AMADOR COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (ACTC) MINUTES
June 4, 2026 – 10:02 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:
Dan Epperson – Board of Supervisors (Alternate for Patrick Crew)
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 Commissioner Plasse, seconded by Commissioner Staples, and unanimously carried to approve the agenda as presented.

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

PUBLIC MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA: None

Caltrans Report with Eric Chin:

General Announcements:

- Caltrans District 10 projects:
  - $1.3 million to support the costs for the State Route (SR) 4 Jack Tone Road intersection improvement project in San Joaquin County. The funding will be used for planning and installation of a roundabout intersection to improve traffic safety and reduce fatal collisions along the SR 4 corridor. The project is estimated to start in 2029.
  - $6.484 million in support of SR 59 intersection control project in Merced County. The funding will be used to construct a single lane roundabout at the intersection of SR 59 and Gerard Avenue to reduce delays and improve traffic safety during peak commute hours.

  - $6.292 million to support Calaveras County's SR 4 Wagon Trail Project between Stallion Way and Stockton Road. The project will realign and reconstruct approximately six (6) miles of roadway on SR 4 with 12-foot width lanes and 8-foot paved shoulders to enhance safety, improve sight distance, smoother curves and better ride quality for motorists.
  - $2.393 million to support Merced County Association of Government's Santa Fe Drive Pavement Rehabilitation Project. The project will rehabilitate approximately 25 miles of deteriorating roadway between the City of Merced and Atwater in Merced County.
- Caltrans Planning Grant workshop will be held at the June 10th Amador County Transportation Commission Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting. Silvia Dayak, Caltrans Transportation Planning Office Chief will be presenting planning grant and investment opportunities for local partners.
- The ACTC FY 2026/27 Overall Work Program (OWP) final draft was approved by Caltrans on May 22, 2026.
- The City of Jackson has been awarded the Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant for the Historic Downtown & Creek Walk connectivity project. The project will improve bicycle and pedestrian accessibility, connectivity, safety, public health and increased economic vitality in historic downtown Jackson. The plan will coordinate with key stakeholders such as community members, local property and business owners, Jackson Elementary School, the Jackson Band of Miwok Indians, Caltrans and more. The start date for this project is unknown at this time.

Funding opportunities:

- Call for Application: United States Department of Transportation (US DOT)/Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Bridge Investment Program. This is a competitive grant and is designed to provide financial assistance for a project to replace, rehabilitate, preserve, or protect one (1) or more bridges on the National Bridge Inventory under 23 United States Code 144(b). The applications are for two (2) funding categories: 1) Planning and (2) Bridge Project grants. Eligible applicants include state and local government, Federal Land Management agencies, Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), special districts with a transportation function and federally recognized tribal governments. The total funding available is approximately $9.7 billion and the deadline for applications is June 29, 2026.
- Call for Applications: United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Rural Business Development Grand Program – Rural Transportation Systems/Rural Business-Cooperative Service. This program is designed to improve the economic conditions of rural areas by providing technical assistance that will enhance the operation of rural transportation systems. Eligible applicants include state and local governments, cities, federally recognized tribal governments and nonprofit organizations with a 501(c)(3) status. The total funds available are $995,500 and the deadline for applications is June 30, 2026.

Commissioner Oneto commented on issues with the traffic signal at SR 49 and Valley View Way, noting that the left turn signal from Valley View Way onto SR 49 will occasionally not activate. Mr. Gedney stated that he has contacted Caltrans regarding the issue. Mr. Chin also noted that traffic signal issues can be reported directly to Caltrans through their online reporting system at https://csr.dot.ca.gov/

Mr. Gedney noted that ACTC and Commissioner Epperson have received several requests from local residents regarding highway improvements and traffic safety concerns. He highlighted several locations for potential follow-up discussions with Caltrans, including intersections in downtown Ione, specifically, SR 104/Preston Avenue/Shakeley Lane. As well as the SR 49/Ridge Road intersection due to the cannabis dispensary that may be opening near the intersection. He also noted an upcoming meeting with Amador County Unified School District (ACUSD) regarding traffic and safety concerns

associated with the school site consolidation Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Discussion continued regarding the appropriate Caltrans divisions for reporting issues and obtaining information. Additional guidance was requested with follow up to be had at the upcoming TAC meeting.

