# AMADOR COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (ACTC) MINUTES
## July 2, 2026 – 9:26 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
Wendy Bottomley - City of Plymouth
Dan Riordan - City of Sutter Creek, Vice Chairman
Sandy Staples - City of Amador City

**Absent:**
Brian Oneto - Board of Supervisors
John Plasse - Citizen at Large

**Also Present:**
John Gedney, ACTC Executive Director
Felicia Bridges, ACTC Transportation Planner
Caitlin Kleven, ACTC Administrative Assistant
April Miller, Amador Transit, General Manager
Caleb Brock, Caltrans District 10 - Deputy District Director for Planning, Local Assistance, and Environmental
Mona Ebrahimi, ACTC Legal Counsel (via Zoom)
Jamie Lubenko, Supervisor-Elect, Amador County Board of Supervisors
Chris Mynderup, Interim City Manager, City of Jackson
Frank Whitmore, City Engineer, City of Sutter Creek

**Pledge of Allegiance**

**AGENDA:**

**Motion:** It was moved by Commissioner Staples, seconded by Vice Chairman Riordan, and carried to approve the agenda as presented.

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

**PUBLIC MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA:** Mr. Chris Mynderup, Interim City Manager for the City of Jackson, addressed the board on behalf of the City of Jackson and Jackson City Council to express appreciation for the recent paving project on French Bar Road. He noted the road had been in very poor condition for some time and stated that the completed project was a significant improvement. Mr. Mynderup also expressed his support for continued paving efforts throughout the county.

**Caltrans Report with Caleb Brock:**
General Announcements/Updates:

- Mr. Brock stated that Planning Office Chief Sylvia Dayak attended the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting in June. She covered various funding opportunities, project

components and timing for the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) and information on the Caltrans customer service request website for maintenance and service requests. She also shared contact information for local development review, project initiation and capital outlay support.

Mr. Brock noted that his office is happy to offer follow-up meetings with any jurisdictions that would like additional information on individual funding opportunities.

- The annual Caltrans Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant (STPG) Program Workshop will be held soon. He encourages more jurisdictions within Amador County to apply for the grant funding. Currently the draft guidelines are out for public comments, and he anticipates the 'Call for Applications' will be out by the end of August or beginning of September.

  Vice Chairman Riordan asked Mr. Brock how the TAC meeting went and if it was well attended. Commissioner Staples stated that she was in attendance and that she appreciated Mr. Brock for arranging it. She noted it to be very informative, with information being made available in person as well as online sources.

- Mr. Gedney stated the Amador County Unified School District (ACUSD) School Site Consolidation project Environmental Impact Report (EIR) will be distributed in September. He noted that based on the information provided by ACUSD, there will only be a qualitative analysis for the intersection at State Route (SR) 49 and Sutter Ione Road. Mr. Gedney then stated that in 2004, when the SR 49 bypass was in development, the previous Executive Director, Mr. Charles Field, requested that Caltrans install a traffic signal at that intersection. At that time, it was found to not meet the criteria for installation. However, due to his request, the appropriate infrastructure was installed and Caltrans noted continued monitoring of the intersection overtime will take place. Mr. Gedney stated that he advised the superintendent of the school district, Mr. Jared Critchfield, that Caltrans may want to see a quantitative analysis of the intersection. However, it appears that analysis will not be performed.

  Vice Chairman Riordan asked Mr. Gedney if there was any way to force the issue. He notes that this issue is just as important as the intersection in Jackson. Mr. Gedney noted that it was a good question but likely very difficult. Vice Chairman Riordan noted that he is concerned due to the speed at which the project is moving along. The concerns that were previously noted are still present even though the intersection in question is located at SR 49/Sutter Ione Road and not SR 88/49/Argonaut Lane. Mr. Gedney agreed and stated the same pattern from before of build it and someone else will fix the problem seems to be in effect. Vice Chairman Riordan stated that he hopes ACTC will stand firm on this current issue as it did previously.

