# AMADOR COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (ACTC) MINUTES
## March 5, 2026 – 10:06 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
April Miller, Amador Transit, General Manager

**AGENDA:**

**Motion:** It was moved by Commissioner Plasse, seconded by Commissioner Oneto, and carried to approve the agenda.

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

**PUBLIC MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA:** Chairman Crew requested a brief status update regarding the Information Technology (IT) system. Mr. Gedney reported that the ACTC IT system had recently been targeted in a cyberattack. Commissioner Staples noted that ACTC was not the only entity in the county affected by the incident. Mr. Gedney advised that the IT team has been working diligently to restore the system but has not yet been able to do so safely.

Commissioner Plasse asked whether it was normal for so many entities within a geographic area to be affected by this type of incident, noting that it appeared more than just public agencies had been impacted. Mr. Gedney replied that he was unfamiliar with the prevalence of this type of hacking event. Ms. Kleven noted that the IT team had informed her the attack was widespread and that multiple agencies in Amador and Calaveras counties had been targeted, including health care providers, government agencies, school districts, and private entities.

Mr. Gedney further commented that the agenda for the meeting had been truncated due to the IT system outage.

**#1. Caltrans Report with Caleb Brock:** Mr. Gedney noted that there will be no Caltrans report today due to conflicting meetings. They were hoping to participate by Zoom Conferencing, however due to the technical issues, they will return next month.

**CONSENT AGENDA (Items 2-7):**

**#2. Expenditures – Budget vs. Actuals:** Vice Chairman Riordan asked how the ongoing work on the Budget vs. Actuals report was progressing and whether any concerns had been identified. Mr. Gedney replied that everything appeared to be going well. He noted that some expenditures, such as the California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA) grant, would appear in the report. He also stated that Ms. Bridges and Ms. Kleven have stepped up and taken ownership of the process, along with the Finance Committee (Plasse/Riordan). Mr. Gedney did note some difficulty with the QuickBooks (QB) online W-2 processing but noted staff has been working with QB tech support to resolve the issues.

Vice Chairman Riordan asked for clarification regarding line item "Net Other Income" on page three (3) of the report, which showed a total of approximately $204,000, noting there was no amount in the budget for that account. Mr. Gedney responded that the issue could be related to how the books were initially set up with the cash and receivable accounts. Since those accounts have been removed, there is now an offset reflected. He stated staff will look into the details of that line item in the report and provide feedback at the next meeting.

He then extended appreciation to the board and stated the purpose of transitioning to the new accounting system was to provide greater clarity and that he welcomes any questions from board members. He also noted that he would like board members—particularly newer members—to become familiar with ACTC's role and operations, and that having a clear Budget vs. Actuals report was part of that effort.

**#5. FY 2026/27 State Transit Assistance (STA) – Preliminary Funding Estimate:** Commissioner Plasse commented that he wanted to call attention to a trend he had noticed regarding the STA funds, which are primarily used to fund AT, and around which AT builds its budget. He noted that the estimates appear to be consistently different from the actual amounts received, particularly in FY 2024/25. The initial estimate used for budgeting was approximately $493,000; however, only $418,000 was ultimately received. He stated that a difference of approximately $75,000 is significant, especially given that STA funds represent a considerable portion of the operating budget. Commissioner Plasse asked whether a different budgeting approach for Amador Transit may be necessary, suggesting that using a reduced percentage of the estimated amount—such as 90 percent—may be a safer approach rather than assuming the full amount will be received. Chairman Crew noted that the percentage might need to be reduced further, possibly to 80 percent, and Commissioner Plasse agreed.

Commissioner Plasse highlighted that in FY 2021/22 and FY 2022/23 the amounts received exceeded the initial estimates. However, in more recent years the actual amounts received have been well below the estimates. Chairman Crew commented that in prior years the estimates had generally been closer to the actual amounts received, but that a variance of approximately $75,000 is significant. Commissioner Plasse agreed, noting that AT is currently budgeting under the assumption that 100

percent of those funds will be received. Commissioner Plasse commented to Ms. Miller, that factoring a more conservative approach into the next year's budget may be advisable, suggesting that only 85–90 percent of the estimated STA funding be used when projecting income. Commissioners agreed with the suggestion.