CONSENT AGENDA (Items 1-7):

#3. FY 25/26 Overall Work Program Financials: Vice Chairman Riordan requested clarification regarding the Regional Transportation Mitigation Fee (RTMF) Account table numbers not adding up. Ms. Bridges explained that some reported revenues, particularly from the county, have been included in the table although payment has not yet been received. She noted that the county reports collected fees monthly but remits payment annually, early in the new FY. The amounts are included for tracking purposes and estimate the expected revenue.

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

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

REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:

#8. ACTC Employee Handbook Update: Ms. Bridges reviewed her staff report. She also noted that the track-changes version of the job descriptions did not print with the handbook. However, staff has made copies available today.

Commissioner Plasse asked if federal policies, including Title VI requirements, were current. Ms. Bridges confirmed that all policies are up to date and noted it is brought before the commission for approval the previous year.

> **Motion:** It was moved by Commissioner Oneto, seconded by Commissioner Staples, and unanimously carried to approve the revised Amador County Transportation Commission Employee Handbook.

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

#9. ACTC Transit Service Improvement Study – Status Update: Ms. Bridges reviewed her staff report.

She noted that the preliminary findings of Task 2 support battery electric vehicles over hydrogen fuel cell vehicles. Factors influencing this determination included the high cost of hydrogen fuel, limited fueling infrastructure, transporting costs, and the higher cost of hydrogen-powered vehicles.

Vice Chairman Riordan asked whether the Long-Term Financial Plan (LTFP) was the final funding application or a precursor to it. Ms. Bridges explained that the LTFP provides a general scope of work and once approved by the commission and submitted to CalSTA, will allow the consultant to complete the study that will support the final application. She noted that the application process is rolling, with a goal of completing the study and submitting the application by late 2026 or early 2027. While there is no deadline to expend the funds, they must be encumbered by CalSTA before the funding program expires in 2027/2028.

Commissioner Oneto requested confirmation that the estimated cost of an electric bus was approximately $1.4 million. Ms. Bridges confirmed the estimate. Commissioner Oneto expressed concern regarding the cost and questioned the overall benefit. Ms. Bridges acknowledged the significant upfront investment but noted that electric vehicles are expected to reduce long-term operating costs through lower fuel and maintenance expenses.

Commissioner Plasse asked whether the funding was competitive or already allocated to the region. Ms. Bridges explained that the funding is allocated and must be used for transportation-related projects that reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Commissioner Plasse asked if the financial plan anticipated an increase in AT's operational costs. Specifically, the operating costs listed in the LTFP would be to offset those increases or could they be used to support existing operations. Ms. Bridges stated that the operating funds identified in the LTFP are intended to help sustain transit operations and prevent additional service reductions. She noted that while the funding requires extensive reporting, it offers flexibility in its use.

Commissioner Staples requested clarification regarding the "Institutional Alternatives Study" identified in the LTFP. Ms. Bridges explained that the study would provide a more comprehensive evaluation of transit operations, including route by route analysis, potential service restructuring, and alternative management models. Vice Chairman Riordan asked whether funding identified for specific projects in the LTFP could be reallocated. Ms. Bridges stated that the listed projects serve as a general scope of work activities and that, once awarded, there may be flexibility for other eligible uses, subject to annual reporting requirements to CalSTA.

Commissioner Oneto asked whether participation in the program would require continued implementation once the funding is exhausted. Ms. Bridges stated that the program guidelines do not require continuation after the funds have been expended and are intended to support post-COVID transit recovery and long-term system sustainability. Commissioner Oneto suggested reviewing the program guidelines to confirm that no such continuation requirements exist.

