AMADOR COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (ACTC) MINUTES
May 7 , 2026 – 9:53 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
April Miller, Amador Transit, General Manager
Eric Chin, Caltrans District 10 Engineering Office Chief

Pledge of Allegiance

AGENDA:

Motion: It was moved by Vice Chairman Riordan, 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 Eric Chin:

General Announcements:

1. The fiscal year (FY) 2025/2026 Rural Planning Assistance Quarter three (3) Request for Reimbursement invoice has been sent for payment.

Funding opportunity:

- Call for Application: United States Department of Transportation (US DOT) Safe Streets and Roads for All Grant Program (SS4A). This is a competitive grant is awarded to support planning, infrastructure, behavioral and operational initiative to prevent fatalities and serious injuries on roads for all roadway users. This includes pedestrian, bicycle, public transportation and commercial vehicle operators. Eligible applicants include Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), political subdivisions of a state or territory (i.e. counties, cities, towns, etc.) and

Federally recognized Tribal Governments. The total funding available is approximately $993 million and the deadline for applications is May 26, 2026.

- Active Transportation Program (ATP): Encourages use of active modes of transportation like biking and walking. Eligible applicants include local, regional and state agencies, such as transit agencies, public school districts, Tribal Governments and private/nonprofit organizations. There is $123 million in funding available and the deadline for applications is June 22, 2026.

Traffic Controls:

- State Route (SR) 49/88 at Vogan Toll Road will have one (1) way traffic control on May 7, 2026 from 8:00 p.m. to 5:00 a.m.

Commissioner Oneto inquired if the ATP grant was open statewide and Mr. Chin confirmed that it was.

Commissioner Plasse asked if the SS4A grant could be combined with an ATP grant. Mr. Chin replied that one (1) of the grants is federal and one (1) is state. He commented that he is unsure if it is possible but could take that back for review.

CONSENT AGENDA (Items 1-7):

#5. Resolution Approving the 2026 Employee Reorganization and Salary Schedule: Commissioner Plasse asked if the employee reorganization and salary schedule were reviewed and approved by the Personnel Committee, Chairman Crew and Commissioner Staples. Chairman Crew confirmed that they were.

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

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

REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:

#8. ACTC FY 2026/27 Overall Work Program (OWP) & Budget Final Draft with Caltrans Comments: Ms. Bridges reviewed her staff report.

Motion: It was moved by Commissioner Plasse, seconded by Commissioner Staples, and unanimously carried to approve, by resolution, the final draft FY 2026/27 OWP and budget pursuant to Caltrans review letter.

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

#9. Assembly Bill 130 Draft Guidance Statewide Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Mitigation Bank Program: Mr. Gedney reviewed his staff report and noted that the topic of the VMT Bank is complex, but that summary information had been included in the agenda item to provide additional clarity. He then provided a draft comment letter for review and explained the concerns related to the implications of the proposed policies on rural communities. He also highlighted concerns regarding the proposed mitigation fee "bank," wherein fees collected from local development projects could potentially be redirected for use in urban areas located more than 100 miles away. Commissioners directed staff to submit the comment letter.

#10-A. ACTC Road Paving Pilot Project: Mr. Gedney introduced Mr. Kenny Neu who reviewed the results of the first pilot paving project on Raggio Rd. Mr. Neu then introduced Mr. Tom Schmidt and Ms. Jillian Herrera from Anrak Corporation to provide an overview of pavement grinding processes, which includes full depth and micro grinding. He noted that grinding work would likely become necessary later in the pilot paving project when work progresses into city streets. Mr. Neu also stated that Anrak is well known in the region and has extensive experience working with agencies such as El Dorado County, Placer County, Nevada County, and Sacramento County.