Ms. Bridges provided clarification regarding the estimates, noting that the $410,000 referenced was the estimate for FY 2025/26, while the amount listed in the second paragraph of the staff report—$372,468—represents the estimate for FY 2026/27. She added that whatever percentage is ultimately used should correspond to that estimated amount.

**#6. Resolution Approving $428,996.66 in Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funding allocated to the County of Amador for the purchase of Road Paving Equipment:** Mr. Gedney stated that the approximately $428,000, reflected on the invoice, was the result of work Mr. Neu has been performing for ACTC. He explained that Mr. Kenny Neu, ACTC paving equipment acquisition consultant, was scheduled to address the board but had not yet arrived and asked to further discuss the paving projects under Item #10-ACTC Reports.

> **Motion:** It was moved by Commissioner Plasse, seconded by Vice Chairman Riordan, and carried to approve the Consent Agenda as presented.

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

**REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:**

**#8. Approve Monthly Expenses:** Ms. Bridges noted there was a revised claims list for the board to review.

> **Motion:** It was moved by Commissioner Plasse, seconded by Commissioner Staples and carried to approve the revised monthly expenses.

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

**#9. ACTC Commissioner Reports:** Commissioner Oneto stated that he was pleased to learn that Mr. Brock had received, at least, preliminary approval to initiate roadway improvements on SR 49 near Drytown. He highlighted one major issue he would like to address is the condition of the shoulders along that section of roadway. In some areas, he observed that there is nearly a one (1) foot drop-off into the adjacent ditch. Commissioner Oneto expressed concern that additional vehicle accidents could occur before the planned road improvements are completed. He acknowledged that county graders may currently be deployed elsewhere due to the inclement weather but suggested that it may be prudent to assign one (1) to pull the shoulders along that stretch of road. Mr. Gedney added that Mr. Brock had indicated he would return to provide an update at the next meeting.

Commissioner Plasse also raised a concern regarding the condition of the railroad crossings on SR 104, specifically the crossing near Rancho Seco and another located further west. He noted that the roadway at these locations has sustained significant damage, including potholes and broken asphalt on both sides of the tracks. As a result, vehicles must cross the tracks at an angle, which he described as unsettling for drivers. Commissioner Plasse acknowledged that two (2) other crossings in the area have recently been repaired; however, he stated that the crossings he identified require urgent attention from Caltrans.

Vice Chairman Riordan asked if there were any updates regarding the Amador County Unified School District site consolidation project. Mr. Gedney replied that he had not received any new information since November 2025. At that time, the school district had agreed to conduct a traffic study, with consultant support, prior to approving the consolidation project. Mr. Gedney noted that ACTC remains neutral on the project, provided it is carried out appropriately. He added that ACTC will respond accordingly once the results of the study are known, as it would with any development of that nature.

**#10. ACTC Reports - Verbal reports:**

**Paving Equipment Acquisition:** Mr. Gedney introduced Mr. Kenny Neu.

Mr. Neu stated that he had recently attended a Sutter Creek City Council meeting, and as a citizen, he participated in the pavement improvement discussion. He reported that the overall sentiment from the council was very enthusiastic regarding the proposed paving project. Mr. Neu then explained that he informed the council members that a significant amount of funding has been invested in this paving project and expressed hope that all jurisdictions would cooperate with one another moving forward. He encouraged the jurisdictions to "trust the process" as the project progresses and noted that he has been encouraged by the positive feedback he has received from the community thus far.

With regard to equipment, Mr. Neu reported that the paver was purchased, although the oil pot is still outstanding. He noted that the equipment setup is nearly complete, as much of the necessary equipment—such as rollers and trucks—is already available. Director Plasse asked whether the stripers had also been ordered, and Mr. Neu confirmed that both the white and yellow striping machines are on their way. The white line machine is ride-on equipment, which will make the application of fog lines easier. Mr. Neu emphasized that the stripers are particularly important, as many jurisdictions require fresh striping. He added that he intends to personally "cat track" the lines to ensure they are straight and properly applied.