Commissioner Plasse questioned whether a smaller vehicle would be more appropriate than the 40-foot bus identified in the LTFP, given the ridership levels on the former Sacramento route. Ms. Bridges explained that the vehicle was included as a general recommendation and that the LTFP is intended to be flexible. She noted that the commission could modify the proposed vehicle type and that the application language could be broadened to allow multiple eligible vehicle options. Discussion also included other potential uses for the funding, such as EV charging infrastructure and related facility improvements, with Ms. Bridges emphasizing that the LTFP is a high-level planning document subject to further refinement.

Vice Chairman Riordan expressed frustration that several studies completed in recent years have not resulted in actionable recommendations, particularly regarding the evaluation of direct versus contracted management of Amador Transit. While he voiced support for moving forward with the CalSTA application and the LTFP, he indicated a preference for focusing on implementation rather than conducting additional studies.

> **Motion:** It was moved by Commissioner Staples, seconded by Commissioner Bottomley, and carried to approve the proposed outline for use in preparing the SB 125 Long Term Financial Plan for the remaining funds, approximately $5 million, with consideration for a more efficient bus size for the Sacramento Route.

Ayes: Bottomley, Epperson, Plasse, Staples, Riordan

Noes: None
Absent: None
Abstain: Oneto

#10. ACTC Road Paving Pilot Project: Mr. Gedney reviewed his staff report.

Per a request from Chad Simmions, Mayor for the City of Jackson, discussion was had on the potential extension of the pilot paving project #3 - French Bar Road. Specifically with regard to the distance and amount of additional material needed to extend the paving.

Mr. Gedney reported on discussions he had with Ashley Johnson of El Dorado County regarding paving project funding opportunities. He clarified that El Dorado County contracts out all paving work and confirmed that a previously discussed $500,000 grant was received through the CalRecycle Rubberized Pavement Grant Program. He also reported that Ms. Johnson provided examples of cooperative agreements and invited ACTC representatives to observe their operations in July.

Mr. Gedney then introduced ACTC legal counsel, Ms. Mona Ebrahimi, to discuss cooperative agreement considerations. Ms. Ebrahimi stated that staff intends to develop a cooperative agreement framework with Amador County and the local jurisdictions to streamline paving projects under a single process. She explained that the purpose of this discussion was to obtain board direction on the agreement structure, subject to participation by the individual jurisdictions. Ms. Ebrahimi clarified that cooperative agreements do not exempt projects from applicable public contracting and competitive bidding requirements. She explained that under the California Uniform Public Construction Cost Accounting Act (CUPCCAA), projects under $75,000 are exempt from competitive bidding, projects between $75,000 and $220,000 require informal bidding, and projects exceeding $220,000 require formal competitive bidding. She also noted that grant-funded projects typically require competitive bidding regardless of project cost. Ms. Ebrahimi emphasized that each project would be evaluated individually to determine the applicable procurement requirements and any available exemptions.

Ms. Ebrahimi then identified several issues for board consideration, including jurisdictional boundaries, participating agencies, and applicable project standards. She noted that these matters could be addressed through a professional services agreement and explained that utilizing an on-call consultant for preparation of the plans and specifications could help streamline project delivery.

Vice Chairman Riordan asked Ms. Ebrahimi to elaborate on the paving standards for projects, like the difference between one (1) inch versus two (2) inch versus full depth reconstruction. Ms. Ebrahimi explained that maintenance projects are exempt from certain public works contracting requirements. She noted that under the Public Contract Code §22002(d)(3), paving projects of up to one (1) inch are generally considered maintenance activities and are not subject to competitive bidding requirements. However, paving projects exceeding one (1) inch are considered public works projects and are therefore subject to applicable competitive bidding requirements unless a specific exemption applies. Ms. Ebrahimi confirmed that the purpose of the discussion was to obtain direction necessary to develop a cooperative agreement framework for future paving projects. She explained that the agreement would establish responsibilities related to project prioritization, contracting, paving operations, invoicing, contractor coordination, and engineering services, with the goal of streamlining project delivery where feasible. She noted that larger projects may still require separate processes due to applicable legal and procurement requirements.

