

Commissioner Plasse acknowledged Commissioner Staples' efforts to distinguish the Pine Grove Project from the proposed Amador City project but stated that he sees significant similarities between the two (2). He expressed concern that the project lacks a self-sustaining funding mechanism and may ultimately require regional funding to be completed. He further commented that the project scope appears to be largely focused on beautification rather than addressing core infrastructure needs. Commissioner Staples responded that the project is being submitted under a formula-based program and that Amador City also remains eligible for the competitive program, noting that neither program involves ACTC funding. She added that, according to Caltrans data, only 40 jurisdictions that passed sales tax measures applied for the available funding, which gives Amador City optimism that it may be competitive in future grant cycles. She stated that if funding is not awarded, the city understands that the project would need to be revised. Commissioner

Plasse asked whether the project could in fact be revised, and Commissioner Staples confirmed that it could.

Commissioner Staples clarified that the project inadvertently included in the agenda packet was a previous project brought forward under a different mayor and submitted to the RTMF program, which ultimately did not proceed. Commissioner Plasse stated that the original project was the one Commissioner Staples had previously advocated for, to which Commissioner Staples responded that the two projects are not comparable. Commissioner Plasse noted that the current project has expanded significantly compared to the prior one. Commissioner Staples agreed, explaining that the earlier project was limited to edge line to edge line improvements, whereas the current project is not. She further stated that the prior project was not denied because of its limited scope. Commissioner Plasse commented that it was denied because it had already been paid for.

Commissioner Plasse reiterated his concerns regarding the parallels to the Pine Grove Project and recalled prior assertions that the project had to be completed as originally submitted. He stated that he would defer to Mr. Gedney and ACTC to ensure that appropriate guidance is provided to Amador City and that all processes are carried out correctly. Commissioner Plasse emphasized that he does not want the project to reach a point where significant funds have been expended and it is deemed impossible to stop, resulting in a waste of public funds similar to the Pine Grove Project.

Mr. Gedney explained that the environmental phase is the initial step in the project process and is used to determine overall project costs based on the environmental mitigation requirements that must be addressed. Commissioner Plasse interjected that the original Amador City project was estimated at $1 million for edge line to edge line paving, whereas the current project estimate is approximately $4 million. Mr. Gedney acknowledged the increase but noted that the environmental phase will result in a refinement and potential revision of the project costs. He emphasized that the current figures are ballpark estimates rather than finalized amounts, explaining that consultants were asked to provide very broad cost ranges for potential environmental studies. He stated that completion of the environmental study will allow for more precise project cost estimates based on the information and findings developed during that process.

Chairman Crew stated that the Board will need to rely on Mr. Gedney's judgment and professional opinion regarding the project. Mr. Gedney responded that this effort represents an initial step to investigate the project, for which funding is available, and that ACTC is not involved in the project at this stage. Commissioner Plasse then asked for confirmation that the project must be included in the RTIP because it is using state funds, and Mr. Gedney confirmed that this is correct.

Commissioner Oneto requested that the record reflect the commissions concerns regarding the Amador City project, specifically that ***"it not follow the same path as the Pine Grove Project"*** and not to allow the ***"we cannot let it die now"*** opinion utilized with the Pine Grove Improvement Project.

> **Motion:** It was moved by Vice Chairman Riordan, seconded by Commissioner Bottomley, and unanimously carried to approve the 2026 Regional Transportation Improvement Program.

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

#9. ACTC Financial System Restructure/Personnel Roles & Responsibilities: Mr. Gedney reviewed the staff report, Budget versus Actuals report, and bank account balances. He stated staff is currently satisfied with the setup and transition from QuickBooks Desktop to QuickBooks Online (QBO), while acknowledging that additional improvements and updates are still needed to enhance clarity. Mr. Gedney thanked the Finance Committee for its role in the successful implementation of the new accounting system and then opened the item for Board discussion.

Chairman Crew commented that the accounting appears to have been consolidated and that the report makes information easier to locate. Commissioner Plasse asked for clarification regarding the date range used in the Budget versus Actuals report and requested that future reports reflect the period through the report run date rather than the full fiscal year, so the percentages shown align with the budget to date. Vice Chairman Riordan agreed and asked that the report run date also be included. Commissioner Plasse noted that the fiscal year is approximately 42% complete and stated that the report should reflect that timeframe. Mr. Gedney acknowledged the request and explained that, due to challenges associated with the transition, this was the first Budget versus Actuals report presented to the board, apologizing for the delay.