Mr. Neu reported on crew mobilization and readiness, specifically that preparations appear to be in good order. He noted a noticeable level of enthusiasm among crew members to learn how to operate the equipment. He also stated that there is a possibility that a representative from LeeBoy may be present during the first pilot project to assist with machine operation and answer any questions the crews may have. Mr. Neu commented that the first project should ideally be located in an area that is somewhat out of the way, and after discussions with Mr. Christman, Amador County Public Works Superintendent, several roads have been identified as potential candidates. Vice Chairman Riordan asked what the process and timeline would be for identifying a location for the pilot project, or

whether that decision had not yet been made. Mr. Gedney responded that Mr. Christman has proposed approximately five (5) potential locations for the pilot project, including Brickyard Road in Ione, String Bean Alley in Amador City, and portions of French Bar Road in Jackson. He also noted that Mr. George Lee, Ione City Manager, had suggested Howard Park as another possible location. Mr. Neu stated that he would coordinate with Mr. Christman regarding the specific timing, noting that the oil pot has not yet been received. Mr. Gedney asked if Mr. Neu could provide an update at the next meeting, and Mr. Neu agreed.

Mr. Neu stated that he will visit those locations to determine which would be the most suitable for the initial project. He added that he plans to be present during the first project to demonstrate the proper method for leveling the roadway prior to asphalt application. He indicated that the team could be ready for the first project in late April or early May.

Commissioner Plasse asked whether the county has established its crew for the project. Mr. Neu replied that progress has been made in assembling the county crew; however, due to recent turnover they are still seeking one (1), and preferably two (2), additional crew members. He noted that retaining these crew members will be important to the long-term success of the project, as training and experience are critical. Frequent turnover requiring repeated training of new staff could present challenges.

Regarding engineer estimates, Mr. Neu noted that he has extensive experience preparing such estimates and would be willing to assist the local jurisdictions with this process. He explained that he already has the necessary equipment, software, and programs at his home to efficiently complete these estimates. Providing this assistance could result in cost savings for the jurisdictions, as they would not need to hire outside consultants to perform the work. Mr. Neu asked whether the board would like to reach out to the city managers to inquire about the three (3) to five (5) worst roads within each jurisdiction. By understanding the parameters of each roadway, along with daily crew costs and material costs, he explained that his programs would allow him to produce accurate cost estimates within minutes. He noted that he has not yet received any calls from the jurisdictions but stated that, if requested, he would be able to produce a cost estimate the same day.

Commissioner Plasse commented that a formal process needs to be developed to determine which jurisdictions and roadways will be selected for projects. He also questioned what ACTC's role will be after the pilot phase has concluded. Since ACTC controls the funding, he asked what the Commission's role would be going forward. Specifically, he asked whether ACTC would function as a pass-through agency for funding based on cost estimates, or if the funds would instead be distributed through a 'Call for Projects' process. Commissioner Plasse further noted that while the project has progressed significantly, including acquiring the necessary equipment, assembling a crew, and discussing how the county crew may be loaned out to assist other jurisdictions, the question of who will ultimately cover the total project costs remains unresolved. He asked whether ACTC would hire the crews on behalf of the cities and county and cover material and equipment usage costs, or whether each jurisdiction would handle those costs independently, with ACTC serving only as a funding pass-through.

Ms. Bridges explained that the concept for this paving project originated through the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) 'Call for Projects' process, which is intended to become a biennial activity conducted in coordination with the two-year funding cycle of the Regional Transportation Improvement Plan (RTIP). Through this process, the cities and county submit Project Study Report (PSR) equivalents along with cost estimates for a proposed project on the RTP Tier I list. The board then evaluates the submissions and selects projects for funding using LTF, Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP), and Regional Improvement Program (RIP) funds. Ms. Bridges provided the City of Sutter Creek as an example, noting that it previously received RSTP funding for a paving project in which ACTC funded the full cost of construction and construction management. She explained that the original intent was to follow a similar process by issuing a Call for Projects, allowing the cities to submit their priority road projects. The board would then select projects based on established criteria within the RTP such as Average Daily Traffic (ADT) and Pavement Condition Index (PCI). Once selected, the board would determine the funding source for each project and establish a construction schedule. ACTC would then fund the projects on behalf of the jurisdictions as they are completed.