- Mr. Brock stated that they are awaiting the Fiscal Year (FY) 25/26 4$^{th}$ quarter invoicing and Overall Work Program (OWP) deliverables.

- He notes that Caltrans is looking forward to working closely with the City of Jackson on the STPG that they were awarded for the Historic Downtown & Creek Walk connectivity project.

- Mr. Brock also commented that there are no current updates on the Drytown Safety Study. Once new information becomes available, he will share it with the board.

Funding opportunities:

- United States Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has issued a 'Call for Applications' for the Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities (BRIC) Grant Program. The grant provides federal funding to support hazard mitigation projects that reduce long-term disaster risks and strengthen infrastructure resilience against natural hazards. Approximately $1 billion in total funding is available. Eligible applicants include states, territories, Tribal governments and the District of Columbia. Local governments and communities are eligible to apply as sub-applicants. Application deadline is July 23, 2026.

Traffic Controls:

- SR 88: One (1) way traffic controls will be in effect from SR 104 to Sunset Drive West for electrical work beginning June 28, 2026, through July 2, 2026, from 7:00 am to 4:00 pm.

**CONSENT AGENDA (Items 1-9):**

**#6. FY 2025/26 Fiscal & Compliance Audits (ACTC/Amador Transit) – Consultant Selection:** Vice Chairman Riordan requested clarification on the audit costs for Richardson & Company. Mr. Gedney explained that the previous year was unique because ACTC and AT underwent separate audits, costing approximately $20,000 and $47,000, respectively. He noted the current combined audit for both agencies is approximately $45,000.

**#7. California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA) Senate Bill 125 Long-Term Financial Plan:** Vice Chairman Riordan suggested postponing discussion of the item until agenda item #12. Ms. Bridges clarified that the item was included on the consent agenda for informational purposes only, as the outline had been approved at the previous meeting. This draft reflects the plan that will be submitted to CalSTA. Vice Chairman Riordan thanked her for the clarification.

**Motion:** It was moved by Vice Chairman Riordan, seconded by Commissioner Bottomley, and carried to approve the consent agenda as presented.

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

**REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:**

**#10. ACTC Transit Service Improvement Study – Draft Amador Transit Zero-Emission Vehicle Fleet Transition Plan:** Ms. Bridges reviewed her staff report. She then introduced Ms. Yeshasvi Mahadev, Senior Associate with Cambridge Systematics to present. Ms. Mahadev then reviewed the draft Amador Transit (AT) Zero-Emission Vehicle Fleet Transition Plan.

Vice Chairman Riordan asked why the recommendation was for a 40-foot electric bus rather than a smaller option. Ms. Bridges explained that the recommendation was based on battery capacity needed to complete a round trip between Amador County and Sacramento without recharging, not passenger capacity. She noted that Appendix F does include an example for smaller buses. While a smaller bus could be utilized, operational and scheduling changes would be required. Vice Chairman Riordan asked that the smaller bus option continue to be evaluated before a final purchase decision is made, and Ms. Bridges confirmed that it would.

Mr. Gedney acknowledged that ridership on the Sacramento route had been minimal and noted that a potential cost-saving option for restoring the service would be to provide a single stop at 65th Street, allowing riders to connect with other transit services. Vice Chairman Riordan asked about the long-

term financial viability of the program, noting that while the first five (5) years are funded, he was concerned whether the long-term feasibility had been evaluated. Ms. Bridges explained that the plan was developed to meet a state mandate requiring both short- and long-term strategies, while recognizing that exemptions may apply where financial or operational constraints exist. She stated the plan is intended to serve as a guide for future fleet and infrastructure planning, with the understanding that meeting the 2040 deadline may not be feasible for the region. Further discussion was held regarding the purpose of the study, potential long-term impacts, and vehicle procurement policies related to the implementation timeline.

