AMADOR COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (ACTC) MINUTES
April 2, 2026 – 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

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

Caltrans Report with Caleb Brock:

General Announcements:

1. In March 2026 the California Transportation Commission (CTC) allocated $848 million to advance mass transit systems, expanded bicycle and pedestrian options and improved freight mobility. Three (3) projects within District 10 have moved forward with that funding allocation.
    1. Phase 1-B San Joaquin Council of Governments (COG) State Route (SR) 99-120 Connector Project
    2. Merced County, SR 140-165 Mobility Improvement Project
    3. San Joaquin County, SR 88 in Lockeford Pavement Anchor Project
2. The Division of Local Assistance, Office of Environmental Compliance and Outreach will be reintroducing the monthly virtual office hour. This is open to all agencies, tribes and their partners. During those sessions, the environmental specialists will be available to answer general questions related to the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) and

compliance with Local Assistance projects. The sessions will be held on the first Wednesday of each month.

3. Caltrans submitted the FY 2026/27 draft Overall Work Program (OWP) comment letter to ACTC.

Funding opportunity:

- United States Department of Transportation (US DOT) released a 'Call for Applications' for fiscal year (FY) 2026 All Stations Accessibility Program. The funding, $686 million, is competitively available for activities like planning, capital projects, upgrading the accessibility of legacy transportation systems for people with disabilities. The deadline for applications is May 1, 2026.

Traffic Controls:

- On April 3, 2026 from 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. traffic controls will be in effect on SR 26 in the Red Corral area for tree work.
- From April 1, 2026 -April 3, 2026 from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. traffic controls will be in effect on SR 124, east of Willow Creek Road, for tree work.

Follow up:

- A coordination meeting between Mr. Brock's team and ACTC recently took place to discuss working holistically together with planning, coordination, and how his team can better understand the issues and opportunities within Amador County.
- A Planning Grant workshop will be held at the ACTC Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting on June 10th.
- Regarding the safety investigation report on SR 49 in Drytown, staff is waiting to hear back from headquarters regarding the potential shoulder width, and the report is expected to be finalized soon. The Project Initiation Document (PID) phase is anticipated to start by the end of April/beginning of May.

Commissioner Plasse stated two (2) railroad crossings on SR 104 between Ione and Galt, near Rancho Seco have very poor pavement conditions with significant potholes. Mr. Brock stated he was unsure of the jurisdiction between Caltrans and the railroad company. However, he would advise the railroad company of the situation and coordinate with them for repairs.

CONSENT AGENDA (Items 1-6):

#3. Expenditures Budget vs Actuals: Commissioner Plasse asked for clarification regarding the Total Expenses" line item on page 3 showing over budget. He noted it is shown in the totals section, but he cannot find the source in the individual line items. Mr. Gedney stated that the discrepancy is likely due to allocations to Amador Transit (AT) which is shown in line item #52110 – Transit Operations Allocation. Mr. Gedney noted that improvements to the financial system are still ongoing and continued feedback is helpful.

Vice Chairman Riordan followed up with a request made at the last meeting for more information regarding line item #52900. Mr. Gedney clarified that staff updated the report to show that line item as Interest Income.

#5. Resolution approving FY 2025/26 Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) Exchange Agreement: Commissioner Plasse inquired about the source of the funding exchange. Mr. Gedney stated that the funds are a portion of a Federal Block Grant that goes to the states for disbursement. The funding is flexible but does follow the AB 1012 "use it or lose it" legislation in which if not obligated within three (3) years the funds are subject to reprogramming.

#6. Caltrans Correspondence – ACTC FY 2026/27 Overall Work Program Comments: Vice Chairman Riordan inquired if ACTC was content with the comments made by Caltrans in the OWP draft letter. Mr. Gedney replied that ACTC was satisfied with the comments and notes a good rapport with Caltrans regarding the OWP.

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

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

REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:

#7. ACTC Transit Service Improvement Study – Software Technology Options: Ms. Bridges reviewed her staff report and introduced representatives from Cambridge Systematics (CS), Inc.