She added that early discussions about forming crews included the possibility of both the cities and the county establishing their own crews. Currently, however, the county is forming the crew that would perform work on behalf of the other jurisdictions. Ms. Bridges stated that it would be appropriate for ACTC, as the funding agency, to manage the RTP Call for Projects process, select the projects for each two-year cycle, coordinate scheduling with the cities and county road crew, and fund the projects as they are completed. Vice Chairman Riordan commented that the proposed process made sense. He noted that, to his understanding, the primary change would be the revision of project cost estimates based on input from Mr. Neu, which would then be presented to the board. From his perspective, keeping the process simple would be beneficial. Mr. Neu agreed, emphasizing that the process should remain straightforward and be managed through a single source. Vice Chairman Riordan concurred and stated that even during the early pilot phase the process should be handled as though it were already fully established. This would include developing complete project estimates and presenting them to ACTC and the board to ensure all costs are accounted for. Establishing a clear process from the beginning would also allow the board to evaluate and learn from each step, including the effectiveness of the crew and the financial aspects of the projects.

Commissioner Plasse asked that the cost estimates prepared by Mr. Neu for projects proposed by the cities and county utilize the county crew costs in the project calculations. He noted that this would require ACTC and the consultant to clearly understand the figures being used in those calculations. Mr. Neu asked whether the process would involve establishing a budget for a specific city and then working backward to incorporate the crew costs into that budget. Mr. Gedney responded that this would not be the case and indicated that those details could be addressed further down the road. Vice Chairman Riordan commented that the most important objective during the pilot project phase is to identify the actual costs associated with the projects, from the initial cost estimate through project execution. He added that it would also be beneficial to conduct a debriefing after the completion of each project to evaluate the overall process and identify any areas for improvement.

Mr. Gedney clarified that the cities were not included in the initial pilot project due to the absence of a grinder, as the county projects selected for the pilot will not require grinding. He explained that the initial phase is intended to allow the crew to gain experience and develop competency with paving operations. Through this process, more accurate cost estimates can be established.

Mr. Gedney reported that Mr. Christman has currently assembled between seven (7) and nine (9) crew members, with the potential to augment that number if necessary. Once the crew completes the first project, the goal will be to develop a concrete cost estimate for a lane mile, or other identified project distance. He explained that the next step would involve a second pilot project that includes the use of a grinder. Mr. Gedney expressed hope that the cities will observe the initial pilot project, while the second pilot project would focus more directly on city roadways where grinding may be required. Commissioner Staples commented that not all city projects will require grinding. Mr. Gedney agreed, noting that this difference is the reason the two (2) pilot projects are structured separately, one (1) focusing on paving only and the other incorporating both grinding and paving. He added that both projects are intended to generate information that will help develop more accurate cost estimates for future projects.

Vice Chairman Riordan asked whether there was a timeline for developing grinding cost estimates, specifically whether that would occur within the next year or two (2). He also asked whether there had been any consideration given to purchasing a grinder. Mr. Gedney responded that, at this time, the recommendation is not to purchase a grinder and deferred to Mr. Neu for additional comment. Mr. Neu explained that he has been in the paving industry since 1980 and does not own a grinder, noting that most paving companies do not own this equipment. He stated that he typically utilizes grinding equipment between 60 and 100 days per year. The equipment is very expensive, costing approximately $1 million to $1.5 million to purchase for the machine alone, with additional costs associated with ancillary equipment and crew required to operate it. Mr. Neu reported that his research shows contracting out where a company would provide the grinder and operator to complete the necessary grinding work, while the paving crew would handle the remaining work would be more cost-effective. Noting, the maintenance and upkeep requirements are significant and that it is critical to have a qualified operator running the machine to avoid maintenance issues or problems during project execution.

Vice Chairman Riordan then asked for clarification regarding the pilot projects and the potential use of Mr. Neu to prepare engineering cost estimates. He noted that this would represent a significant change from the current process, as most jurisdictions already have engineers on staff who have been preparing estimates for years. Mr. Gedney responded that those details are not yet fully understood. He explained that the county is already proficient in developing project cost estimates and that there has been no suggestion that staff should replace that function. However, if the cities wish to utilize the county's experience or Mr. Neu's expertise in preparing estimates, they would be welcome to do so. Commissioner Plasse offered ACTC's consultant, Mr. Neu, could provide cost estimates for all projects submitted. Mr. Gedney acknowledged that Commissioner Plasse raised an important point, particularly with regard to quality assurance. He explained that previous cost estimates for projects have shown a wide disparity between jurisdictions. He further noted additional issues still need to be addressed moving forward, including bidding requirements, disclosures, and cooperative agreements.