Discussion continued regarding the types of projects anticipated under the cooperative agreement. Mr. Gedney noted that the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Tier 1 project list includes a variety of

roadway rehabilitation projects. He emphasized the importance of distinguishing between major reconstruction projects, which are better suited for state and federal funding programs, and smaller rehabilitation projects targeted by the pilot paving program. Commissioner Plasse added that the original intent of the pilot program was to address lower-speed local roads and city streets rather than major arterial roadways. Ms. Ebrahimi clarified that, from a public contracting perspective, project eligibility is determined by project scope and cost rather than roadway classification or project intent. In response to questions from commissioners, Ms. Ebrahimi confirmed that two (2) inch overlay projects would generally be subject to competitive bidding requirements. She further explained that projects below the applicable CUPCCAA threshold of $75,000 may qualify for force account work without bidding, provided the jurisdiction has adopted CUPCCAA procedures. However, she noted that most roadway improvement projects would likely exceed that threshold.

Ms. Ebrahimi explained that one (1) approach used by public agencies is to develop a master scope of work that includes multiple projects and incorporates both individual and combined project bid alternatives. She noted that this allows agencies to competitively bid multiple projects under a single process and award the work to the lowest responsive bidder. She further clarified that the pilot paving projects differed because they were conducted as training exercises rather than public works projects.

Vice Chairman Riordan discussed the possibility of identifying projects that could be completed with a one (1) inch overlay following grinding, thereby qualifying as maintenance projects exempt from competitive bidding requirements. Ms. Ebrahimi confirmed that projects could be categorized by treatment type but emphasized that projects must be evaluated as a whole and cannot be separated into individual components to avoid bidding requirements. Mr. Gedney noted that El Dorado County utilizes grinding and chip seal treatments to keep certain projects below the one (1) inch threshold. Ms. Ebrahimi noted that staff could evaluate and categorize projects by overlay depth to identify those that may qualify as maintenance projects under the one (1) inch paving exemption. In response to questions from commissioners, she clarified that the threshold applies to paving depth rather than grinding activities. She further cautioned that relying on training projects as a means of avoiding competitive bidding requirements could invite legal challenges, particularly given the increased scrutiny of public works projects by labor organizations. Commissioner Staples noted that her jurisdiction routinely receives inquiries regarding active projects, contractors, and project costs. In response to questions regarding CUPCCAA bidding thresholds, Ms. Ebrahimi stated that the applicable cost limits are established by statute. She further clarified that larger paving projects cannot be divided into smaller segments for the purpose of avoiding competitive bidding requirements.

Mr. Gedney inquired if the county crew could bid against private contractors. Ms. Ebrahimi stated that county crews could not compete against private contractors through the bidding process. However, she explained that materials and labor may be treated separately for procurement purposes. The materials would be subject to competitive bidding. While labor costs could be evaluated independently against applicable CUPCCAA thresholds. She noted that any such approach would remain subject to statutory bidding limits and the purchasing policies of the participating jurisdictions.

Ms. Ebrahimi sought commission input regarding provisions to be included in a future cooperative agreement, including lead agency responsibilities, project prioritization, payment procedures, indemnification, and CEQA compliance. During discussion, Vice Chairman Riordan noted that ACTC had historically avoided serving as the lead agency on projects. Mr. Gedney acknowledged that had been the previous practice but explained that ACTC's role has evolved with the focus on edge line-to-edge line paving projects. He clarified that ACTC's involvement would be limited to paving projects with no environmental, right-of-way, and limited design requirements and would not include serving as lead agency for state highway projects.