Commissioner Plasse raised questions regarding fare payment options, noting that many AT riders may be less comfortable with technology. Ms. Bridges described a preloaded smart card option for use upon boarding. Commissioner Staples noted that type of payment could reduce credit card processing fees. Commissioner Plasse also referenced peer agency information indicating fare systems may charge 5–10% and requested additional input. Mr. Prashanth Venkataram clarified that the processing fees referenced in the presentation apply to payment technology, not the TripSpark software. He noted that peer agency research did not identify specific fee amounts for electronic fare systems, but many agencies offer contactless payment options as well as accepting credit and debit cards. While this approach has been implemented by another rural agencies, additional research would be needed to determine potential costs for AT.

Vice Chairman Riordan asked whether further analysis of contactless payment options would be conducted. Ms. Yeshasvi Mahadev stated that the information presented was for reference only and that any implementation would require a competitive procurement process, with no specific recommendations being made at this time. Mr. Gedney reminded the board that this was brought up due to their specific request for additional information regarding the TripSpark software, and whether moving forward with this software's upgrades would be the consultant's recommendation. Vice Chairman Riordan acknowledged that the software question had been addressed but raised additional considerations. Mr. Gedney explained that the item has both short- and long-term components, including addressing current operational needs and aspects of a future CalSTA funding application. He noted that options such as Token Transit and other ridership technology improvements remain under consideration but have not been fully evaluated. He also advised the board to consider study time constraints when determining the level of effort to dedicate to ridership technology versus infrastructure and vehicle improvements.

Vice Chairman Riordan sought clarification that Mr. Gedney was recommending the board not expand the current scope due to timing and funding constraints but instead consider additional technologies as part of a future CalSTA application. Mr. Gedney confirmed and noted the focus should shift to broader items such as Zero Emission Vehicles (ZEV) and infrastructure. Commissioner Staples commented that the study found limited impact of technology on ridership, noting that while it may not be a strong short-term investment, potential long-term benefits should still be considered.
Commissioner Plasse asked whether TripSpark offers similar onboard payment capabilities. Ms. April Miller-Amador Transit General Manager stated that while not included in AT's current package, such options are available, though additional review would be needed. Vice Chairman Riordan asked

whether adopting TripSpark would limit adding future technology options, and Ms. Miller confirmed it would not.

Vice Chairman Riordan asked whether peer agency interviews focused solely on software technology or also included management structures. Mr. Venkataram stated that while some management questions were asked, they were not the primary focus, and insufficient data has been gathered for presentation at this time. Vice Chairman Riordan emphasized the importance of the topic, and Ms. Mahadev confirmed it would be addressed following further research.

Ms. Bridges stated the recommendation for this item is to support the AT Board of Directors moving forward with TripSpark software upgrade and noted this item will need to be discussed by the AT board for consideration and approval.

#8. ACTC FY 2026/27 Unmet Needs Report and Ongoing Research: Ms. Bridges reviewed her staff report. Commissioner Plasse recommended that analysis of fixed routes incorporate data from AT Performance Reports, noting the fixed routes show higher costs across all metrics compared to DAR, as well as a lower farebox recovery ratio. Ms. Bridges concurred, adding that the Short-Range Transit Development Plan (SRTDP) reached similar conclusions. Mr. Gedney noted the only cost-saving recommendation from the SRTDP was implementation of a smartphone application for on-demand DAR, along with public DAR service featuring a graduated fare structure based on pickup location and service type.

Commissioner Staples noted that the challenges being discussed are consistent across rural transit agencies and not unique to the region. Commissioner Plasse added that the Transportation Development Act (TDA) allows a lower farebox recovery ratio for rural agencies compared to urban systems. Mr. Gedney commented that the prior legislative relief suspending farebox ratio penalties will expire in the new fiscal year.

> **Motion:** It was moved by Commissioner Plasse, seconded by Commissioner Staples, and unanimously carried to approve the FY 2026/27 Unmet Transit Needs Report by resolution and direct staff to continue in-house research.