Ms. Mahadev clarified that the study found 92% of bus blocks could be operated without on-route charging, but this does not mean only 92% of the fleet would transition to electric vehicles. She explained that the data indicates operational adjustments, such as mid-route charging, may be necessary depending on bus size. She also noted that Section 9 (page 33) of the study provides a year-by-year Total Cost of Ownership analysis, including a comparison of continuing current operations versus transitioning to zero-emission vehicles, as well as the incremental costs associated with both large and small battery-electric buses over the evaluation period.

Chairman Crew commented that successful implementation of zero-emission vehicles would possibly require utility providers to invest in the necessary charging infrastructure. He noted local agencies and the public contributing only their proportional share of the cost of charging vehicles. He expressed concern that funding the required infrastructure upgrades would not be sustainable long term. Mr. Gedney agreed and highlighted previous plans to utilize hydrogen fuel cell (HFC) technology, noting the challenges that made implementation infeasible. Ms. Mahadev explained that HFC technology is generally not cost-effective for smaller transit agencies due to higher fueling and operating costs but may be appropriate for larger fleets. She stated that the study found no advantage to transitioning a smaller agency, such as AT, to a single fueling technology. She further noted that peer agencies reported significant operational challenges with HFC, and while it may offer benefits during power outages or wildfires, battery-electric technology is currently the more practical and accessible option for smaller fleets.

Vice Chairman Riordan questioned whether the initial five (5) years of funding would be sufficient to sustain the program beyond that period if technology or operating conditions changed. Mr. Gedney replied that those considerations had been incorporated into the analysis and noted that waivers remain available if needed. He explained that the state's zero-emission mandate is incentive-based rather than punitive, allowing agencies to continue operating conventional vehicles when appropriate waivers are obtained. When asked by Vice Chairman Riordan about the long-term confidence in the program, Mr. Gedney stated that future conditions cannot be predicted, although he believes the state will continue pursuing its zero-emission goals. Ms. Bridges explained that the five (5) year plan is intended to secure the remaining $5 million in funding for vehicle purchases, infrastructure improvements, and related design and engineering studies. She stated that implementation of the plan will allow AT to evaluate program performance, future funding needs, and additional grant opportunities. Further discussion was held regarding long-term implementation, funding, and the possibility of future state grant opportunities. Ms. Bridges concluded that the five (5) year plan is one (1) component of the overall study and will serve as a guideline for AT's transition toward the state mandate. She noted the item was presented for informational purposes only and that no board action was required at this time.

**#11. State Route 88/Pine Grove Corridor Improvements – Project Funding:** Mr. Gedney noted that this item was included as a placeholder to monitor project construction and invoice reimbursements. He reported that staff continues to coordinate with Caltrans and the county to keep the project moving

forward, but there were no actionable items requiring board direction at this time. Vice Chairman Riordan asked if there was any resolution on this issue. Mr. Gedney stated that there is no resolution yet.

**#12. ACTC Road Paving Pilot Project:** Mr. Gedney introduced Mr. Kenny Neu to present information on the recently completed paving projects.

Mr. Neu commended the paving crew for their continued improvement, noting that production increased from approximately 200 tons of pavement per day on the initial project to 740 tons per day on the French Bar Road project. He also praised the quality of the work and the roadway preparation completed prior to paving. Mr. Neu stated that the commission should be commended for the program's success, noting the positive feedback received from residents following the recent paving project.

Mr. Neu reported that the final pilot paving project would be String Bean Alley and should commence in approximately two (2) weeks following completion of emergency repairs. He inquired if there were going to be any additional projects once String Bean Alley is completed. He noted that Mr. Jeff Christman, Amador County Public Works Director highlighted some additional potential project locations, including Hale Road in Fiddletown and Greilich Road in Plymouth. Commissioner Bottomley also suggested Old Sacramento Road. Further discussion noted that some of the proposed roadways would require grinding prior to paving and involve traffic controls.

Mr. Gedney apologized to the board, acknowledging that an extension of paving on the French Bar Road project was completed without formal board approval. He stated that he was unsure of the city limits. While he acknowledged that is not an excuse, he noted that numerous requests for the paving to continue up to the residential area had been received. He clarified though that the additional paving did not extend all the way down to SR 49. He continued that though the additional paving was not part of the coordinated project, it met criteria for the project. Mr. Neu commented that he believed the decision was appropriate.