Commissioner Bottomley asked about the income accounts shown in the Budget versus Actuals report, beginning with line item #44000, noting that no income was reflected. Mr. Gedney explained that some of the accounts are reimbursable in nature and therefore would not show income. He used the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) program as an example, noting that ACTC does not directly receive those funds; instead, the funding is programmed to a project and reimbursed by Caltrans after expenditures are made. He explained that ACTC may program CMAQ funds, such as for the purchase of buses for Amador Transit, but the implementing agency is responsible for the purchase and reimbursement process. Mr. Gedney added that for other income accounts listed, funds do exist, and some balances are not currently reflected due to delays in depositing checks. Commissioner Bottomley commented that including income accounts for which no actual funds are received may skew the financial information and result in inaccurate reporting and suggested that such accounts be removed from the budget. Mr. Gedney agreed and clarified that the line items beginning at #52000 were included to illustrate allocation accounts and to show where apportionments are directed, either to specific projects or to apportionment reserves.

Vice Chairman Riordan commented that it may be challenging for ACTC to reflect funds in accounts where monies are not directly received by the agency, expressing concern that this could create a lack of clarity for the board regarding which accounts have received funding. He acknowledged Mr. Gedney's earlier comments that additional refinement of the accounting system is needed and commended staff for their work on the transition. Vice Chairman Riordan stated his hope that, with guidance from the CPA, transparency can continue to improve without the need for lengthy explanations of funding accounts. Mr. Gedney agreed and noted that the presentation was intended as an overview and that the reports would be brought back to the board on a monthly basis.

Mr. Gedney highlighted the separation of duties recommended by the CPA to effectively manage the system and mitigate potential areas of fraud. He briefly reviewed the proposed delegations of authority to staff and noted that formal recommendations regarding potential staff reclassifications, along with the proposed budget for the next fiscal year, will be presented to the Board in February.

Vice Chairman Riordan commended ACTC staff for their ongoing work with the Finance Committee, noting that staff meet monthly to review transactions in order to maintain transparency and clarity.

#6. 10:00 a.m. Annual Unmet Needs Public Hearing: At 10:04 a.m. Chairman Crew opened the public hearing.

Mr. Gedney introduced Ms. Karyn Gregorius-Executive Director of ARC of Amador and Calaveras and Chair of the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC). Ms. Gregorius provided testimony on behalf of the council. She briefly reviewed the history and composition of SSTAC, noting that the council meets bi-monthly to identify community transportation needs and discuss potential solutions. She explained that information gathered by the council is compiled and presented to the board on an annual basis. Ms. Gregorius stated that the council's goals include supporting the sustainability of the transit system, identifying and addressing community needs, and formally presenting those needs each year. She further noted that within the chart, the section titled "Transit Solutions" contains recommendations that are primarily intended to research and determine the feasibility of the proposed actions. Ms. Gregorius then reviewed the FY 2026/2027 Unmet Transit Needs Recommendations Chart and highlighted four (4) unmet needs: (1) restoration of the Sacramento route; (2) restoration of Routes 5 and 6, including service before 9:00 a.m. and after 4:00 p.m.; (3) expansion of Dial-a-Ride (DAR) service areas throughout the county; and (4) implementation of on-demand DAR service.

Vice Chairman Riordan asked whether the recommendations shown on the chart were prioritized. Ms. Bridges explained that the restoration of the Sacramento service route appears first on the list due to the volume of requests received by Amador Transit (AT) throughout the year for that service. Commissioner Plasse then questioned why individuals are identifying the Sacramento route as a need, however, were not utilizing the service when it was previously in operation. He noted that the route averaged approximately 1.5 riders per day. He stated that it did not seem consistent for the route to be the highest requested unmet need given its low historical usage. Ms. Bridges responded that she could not speak to the details to the requests, as the request forms do not capture that level of detail, and noted that Ms. Miller, General Manager of AT, may have additional insight.