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

#9. ACTC Road Paving Pilot Project Update: Mr. Gedney reviewed his staff report and noted that research is ongoing, but no material or labor cost estimates were made available for presentation at this time. He also addressed prior questions regarding which agency would take the lead on the pilot project material and labor costs. While ACTC has funding available to cover those costs, the pilot's primary purpose is to establish a per-lane-mile cost template that can be used by all jurisdictions.

Vice Chairman Riordan stated that potential challenges still need to be addressed, including whether the use of public funds would require projects to be bid and which agency would assume liability. Chairman Crew asked whether development of definitive project cost estimates would require future projects to be bid, and whether ACTC would serve as a competitive bidder or as a cost benchmark. The board discussed the use of existing county employees and whether the work would fall within normal job duties or be subject to bidding requirements. Mr. Gedney responded that use of state or federal funds would trigger bidding requirements, though cooperative agreements between jurisdictions may

help mitigate that process. He added that ACTC has worked with legal counsel since the outset of the project and would continue to do so regarding liability matters.

Discussion continued regarding material and labor cost estimates, including current trucking estimates of approximately $10,000 per day. Mr. Gedney commented project costs remain well within available ACTC funding. He added that approximately $500,000 has been spent to date on equipment costs. Commissioner Plasse suggested ACTC could fund materials while the county provides trained employees but questioned whether training costs for county and city staff would be paid by ACTC or absorbed by each jurisdiction. Mr. Gedney stated long-term personnel cost issues are still under review. For the pilot projects, he noted ACTC funding would require full disclosure of county costs and more detailed documentation, including employee cost data already developed by the county but not yet provided to ACTC. Mr. Gedney continued that while he trusts the county to provide accurate information, supporting documentation is necessary for verification. Vice Chairman Riordan stated ACTC should not have to pay labor costs solely to obtain documentation, particularly after already spending approximately $500,000 on equipment. Mr. Gedney noted that, based on prior experience tracking discretionary disbursements, ACTC revised its policy to require project proposals and supporting records for audit purposes. Vice Chairman Riordan suggested the county provide full documentation so ACTC could fund project costs excluding labor, allowing accurate cost data and transparency for all jurisdictions.

Mr. Kenny Neu, paving expertise consultant, joined the meeting and presented two (2) cost estimates to the board and the public, noting he developed the quotes with assistance from Mr. Jeff Christman-Amador County Public Works Superintendent. He reviewed the estimates and highlighted the material and trucking costs may increase due to fluctuations in asphalt and fuel prices, with final costs determined at the time of completion for each project.

Commissioner Plasse asked whether a standard cost per mile could be derived for planning purposes. Mr. Neu responded that costs would vary by project based on material tonnage, road specifications, and other factors. He cited French Bar Road as an example, estimated at approximately $167,000, noting it was significantly lower than prior per-mile estimates. He added that a 10% contingency could be included to account for cost variability.

Mr. Gedney asked whether the initial plan remained, which included completing five (5) pilot projects. Mr. Neu stated he was unsure of all the original pilot locations and that the roads included in his estimates were provided by Mr. Jeff Christman, and all within county jurisdiction. The board continued discussing project locations and travel distances.

Mr. Neu also reported that he had contacted Anrak Corporation, the grinding company referenced at the prior meeting, and would meet with them the following week to review some of their completed projects. He added the company could attend next month's meeting to explain its services and answer board questions regarding grinding.

Vice Chairman Riordan expressed concern regarding inclusion of Raggio Road, as it had not been previously discussed as a potential site. Chairman Crew noted several factors supported its selection, including traffic volume and roadway size. Mr. Gedney acknowledged that Raggio Road had been added at the last minute and emphasized the importance of determining funding responsibility for the pilot project. Commissioner Oneto noted his objection to Raggio Road. He agreed the road was in poor condition but questioned whether the limited residential and pedestrian use warranted use of pilot funds, suggesting another road may provide greater benefit. Commissioner Staples stated pilot roads should be selected based on their value as training opportunities for an inexperienced crew rather

than broader community benefit. Mr. Neu agreed, stating Raggio Road's poor condition and low traffic volume made it a strong pilot candidate.