Ms. Herrera introduced herself and distributed a company brochure outlining services offered by Anrak Corporation, which was made available to the board and public. Mr. Schmidt provided a brief history of the company and reviewed different grinding methods, asphalt treatments, typical useful life spans, and use in conjunction with chip sealing. He also discussed the cost effectiveness of micro milled asphalt, noting it is commonly used by neighboring counties. Commissioner Plasse asked if micro grindings, once applied and oiled, could be used as an "asphalt in place" treatment. Mr. Neu confirmed, explaining the material already contains oil from the original asphalt and, when combined with fresh oil, binds into an effective treatment with an estimated five (5) year warranty. Mr. Schmidt added that micro grinding can also serve as a cost-effective paving patch and strong base for future chip sealing.

Commissioner Oneto asked whether completing patch paving one (1) year in advance would allow time for the patches to settle. Mr. Schmidt replied that would not be necessary, explaining that the patch paving and chip seal process creates a sealed roadway surface. He noted the key factor is ensuring proper compaction during patching, which minimizes roadway deflection after chip sealing and results in a smoother roadway.

Vice Chairman Riordan asked how roads would be determined as suitable for this type of treatment. Mr. Schmidt stated he was unfamiliar with the road selection process, but suggested consulting with Ashley Johnson from El Dorado County and Mr. Neu regarding appropriate project locations. He also noted that Ms. Johnson is very knowledgeable about potential grant funding opportunities for these types of projects.

Commissioners discussed roadway smoothness standards used by some counties, challenges associated with roads in poor condition, and how to prioritize projects as roadway conditions change over time. Mr. Neu stated he could inspect roads under consideration and recommend appropriate treatment options. Mr. Schmidt added that Anrak Corporation utilizes a mobile lidar system to scan roadways. He also presented a video showcasing completed projects, roadway technologies, and grinding techniques used to improve roadway smoothness. Commissioners then discussed potential project locations throughout the county. Commissioner Oneto suggested Lower Ridge Road, specifically the section from Climax Road to the intersection of SR 104 and SR 49. While Commissioner Plasse identified a section of Buena Vista Road between SR 88 and SR 124, noting this project is currently included in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP).

Vice Chairman Riordan asked who would be responsible for reviewing projects and ensuring consistent roadway smoothness standards throughout the county. Mr. Schmidt referenced El Dorado County as an example, noting the county maintains very stringent roadway smoothness standards and utilizes trained county staff to inspect projects. He stated a similar approach could be implemented in Amador County, with Mr. Neu providing staff training to conduct inspections and ensure quality workmanship.

Commissioner Oneto asked about the cost difference between standard grinding and micro grinding. Mr. Schmidt stated equipment costs have increased significantly, noting replacement costs for a micro

grinding drum rose from approximately $1,400 to $14,000. Commissioner Plasse asked what rental costs currently are. Mr. Schmidt explained that micro grinders are generally contracted by the job rather than rented by the day, with projects typically bid by the foot and prices locked in once accepted. He noted costs have increased from approximately $5,800 per day to $8,800 per day. Mr. Schmidt also estimated his crew can grind approximately 12,000 square feet (sq. ft.) or 1,000 linear feet per hour.

Vice Chairman Riordan asked for clarification on the process for utilizing micro grinding on roadway projects. Using an example, he asked if Mr. Neu would first identify a potential roadway candidate, followed by Mr. Schmidt inspecting the roadway and providing a fixed cost estimate. Mr. Schmidt confirmed that would be the process. Mr. Neu added that he would be touring several completed Anrak Corporation projects with Ms. Herrera to gather additional information to bring back to the board. Mr. Schmidt also noted that unmanned grinding machines are available for lease in various sizes, as well as manned machine rentals. Commissioners discussed the advantages and disadvantages of renting versus owning grinding equipment, including associated costs and operational challenges. Commissioner Oneto again suggested Lower Ridge Road, from Climax Road to the intersection of SR 49 and SR 104 in Sutter Creek, as a potential grinding project and noted there may be an opportunity to partner with the City of Sutter Creek on the effort.