Commissioner Oneto asked how many requests had been made for the Sacramento route. Ms. Miller explained that the service was temporarily discontinued during the COVID period, when many individuals were working or attending school remotely, and since then, with the return to in-person work and schooling, the requests for service were increasing. Ms. Bridges added that AT received approximately 100 total service requests during the 2025 calendar year, of which 30 to 40 were for the restoration of the Sacramento route.

Vice Chairman Riordan asked for confirmation that the next step would be to analyze and evaluate feasibility and then determine the actual need. Both Ms. Bridges and Ms. Gregorius confirmed

that this was correct. Ms. Gregorius explained, in response to Vice Chairman Riordan's questions, that items advance to the short-term list through feedback submitted via the Unmet Transit Needs form on the websites and through discussions held at SSTAC meetings. The local service agencies convey needs identified by the populations they serve, such as veterans and seniors. She noted that the council also considers the county as a whole and works in coordination with both long- and short-term transit plans to accommodate growth where it is appropriate and needed.

Commissioner Plasse asked whether the most recent Amador County Short-Range Transit Development Plan had been reviewed by SSTAC. Ms. Gregorius confirmed that the council reviews these plans on an ongoing basis and takes their recommendations into consideration. Commissioner Plasse then asked about the "Transit Solutions" section that references "in-house research," specifically whether transit studies qualify as "in-house" research and whether any research is conducted at the staff level, given staff involvement in those studies. Ms. Gregorius responded that this determination is at the discretion of ACTC staff and that SSTAC does not provide guidance at that level.

Vice Chairman Riordan commented that he appreciates the effort involved in developing the recommendations and stated that it is now up to staff to review and research the items identified in the chart. Mr. Gedney added that a report evaluating the feasibility of the recommendations will be brought back to the Board in February or March.

> **Motion:** It was moved by Commissioner Oneto, seconded by Commissioner Plasse, and unanimously carried to close the Annual Unmet Transit Needs Public Hearing.

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

#10. StreetSaver Pavement Management Program: Mr. Gedney reviewed his staff report.

Commissioner Plasse referenced the staff report's mention of a new mobile inspection station, and asked Mr. Gedney confirmed its availability, noting that the City of Sutter Creek recently used it and presented the resulting data to ACTC. While Mr. Gedney was unsure of the specific technology used, such as LiDAR, he explained that roadways are driven and data is collected. A potential issue remains whether the data gathered can be transferred and uploaded into the StreetSaver program. Vice Chairman Riordan asked if this issue had been resolved, and Mr. Gedney responded not at this time. In the meantime, staff must continue conducting in-person inspections using rollers and other tools. Mr. Gedney also noted the availability of smart pads for maintenance crews, which will help streamline data collection. He explained that because in-person inspections are costly, they are performed once, after which the program relies on deterioration curves to project Pavement Condition Index (PCI) values over time. Mr. Gedney highlighted that a major benefit of the StreetSaver Program is the ability to incorporate the program's Decision Tree to determine roadway treatments and the associated costs. Specifically, the program recommends lower-cost treatments for higher PCI roadways and more extensive rehabilitation for lower PCI roadways. He added the program also includes a budgeting tool that allows users to input a total budget to determine how many roadway segments can be addressed in a given year, as well as a target PCI feature that enables jurisdictions to compare overall PCI levels and prioritize projects based on a desired PCI outcome.

Mr. Gedney noted that Commissioner Plasse expressed interest in utilizing the StreetSaver program for upcoming paving projects, and Commissioner Plasse agreed that it could be a valuable resource.