Commissioner Staples asked what the process would be for the pilot projects and whether any jurisdictions other than Sutter Creek had been visited. Mr. Neu responded that he has not yet visited any other jurisdictions. Commissioner Staples then asked whether there had been any consideration given to how Amador City would be included in the process and Mr. Gedney replied that there has been. He reiterated that the cities are expected to participate in the pilot project that involves grinding. Commissioner Staples commented that Amador City only has one street that would require grinding. Mr. Gedney added that the cities would also be invited to observe the paving pilot project. He noted that String Bean Alley in Amador City had been identified as a potential candidate for the pilot project. Commissioner Staples responded that String Bean Alley is primarily a county road, with only approximately ten feet located within the city limits. Mr. Gedney emphasized that the pilot project is not intended to exclude the cities. Rather, the intent is to conduct the pilot in a methodical manner. The initial county projects were identified as appropriate candidates for the first pilot project as they do not require grinding.

Commissioner Staples explained Amador City's concerns and stated she wants to ensure that the city is included and that there is a clear understanding of its circumstances. Mr. Gedney responded that Mr. Neu has been serving as an ambassador for the project and that Sutter Creek was simply the first stop in those discussions. Mr. Neu confirmed that he had not been asked to attend the Sutter Creek meeting for that purpose and that his comments occurred incidentally during the meeting. He advised Commissioner Staples that she is welcome to contact him at any time and that he would be happy to visit and review any projects the city may wish to discuss. Commissioner Staples returned to the suggestion of String Bean Alley as a potential pilot project location and expressed agreement with the idea. She noted that although the roadway is a county road, it is located between two (2) cities. Mr. Gedney explained that the goal is to select roadways with low traffic volume and in extremely poor condition. Commissioner Oneto agreed, adding that the selected roadway should ideally be one that can be completely closed in order to allow the crew adequate opportunity for training.

Vice Chairman Riordan asked whether, if several potential roads have already been identified, Mr. Neu could prepare cost estimates for those locations. Once completed, he suggested the board could review the estimates and consider selecting one of the projects. Commissioner Plasse commented that the pilot projects are intended as training exercises and are not meant to function as a Call for Projects. The Vice Chairman agreed, noting that he raised the question to clarify the appropriate approach. He asked whether the board should make the selection or whether the decision would be delegated to ACTC. Mr. Gedney explained that the primary purpose of the pilot projects is to provide training for the crew while also beginning to develop reliable cost data. Commissioner Plasse asked for clarification that ACTC would be covering the cost of materials and other ancillary expenses associated with the pilot projects, aside from the equipment already purchased. Mr. Gedney confirmed that it was his understanding that ACTC would cover those costs and stated that the objective of the pilot phase is to collect data that will help develop accurate cost estimates for future projects.

Vice Chairman Riordan asked Mr. Neu whether he would still be able to prepare preliminary cost estimates, understanding that the figures may not be fully accurate due to several unknown factors. Mr. Neu confirmed that he could. The Vice Chairman noted that having an initial estimate would be helpful in establishing a baseline that could be refined as the process progresses. He suggested that if

Mr. Neu has a list of potential pilot project locations, he could visit those sites and prepare cost estimates using the current estimating process, acknowledging that some assumptions may need to be made. Once completed, the estimates could be provided to Mr. Gedney for presentation to the board for review. Mr. Gedney noted that he recalled Chairman Crew requesting that staff provide the salary structure of the proposed road crew in order to gain an overview of potential personnel costs. He explained that he has not yet completed this request because Mr. Christman is still determining the final composition of the road crew, making it difficult to calculate accurate personnel costs without knowing all of the individuals involved.

Mr. Neu commented that cost estimating for asphalt projects can vary significantly from project to project, and that a standard "per lane mile" cost is not always directly comparable. He suggested beginning with smaller projects that could be completed within one (1) day and then progressing to larger projects such as French Bar Road, where the longer distance would provide a clearer understanding of the crew's production capabilities. He noted that this would provide a more accurate representation of how many tons of asphalt the crew can place in a single day. Commissioner Plasse asked whether the county has the capability to perform small-scale grinding work, such as using a skid steer to smooth transitions between surfaces. Mr. Neu confirmed that the county does have that capability.