Mr. Neu stated the original goal of the pilot paving project was to improve roadway conditions throughout the county in a cost-effective manner by utilizing his experience and expertise. Commissioner Plasse agreed, noting that with approximately 700–800 miles of roadway in the county, outsourcing repairs at roughly $700,000 per lane mile is not financially feasible. He suggested establishing an annual paving budget, then selecting projects submitted by local jurisdictions through a "Call for Projects" process. Under that approach, Mr. Neu would inspect proposed roadways, prepare cost estimates, and present recommendations to the board for project selection and scheduling. Mr. Neu agreed, stating the process would provide all jurisdictions an equitable opportunity to participate.

Mr. Schmidt asked whether all local jurisdictions maintain public works departments, and the board responded no. He reiterated local public works directors should connect with Ms. Johnson from El Dorado County, noting she has helped several counties identify funding opportunities for roadway projects. Commissioner Plasse replied that grant writing efforts would likely fall under the responsibility of this Commission, and it may make more sense for the Commission to coordinate with her directly rather than having six (6) separate agencies contact her individually.

Mr. Gedney asked Mr. Schmidt to revisit the process for selecting roadway treatments and the associated operational requirements. Commissioner Plasse clarified that the question related to staffing needs during grinding and finish work, including chip sealing, and Mr. Gedney confirmed. Mr. Neu and Mr. Schmidt then reviewed the grinding process, roadway cleanup, rubberized chip seal application, and common oil application techniques used during treatment. Mr. Schmidt also discussed the methods used to ensure accurate oil application rates. Commissioner Plasse asked whether the oil application work would be completed by county crews, and Mr. Neu responded that portion would be outsourced rather than performed in-house. Vice Chairman Riordan asked whether county crews would still be involved in the oil and chip seal process. Mr. Neu stated county crews would participate in various aspects of the projects to differing degrees. Vice Chairman Riordan then asked if fixed cost estimates would include county labor costs in addition to grinding and paving expenses, and Mr. Neu confirmed they would.

Commissioner Oneto asked for clarification that the oil would first be applied to the roadway, followed by the chip seal application at a later date. Mr. Neu confirmed, explaining the oil must cure before the

chip seal is applied. Additional discussion was held regarding chip seal application timing, as well as quality control verification and staff training processes.

Discussion then turned to proper roadway preparation prior to chip sealing. Mr. Neu and Mr. Schmidt emphasized the importance of roadway preparation to help prevent issues such as deterioration from tree sap and water intrusion. They noted that proper mitigation measures improve roadway longevity.

Commissioner Plasse asked whether rejected asphalt roofing shingle granules could potentially be used as the sand base material for chip sealing roadways, referencing Specialty Granules LLC located in Ione, as a possible local source. Ms. Herrera stated she could not speak directly on the topic, but noted potential concerns regarding material consistency, particularly if the granules were considered "rejects." She explained factors such as oil content used in shingle manufacturing could affect the final product. Commissioner Plasse clarified the granules he referenced would be rejected prior to application onto roofing shingles, with common rejection reasons being color variation or sizing inconsistencies. He stated the material may be worth exploring as a local and cost-effective option, and commissioners agreed.

Chairman Crew asked whether county crews, while not yet proficient in micro grinding work, could realistically be prepared by the end of summer. Mr. Neu stated additional work on the pilot projects would still be necessary, but he was confident that goal was achievable. Chairman Crew then asked whether the crews could potentially complete a project such as Ridge Road this year. Mr. Neu responded that once fully trained, he would have no hesitation utilizing county crews on a project of that nature. Commissioner Oneto asked if Mr. Schmidt and Ms. Herrera would be willing to give this same information presentation to the Board of Supervisors meeting and invite all the city representatives as well. Ms. Herrera replied they would be happy to.

Mr. Neu asked the board whether all four (4) proposed pilot paving projects had been approved, noting he was only aware of approval for two (2) of them. Commissioner Plasse responded approval of the remaining projects was included within the current agenda item.

Mr. Gedney then reviewed his staff report.