Commissioners discussed ACTC's potential role in administering paving projects under a cooperative agreement, including consultant procurement, project prioritization, contract administration, and invoice processing. Discussion was also held regarding jurisdictional cost-sharing responsibilities and reimbursement procedures. Mr. Gedney emphasized the importance of establishing participation and cost-sharing parameters among the jurisdictions prior to executing contracts. Ms. Ebrahimi further clarified that county crews could not perform work for another jurisdiction as a means of avoiding competitive bidding requirements and that participating jurisdictions must comply with applicable CUPCCAA requirements. Commissioner Plasse asked if ACTC adopting CUPCCAA would make a difference. Ms. Ebrahimi stated she would research whether ACTC adopting CUPCCAA would affect the process. Discussion continued regarding project funding, cost-sharing, and the administration of paving projects under a cooperative agreement. Commissioners expressed support for developing standardized plans and specifications that could be utilized by participating jurisdictions and for establishing an on-call engineering resource to streamline project delivery and reduce engineering costs. Ms. Ebrahimi noted that engineering services must be performed by a licensed engineer and remain subject to applicable procurement requirements. Commissioners generally agreed that a standardized approach would improve efficiency and simplify project implementation.

Commissioner Epperson asked if the jurisdictions have expressed interest regarding this idea or if this would be something new for them to learn of. Commissioner Plasse stated that several jurisdictions have already expressed interest in the concept of a cooperative agreement. Specifically, the city representatives that sit on the board as well as representatives of the City of Ione. He noted that the proposed framework would consist of a cooperative agreement and a standardized set of plans and specifications administered by ACTC, with participation remaining at the discretion of each jurisdiction. Ms. Ebrahimi reiterated that under the proposed framework, ACTC would retain engineering services and develop standardized plans and specifications for participating projects, with participating jurisdictions reimbursing ACTC for their proportionate share of the costs. Discussion was held regarding the use of standardized plans and specifications that could be applied to a defined category of roadway projects and utilized across multiple years. Commissioners expressed support for a simplified, standardized approach that participating jurisdictions could elect to use based on project needs and available funding.

Commissioners discussed the development of roadway treatment standards and the role of engineering services in preparing project plans and specifications. Mr. Neu, ACTC paving consultant, emphasized the importance of avoiding unnecessary project design costs, while Ms. Ebrahimi noted that compliance with applicable engineering and contracting requirements is necessary to limit liability. Additional discussion was held regarding liability, governmental immunity, and the roles of licensed engineers and contractors.

Commissioners discussed the potential use of grinding and micro-grinding treatments, project categories that may require those treatments, and possible funding sources. Discussion was also held regarding the history and development of the Tier 1 project list. Commissioner Bottomley noted that conditions on one (1) of the listed projects had deteriorated significantly since the list was developed. Vice Chairman Riordan commented that the project could be reconsidered through a future 'Call for Projects' process with an updated Project Study Report (PSR). Mr. Gedney again reviewed the history of the paving pilot project and reiterated that the original concept included city roadway projects for grinding-related training. He stated that those projects were subsequently removed from the pilot program just last month. Commissioner Plasse expressed support for retaining some city projects within the pilot. Commissioner Staples confirmed that the commission had agreed to remove those projects.

Ms. Ebrahimi acknowledged that additional issues remain to be addressed and proposed bringing a draft cooperative agreement to a future meeting for commission review. She explained that the agreement would establish ACTC's role in administering contracts, identify participating jurisdictions, and include provisions related to project administration and indemnification. She further noted that she could provide a staff report with additional analysis regarding public contracting requirements and identify which projects may qualify as maintenance activities versus public works projects. Vice Chairman Riordan expressed support for that approach and requested additional clarification regarding the legal parameters for maintenance projects.

Mr. Neu provided an update on upcoming pilot training projects and planned meetings related to grinding operations. Further discussion was held regarding funding sources, bidding requirements, cost-sharing, CUPCCAA requirements, and the potential use of a Joint Powers Authority (JPA), with Ms. Ebrahimi agreeing to provide further research on those topics at a future meeting.

#11. Approve Monthly Expenses:

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

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

#12. ACTC Commissioner Reports: None

#13. ACTC Reports: None

#14. Future Agenda Items:

- Continued discussion regarding the legal aspects of the Pilot Paving Project
- ACTC/AT CalPERS UAL payment discussion update

#15. ADJOURNMENT: At 11:57 a.m. the Vice Chairman adjourned the regular meeting to Thursday July 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.