Commissioner Plasse stated there are currently two (2) pilot projects identified and, to his understanding, an additional two (2) to three (3) projects would likely be needed for adequate crew training. Mr. Gedney stated there was insufficient time to prepare additional estimates before month's end, but Mr. Neu could return next month with more estimates for the board to select the remaining projects. He added that the current estimates were sufficient to authorize $180,000 for the two (2) pilot locations under consideration. Commissioner Staples suggested Mr. Neu inspect the remaining candidate roads (Stringbean Alley, Brickyard Road, and Barney Road) and recommend which would provide the best training opportunities, along with cost estimates, for future board consideration. Chairman Crew stated the board should defer to Mr. Neu's expertise in evaluating the pilot locations.

Commissioner Plasse asked whether the "Equipment Owned" line item on page two (2) of the estimates, was equivalent to ACTC paying rent on equipment it had already purchased. Mr. Neu stated the figure was included to show a complete future cost model and was not necessarily specific to the pilot. Vice Chairman Riordan objected to charging equipment costs for the pilot, noting ACTC had already purchased the equipment. He stated such charges may be appropriate for future projects, but not for the pilot while also paying for crew labor. Mr. Gedney added that, based on comments from Mr. Christman, the county would depreciate the equipment, and those costs should likely be excluded.

Mr. Gedney recommended ACTC fund labor for the pilot, as reimbursement would require the county to submit documentation showing actual labor costs rather than estimates, providing useful future data. Commissioner Staples added this would also incentivize county participation and crew training. Mr. Neu stated the categories included in the cost estimates could be added or removed depending on the level of detail requested by the board. Chairman Crew directed that the "Equipment Owned" line item be removed and stated ACTC should fund labor for the first two (2) pilot projects while crews remain in the initial training phase.

> **Motion:** It was moved by Commissioner Staples, seconded by Commissioner Bottomley and carried to approve French Bar Road and Raggio Road as the first two (2) public roads of the paving project and completely funding the project except the cost estimate line item "Equipment Owned."

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

Ms. Bridges noted the staff report included a recommendation to reimburse the county for the purchase of the striping equipment.

> **Motion:** It was moved by Commissioner Staples, seconded by Commissioner Oneto, and unanimously carried to approve reimbursing Amador County in the amount of $57,801.95 for the purchase of the pavement striping equipment.

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

#10. Local Jurisdiction Speed Surveys: Mr. Gedney reviewed the staff report. Commissioner Plasse stated that jurisdictions may enforce speed limits without a speed survey but cannot use radar enforcement without one. He added that citations issued by radar may be challenged if no speed survey has been completed for that roadway segment.

Commissioners inquired about ACTC funding participation in the effort. Mr. Gedney stated the contribution would be nominal, approximately $4,000 to $5,000. He noted the effort would be a partnership with local jurisdictions, with ACTC funding consultant support and jurisdictions responsible for data collection. Mr. Gedney stated the board could direct ACTC to conduct further research regarding shared responsibility. The board then discussed funding thresholds and consultant costs.

Motion: It was moved by Vice Chairman Riordan, seconded by Commissioner Oneto, and unanimously carried to approve supporting the speed survey efforts in Amador City and Sutter Creek in an amount not to exceed $10,000.

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

#11. Approve Monthly Expenses:

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

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

#12. ACTC Commissioner Reports: Commissioner Plasse expressed appreciation to Mr. Neu for all the work performed regarding the paving project.

#13. ACTC Reports: None

#14. Future Agenda Items:

- 2nd draft of the OWP report
- Paving equipment acquisition project – rough draft of a cooperative agreement

#15. ADJOURNMENT: At 11:03 a.m. the Chairman Crew adjourned the regular meeting to Thursday May 7, 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.