> **Motion:** It was moved by Vice Chairman Riordan, seconded by Commissioner Oneto, and unanimously carried to approve:
>
> A: Reimbursement to the county for the purchase of an oil spray bar in the amount of $9,625.01,
> B: Reimbursement to the county for the costs of four (4) paving pilot projects totaling $653,681, and
> C: Video Documentary sole source contract with Mr. Riley Dermanuelian, cost not to exceed $3,800.

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

#10-B. Cooperative Agreements: Mr. Gedney reviewed his staff report. He noted that the cooperative agreements included are examples used by other counties and cities for similar collaborative projects, and the format could serve as a template following completion of the pilot projects. As an example,

he referenced a potential partnership between the county and the Sutter Creek to pave Lower Ridge Road that Commissioner Oneto had previously mentioned.

Tom Dubois, City Manager for the Sutter Creek, raised concerns regarding project inspections, noting that responsibility for inspections had not been addressed in the example cooperative agreement. He referenced a recent Amador Water Agency (AWA) project in Sutter Creek where paving work was substandard, resulting in the potential need to terminate the contractor and hire another to complete the work. Mr. Dubois asked how a similar situation would be handled under a cooperative agreement.

Vice Chairman Riordan commented that the issue appeared to have two (2) components: determining how inspections would be handled and obtaining legal review to incorporate protections for failed projects within the cooperative agreement. He noted the current pilot project had not progressed to that stage yet but felt those steps would address the concerns raised by Mr. Dubois. Mr. Neu stated there are several options for inspections, including hiring private companies to perform services such as asphalt compaction inspections. He added that some counties and cities have in-house inspectors, though he was unsure whether Amador County currently does. Commissioner Plasse noted that a county inspector was present during the Raggio Road project. He also stated the original intent of the pilot projects was to utilize in-house staff at a lower cost point, as the roads involved did not need to meet "freeway" smoothness standards and would therefore use different specifications. Mr. Neu agreed, noting that if Caltrans specifications were applied, most projects would require full depth reclamation.

Commissioner Plasse asked how quality standards and inspections would ultimately be addressed, including whether each jurisdiction would need to establish its own specifications and utilize separate engineering firms for inspections. Commissioner Oneto commented that could become a very costly undertaking. Mr. Neu stated that approximately 90% of the jobs his company performs are not inspected, noting the process ultimately comes down to integrity and trust in the work being performed correctly.

Vice Chairman Riordan stated he wants the city managers to be comfortable enough with the process to fully participate, particularly regarding liability management. However, he also noted he does not want to overburden the process by spending funds on measures that may not ultimately be necessary. Commissioner Plasse asked whether, under cooperative agreements between the county and cities, the county would want to assume liability for inspections.

Discussion continued regarding the potential for delays to the pilot project due to administrative requirements and red tape. Mr. Gedney stated additional information could be brought back to the board next month. Chairman Crew asked Mr. Dubois whether local city managers still meet monthly, and Mr. Dubois responded those meetings have not occurred for some time. Chairman Crew noted that forum would be an appropriate venue to discuss the topic and gauge consensus among the jurisdictions. Commissioner Oneto reiterated that the purpose of the project is to improve roadway conditions. While the work may not be perfect, it would still provide a serviceable improvement over current conditions. He stated it is the responsibility of the crews to perform the work properly and expressed concern that hiring inspectors would increase costs without substantially changing the outcome. Mr. Neu agreed, stating the goal is to complete quality work in the most cost-effective manner possible.

Commissioner Staples asked for clarification regarding the paving depth proposed for the pilot projects, noting to her knowledge, two (2) inches is typically used. Commissioner Plasse agreed but stated the required depth would ultimately depend on the needs of each individual project.

Commissioner Staples commented that, regarding Mr. Dubois' concerns about the recent AWA project in Sutter Creek, the pilot projects being undertaken by the Commission are substantially different in nature. Mr. Neu agreed and reiterated that each project is unique and will require varying amounts of material and time.