Commissioner Plasse commented that the PCI values and deterioration curves are based on subjective data that is created and entered into the program. He cited the previously discussed Amador City project as an example, noting that its PCI is listed as 27. While on page five (5) of the StreetSaver Analysis for the City of Plymouth included in the agenda, indicates that a PCI of 20 represents a county road with weeds growing through it. He stated that this breakdown of pavement conditions does not appear accurate and expressed interest in the new data input method that removes human bias, noting that otherwise the results amount to "garbage in, garbage out." Mr. Gedney responded that local knowledge remains an important component and that program recommendations can be reviewed with local public works crews to confirm their accuracy. He emphasized that the StreetSaver program is not intended to be used as an absolute determination, but rather as a guide in the decision-making process. Regarding the Amador City project, he explained that in 2015 the old highways were not included in the survey and therefore lacked PCI data. He added that staff was later trained on how to assess roadways and gather PCI data, meaning the current data was collected by trained local staff rather than pavement professionals. Mr. Gedney stated that if data is gathered consistently and using the same methodology, the results become more uniform across jurisdictions. Commissioner Plasse agreed, stating that applying the same methodology helps reduce human bias, such as selectively identifying the worst roadway segments. He further noted that, as an example, no data has been collected for French Bar Road to reflect PCI values below 20. Commissioner Plasse concluded that a new, more objective methodology that removes human selectivity would be a better system, while noting that the alternative would be to forego the program entirely and rely on paving experts' evaluations of roadways identified for projects.

Mr. Gedney noted that jurisdictions receiving SB 1 funding are required to maintain an updated Pavement Management Program, which must be submitted annually based on the most recent pavement survey. He stated that the StreetSaver program is currently underutilized and expressed a desire for additional training and improved integration of the new inspection stations with the program.

Vice Chairman Riordan commented that he would like to further discuss the program and the new technology with the Sutter Creek Public Works Department, noting that if the technology could benefit all jurisdictions, it may be worthwhile to pursue a collaborative approach.

Commissioners continued discussion regarding the new technology.

Mr. Gedney stated that the discussion ties into the paving equipment acquisition project currently underway and noted that the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for that project is scheduled to close the following day. Commissioner Plasse asked whether any submissions had been received, and Mr. Gedney replied that one (1) submission had been received to date.

Commissioner Bottomley inquired about the cost of a StreetSaver program subscription and how jurisdictions would access the program. Mr. Gedney responded that it is $1,500 per year per jurisdiction and city staff could reach out to ACTC for assistance with the program.

Commissioner Plasse asked about the Carbon Reduction Program item on the agenda, which has approximately $220,000 in remaining funds available for eligible projects, and whether those funds could be used for the StreetSaver program. He cited an eligibility criterion referencing "traffic monitoring, management and control facility or program." Mr. Gedney replied that he believes this language applies more directly to signalization, synchronization, and efficiency improvements related to traffic signals.

#11. Approve Monthly Claims List:

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

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

#12. ACTC Commissioner Reports: None

#13. ACTC Reports - Verbal reports: Mr. Gedney stated, regarding the Caltrans Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant opportunities, two (2) local jurisdictions (Jackson and Plymouth) seemed to be interested in submitting applications. Mr. Gedney asked Commissioner Bottomley if the City of Plymouth did submit their application. Commissioner Bottomley responded that she had spoken with Mr. Kevin Molina, the executive staffer overseeing the grant, and was informed that the Plymouth Trail Extension project would not qualify. Mr. Gedney provided Mr. Brock a brief review of the project that Plymouth was intending to submit and asked for insight. Mr. Brock responded that there are other potential avenues and funding opportunities that could be pursued and noted that Caltrans could assist in identifying those options.

Mr. Gedney then noted that the City of Jackson submitted an application for a planning grant related to its Downtown/Main Street project, which includes several proposed improvements, such as converting Main Street to one-way traffic and adding a creek walk crossing to improve pedestrian safety when crossing the highway. Commissioner Oneto expressed uncertainty about how well a one-way traffic configuration in the downtown area would be received by the community. Mr. Gedney responded that the purpose of initiating a planning grant is to gather community input on proposed concepts. Commissioner Plasse commented that the one-way traffic concept would result in approximately 70 additional downtown parking spaces. He added that he previously served on the Jackson Revitalization Committee and that a similar idea had been proposed at that time but did not receive sufficient community support.

Mr. Gedney noted that Ms. Julia Sierk, Sutter Creek City Council Member, expressed interest in submitting a planning grant application and sought guidance from ACTC regarding the process; however, he stated that he was unsure whether the application had ultimately been submitted. Vice Chairman Riordan commented that, to his knowledge, the application was not submitted due to the application requirements and the short submission deadline.