Vice Chairman Riordan clarified that he did not fault Mr. Neu, as he was acting under direction, but reiterated his concern that the extension of the French Bar Road project had not been authorized by the board. He emphasized that pilot projects should remain within the parameters established by the commission and that decisions to expand a project require board knowledge and approval. Vice Chairman Riordan also expressed concern that deviating from the approved project scope could create legal issues and potentially jeopardize the pilot program, while acknowledging he understood the reasoning behind the decision. Chairman Crew stated that he had discussed the unapproved paving extension with Jackson Mayor Chad Simmons and noted that the City of Jackson was considering contributing approximately $10,000 toward the additional work. He commented that, while he believed the extension was strategically appropriate, future project expansions should require board approval. Commissioner Bottomley agreed that jurisdictions should not be permitted to expand projects without board authorization. Commissioner Staples noted that legal clarification on the issue would likely be provided by Ms. Ebrahimi, and Mr. Neu added that Mr. Christman was pursuing additional state funding opportunities.

Mr. Gedney explained that the original training program included two (2) pilot projects: one (1) for paving only and one (1) incorporating both grinding and paving. He noted that the French Bar Road extension remained consistent with the paving-only pilot, while future projects, such as Old Sacramento Road, would expand the training program to include grinding. Vice Chairman Riordan sought clarification on the paving depth and reiterated his concern regarding the legal implications of

expanding project work beyond board authorization. Discussion followed regarding the paving process, including leveling, pavement thickness and compaction.

Mr. Gedney introduced ACTC legal counsel, Ms. Mona Ebrahimi, to discuss cooperative agreements. Ms. Ebrahimi reported that legal counsel is preparing a memorandum analyzing the commission's options for continuing the paving program, including the potential formation of a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) and the applicability of the California Uniform Public Construction Cost Accounting Act (CUPCCAA). She stated that she would not discuss potential legal concerns in open session but noted that the memorandum would present legally appropriate options for achieving the commission's goals of completing projects efficiently and cost-effectively. She anticipated the memorandum would be presented for discussion at the next meeting.

Mr. Gedney stated that additional discussion is needed regarding the long-term parameters of the paving program, including developing a sustainable funding model, differentiating roadway types, and establishing accurate cost metrics for labor and materials. He noted that this information, together with the legal options memorandum, would help guide future program decisions. Mr. Gedney clarified that the pilot program would conclude upon completion of String Bean Alley and that no additional projects would be added. He stated that staff would present the pilot program results and potential next steps, including a future grinding and paving pilot, for board consideration at the next meeting.

The board discussed the success of the pilot paving program and commended the quality of the crews' work. Vice Chairman Riordan acknowledged the frustration of pausing additional pilot projects but emphasized the importance of resolving the outstanding legal issues before proceeding. Mr. Gedney noted that, while ACTC could not move forward until legal guidance was received, the county could continue paving projects independently. Mr. Neu inquired about the funding process with the county and ACTC for future projects, such as Greilich Road for example. Mr. Gedney clarified that ACTC was not currently in a position to authorize reimbursement for additional paving projects until the board provided further direction.

Ms. April Miller, General Manager for AT, asked whether the paving crew could pave the AT headquarters parking lot, noting that the agency has two (2) years of State of Good Repair (SGR) funding available that must be spent during the current FY. Ms. Bridges commented that the parking lot is believed to be within the jurisdiction of the City of Sutter Creek rather than the county.

Ms. Jamie Lubenko, Amador County Board of Supervisors-Elect for District 5, expressed concern that delaying additional projects could reduce the available construction season. She also asked how roadway projects are selected and whether a list of potential projects was available. Mr. Gedney explained that the county currently contracts out road paving projects and that the pilot program is intended to develop the county's ability to perform paving work in-house, which he noted is a more financially sustainable approach.