Commissioner Bottomley commented that it may be prudent to determine inspection requirements based on the characteristics of each roadway. She noted that lower-speed roads with limited traffic may not require inspections, while roads with higher traffic volumes or complicating factors such as water intrusion could benefit from additional oversight. Vice Chairman Riordan suggested that specifications could be established prior to each project and validated throughout each stage of the work to ensure agreed-upon standards are being met. Mr. Neu stated that while he does not consider himself the ultimate expert in the field, he would be present throughout each stage of the pilot projects to help ensure standards are met. He also noted he could train a member of the county crew to perform inspections.

Vice Chairman Riordan commented that maximizing the benefit of the endeavor will require participation from all jurisdictions, noting that indifference toward the effort would be detrimental. He stated there is no need to overspend on unnecessary measures or involve legal teams prematurely but emphasized the importance of establishing appropriate checks and balances so jurisdictions feel comfortable participating in the projects. He suggested establishing project standards at the outset of each project, so all parties are in agreement. Vice Chairman Riordan further noted that if the city managers can collaboratively review the cooperative agreements and agree upon the project parameters, it would help ensure the projects proceed efficiently and avoid unnecessary delays or complications.

Commissioner Oneto expressed trepidation regarding the Vice Chairman's suggestions, noting that many county roads are in poor condition and do not require workmanship meeting Caltrans specifications. He questioned whether, if work on a county or city road was later deemed insufficient, would liability then extend to ACTC, the county, or the cities involved. Commissioner Oneto stated the project is intended to be a cooperative partnership among the jurisdictions and cautioned that imposing overly stringent specifications and metrics could hinder the effort. Commissioner Plasse stated he also had concerns regarding both current and future liability, particularly the potential exposure of crews to standards that could later be interpreted differently by future decision makers. He reiterated that the purpose of the project is not to create pristine roadways, but to improve existing conditions. Commissioner Plasse further noted that jurisdictions always retain the option to bid projects out if they are uncomfortable participating under the cooperative agreement. Commissioner Oneto added that training competent personnel to perform adequate work on imperfect roads should result in the best practical outcome given the circumstances. Mr. Neu agreed, stating that objective reflects the overall purpose of the project.

Commissioner Plasse asked how this discussion could be worked into the cooperative agreements. Mr. Gedney replied there are more conversations needing to be had and a decision does not have to be made immediately. He acknowledged that there is much excitement about the project but that this issue may be getting ahead of itself. Additionally, the presentation by the grinding company may have triggered the notion that this is the next step. However, the issue of grinding and cooperative agreements is still some time off. There is ample time to have discussions with the city representatives and select projects.

#11. Approve Monthly Expenses:

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

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

#12. ACTC Commissioner Reports: Chairman Crew noted that a local citizen brought to his attention that the Pine Grove Corridor Improvement Project, currently under construction, includes signage advising motorists to slow to 45 mph within the construction zone, despite the posted speed limit through Pine Grove being 35 mph.

Commissioner Plasse commented that his observations of the paving pilot project were very positive, noting high crew morale, a strong willingness to learn, and evident pride in their workmanship. Vice Chairman Riordan concurred and expressed enthusiasm for the project continuing. Commissioner Bottomley added that she saw positive social media posts regarding the project. Noting the community appeared enthusiastic and that many residents were commenting with requests for their own roads to be paved.

#13. ACTC Reports: Mr. Gedney provided an update regarding the hacking incident from earlier this year, noting that remediation costs were lower than anticipated and were included in the monthly expenses. Based on information from the remediation company, the hackers were identified and were only able to access the ACTC system for approximately eight (8) seconds. Although an attempt was made to download information, no sensitive or personal data was compromised.

#14. Future Agenda Items:

- Information on cooperative agreements and liability considerations for the pilot paving project, specifically as they relate to the cities.
- Information from discussion with Ashley Johnson from El Dorado County

#15. ADJOURNMENT: At 11:50 a.m. the Chairman Crew adjourned the regular meeting to Thursday June 4, 2026 at 9:00 a.m. at 117 Valley View Way, Sutter Creek, CA 95685.

Dan Riordan, Vice Chairman
Amador County Transportation Commission

ATTEST:

Caitlin Kleven, Recording Clerk

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