Commissioner Staples commented, in response to the Vice Chairman's suggestion of preparing an initial estimate prior to completion of the training phase, that such an estimate may not be feasible. She explained that the cost estimate for training projects would likely differ significantly from the estimate for a project performed by a fully trained crew. Vice Chairman Riordan replied that he understands Commissioner Staples' point; however, he believes that Mr. Neu's level of expertise would allow him to produce a reasonably accurate estimate for a project. Mr. Neu confirmed that he could prepare such an estimate. Commissioner Staples added that while material costs could be estimated, time and personnel costs would remain variables that cannot be fully accounted for during the training phase. Mr. Neu responded that estimates are inherently projections and cannot account for all variables, such as fluctuations in asphalt prices or potential changes in personnel wages. He noted that smaller projects that could be completed within one (1) day would be easier to estimate. As an example, he stated that a project such as String Bean Alley may cost approximately $125–$130 per ton, whereas a longer roadway such as French Bar Road may be closer to $110–$115 per ton.

Commissioner Plasse commented that several nearby counties have adopted Pavement Condition Smoothness goals when performing roadway repairs. He noted that when preparing cost estimates, the cost of paving alone is not the only factor considered. The appropriate treatment for a roadway is determined based on several parameters, including traffic volume and the current condition of the roadway. As a result, cost estimates may vary depending on the treatment required for a particular road. Commissioner Plasse then asked whether it would be beneficial to have the grinding contractor evaluate the roadways to determine the appropriate level of treatment. Mr. Neu responded that although those contractors may offer such services, it would not be necessary in this case. Commissioner Plasse stated that a common assumption is that most roadways would receive a two (2) inch overlay; however, the board would ultimately rely on Mr. Neu's expertise when determining the appropriate treatment. He added that the goal is to ensure that available funding stretches as far as

possible. Mr. Neu responded that he could inspect potential project locations and provide recommendations for appropriate treatments. Commissioner Plasse agreed and stated that those recommendations could then be brought back to the board for review and discussion, after which the board could determine which projects to move forward with.

Mr. Gedney noted that as the pilot project progresses, tentatively scheduled for the end of April, approximately $500,000 has already been invested in equipment. However, the costs associated with materials and personnel have not yet been addressed. He stated that it is still unclear whether the county would absorb those costs, request upfront payment, or seek reimbursement from ACTC. Mr. Gedney asked Mr. Neu whether those discussions had taken place yet and added that he could speak with Mr. Christman and the material supplier to obtain that information.

Commissioners agreed ACTC should cover the costs to complete the pilot paving projects. Vice Chairman Riordan commented that the specific figures should be reviewed once they are determined, specifically, the full cost of personnel and materials for the pilot training project. He noted that those costs could total approximately $350,000, in addition to the already known equipment investment of approximately $500,000. Vice Chairman Riordan stated that once those figures are known, the Commission can determine whether ACTC is willing to absorb the full cost or whether it may be appropriate to request cost sharing from the county, since the pilot work would occur on county roads. However, he cautioned that it would not be prudent to commit to covering the costs before the actual figures are known. Mr. Gedney agreed.

Mr. Gedney suggested Mr. Neu visit the proposed locations, develop preliminary cost estimates, and present those estimates to the board. Vice Chairman Riordan commented that having those estimates would help the Commission determine whether ACTC is willing to absorb the pilot project costs.

Mr. Gedney asked Mr. Neu to work with Mr. Christman to develop preliminary labor and material cost estimates and bring that information back to the Commission. Mr. Neu stated that he could provide information at the next board meeting regarding daily labor costs, equipment and material costs, and ancillary costs such as striping.

Commissioner Plasse asked Mr. Neu whether he had an estimate of how much training would be required for the crews, for example in terms of the number of projects or miles of roadway completed. Mr. Neu replied that it would largely depend on the crew but estimated that completing approximately three (3) to five (5) road segments would likely provide sufficient training experience. He added that the most significant factor will be the crew's willingness to learn and take pride in their work. While many potential crew members have some paving experience, the program represents a new approach and will require time for the crew to become fully proficient. Direction was given to have Mr. Neu return at the next meeting with preliminary cost estimates.

**#11. Future Agenda Items:**

- Paving Pilot Project - cost estimate update

**#12. ADJOURNMENT:** At 11:15 a.m. the Chairman Crew adjourned the regular meeting to Thursday April 2, 2026 at 9:00 a.m. at 117 Valley View Way, Sutter Creek, CA 95685.

Patrick Crew, Chairman
Amador County Transportation Commission

ATTEST:

Caitlin Kleven, Recording Clerk

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