#14. Caltrans Report with Caleb Brock:

- Mr. Brock informed the board of two (2) upcoming funding opportunities. First, the U.S. Department of Transportation has released a 'Call for Applications' under the Better

Utilizing Investments to Leverage Development (BUILD) program, which funds regionally or locally significant surface transportation projects. He stated that $1.5 billion is available statewide, with an application deadline of February 24, 2026. Mr. Brock explained that Caltrans will provide letters of support to local partners for this federal program and that jurisdictions requesting letters of support must submit their requests by December 18, 2025. He added that although the investment manager is currently on vacation, any requests sent directly to him will be ensured completion prior to the February 24, 2026 deadline. Second, the California Office of Traffic Safety under the Highway Safety Program, which focuses on reducing serious injuries and fatalities resulting from motor vehicle crashes and impacts to roadway users. The application deadline for this program is January 31, 2026.

- Mr. Brock noted that his department regularly works with local partners to pursue funding opportunities. While the department typically focuses on larger projects requiring significant funding, he emphasized that opportunities are also available for smaller jurisdictions. He stated that the department is willing to meet with local jurisdictions and ACTC to strategize potential projects and identify appropriate funding sources. Vice Chairman Riordan thanked Mr. Brock for the information and asked Mr. Gedney and Ms. Bridges whether this topic would be appropriate for inclusion on a TAC meeting agenda in the near term. Commissioner Oneto agreed and welcomed the potential guidance. Mr. Brock concurred and suggested meeting with the TAC on a quarterly basis to discuss ideas, with the option of meeting individually with jurisdictions if additional assistance or direction is needed. Mr. Gedney clarified that the referenced funding opportunities are intended for larger projects and would not typically be used for pavement projects, but rather for traffic safety–related improvements. Commissioner Oneto commented that pavement improvements are inherently related to traffic safety and cited SR-49 as an example. Mr. Gedney agreed, but explained that the programs are generally aimed at large, multi-agency efforts, such as the Wicklow Way project. He noted that while involvement from the federal government and Caltrans would be beneficial, such projects would not be feasible without other partners, including Amador County and the Amador County Unified School District, taking a leadership role in advancing the effort. Vice Chairman Riordan commented that inviting the school district to a TAC meeting would be beneficial, given the district's long-term vision and the anticipated traffic impacts associated with student growth, regardless of where the project ultimately moves forward.

- Caltrans has approved ACTC's Quarter one Rural Planning Assistance (RPA) funding invoices.

- Caltrans maintenance crews will be performing vegetation management and light repair work on SR 104, SR 108, SR 49, and SR 16. In the Pine Grove area, crews will be cleaning drains, removing litter and debris, repairing potholes, and fixing guideposts. Additionally, on SR 124, one-way traffic controls will be in place for highway construction from December 4, 2026 through December 6, 2025, between 9:00 PM and 6:00 AM.

Mr. Brock then followed up on Commissioner Oneto's inquiry from the previous month regarding invasive plants. He explained that each district is required to prepare an annual vegetation control plan, which documents environmentally sensitive areas and the pesticides used. He noted that

maintenance crews employ three methods of vegetation control: chemical spraying, mechanical mowing, and manual removal. Mr. Brock added that Caltrans landscape specialists are certified to apply chemical treatments and are registered with each county's Agricultural Commission. He stated that he will be reaching out to Amador County to determine whether there are any significant concerns related to stinkwort.

Mr. Brock stated that he wants to ensure he and his department continue to bring value to the region. He noted that, moving forward, he plans to bring informational topics to the Board to provide greater insight into the work of his team, Caltrans' role, and opportunities to strengthen partnerships with local jurisdictions. He asked Board members to share any specific topics, funding opportunities, or projects they would like addressed, and indicated he would be willing to present that information in future meetings. Commissioner Oneto commented that developing and sharing a roadmap to available funding sources would be beneficial.

#15. Future Agenda Items:

- Draft ACTC Overall Work Program and Budget for FY 26/27
- Caltrans attendance at TAC meetings for funding opportunity discussions
- StreetSaver Program-data transfer research (MTC)
- RTMF program- Building permit research

#16. ADJOURNMENT: At 10:49 a.m. the Chairman Crew adjourned the regular meeting to Thursday February 5, 2026 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.