Further discussion was held regarding the condition of county roads, the criteria used to prioritize paving projects, and the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) 'Call for Projects' process. Mr. Gedney clarified that the pilot projects were selected from roadways not included on the Tier 1 project list. Ms. Lubenko asked if there was a similar process for selecting the roads not on the Tier 1 list. Chairman Crew noted that the board is considering options for prioritizing non-Tier 1 roadways. Mr. Gedney added that discussions are ongoing regarding a coordinated paving program between the county and cities, but the process and associated legal considerations still need to be resolved.

Ms. Lubenko noted that she appreciated the information and discussion but emphasized the importance of establishing clear, objective criteria for selecting roadway projects so the process would be transparent to the public. The board discussed the need to develop a sustainable project selection process, including cooperative agreements between the county and cities and consistent criteria for prioritizing future paving projects.

Mr. Gedney acknowledged that the remaining paving season is limited but emphasized that the commission must follow the appropriate legal process before proceeding with additional projects. The board discussed the need to establish both short- and long-term project selection criteria. Commissioner Staples expressed concern that the process should avoid becoming politicized. Ms. Bridges reiterated that ACTC roadway projects are selected through the RTP 'Call for Projects' process using adopted evaluation criteria and available funding. Mr. Gedney added that future funding cycles would include separate solicitations for full-depth reclamation and one-inch overlay projects. He confirmed that staff would proceed in accordance with legal counsel's recommendations to be presented at the next meeting.

Ms. Lubenko expressed her appreciation for the pilot paving program, noting that the community is beginning to see its positive results. Mr. Gedney also commended Mr. Neu for his training of the county paving crew and noted a noticeable improvement in crew morale. Chairman Crew asked if the crew could be considered journeymen level competency yet. Mr. Neu stated that the crew had not yet reached journeyman-level competency but was making significant progress and would continue to improve through additional paving projects.

**#13. Sutter Creek – Gold Rush Ranch Mitigation Agreement:** Mr. Gedney reviewed the staff report and then asked Ms. Ebrahimi to continue with the presentation.

Ms. Ebrahimi reviewed the project history, noting that the original Gold Rush development project was approved by the City of Sutter Creek in 2009. Prior to construction, ACTC advanced funding for improvements at the Prospect Road/Bowers Drive intersection with the understanding that the costs would be repaid by the development. Although the intersection improvements were completed, the original project did not proceed, and the property was later sold for phased redevelopment by a new owner.

Ms. Ebrahimi stated that ACTC's position is that the approximately $1.5 million advanced for the Prospect Road/Bowers Drive intersection improvements must be reimbursed and cannot be considered a gift of public funds. She noted that the City of Sutter Creek has indicated it does not have funding available for repayment, shifting the discussion to how the developer could reimburse ACTC for the costs.

Ms. Ebrahimi presented a proposed reimbursement agreement, recommended for approval by the sub-committee, that would facilitate repayment of the $1.5 million advanced by ACTC through an approximately $1,000 per single-family unit fee in addition to the standard Regional Transportation Mitigation Fee (RTMF). She noted the agreement ensures ACTC is reimbursed for the intersection improvements, resolves the longstanding reimbursement dispute, and establishes that the repayment obligation remains with the property regardless of future ownership if the project does not proceed. She also noted that Commissioner Oneto requested the agreement be reviewed by the full commission before approval and opened the floor for questions.

Vice Chairman Riordan restated the proposed agreement for clarification and expressed appreciation for ACTC's flexibility in reaching a resolution. Discussion followed regarding how the agreement

provides greater certainty for future development by clearly establishing costs and reimbursement obligations. Mr. Gedney thanked the commission and Ms. Ebrahimi for their work on the agreement, noting it resolves a longstanding issue. He also explained that the City of Sutter Creek selected one (1) of two (2) reimbursement options presented to the subcommittee, and the commission discussed the differences between the two (2) proposals.

Mr. Gedney discussed concerns regarding the proposed repayment timeline, noting that reimbursement would occur through an approximately $1,000 per single-family unit fee across the full 1,500-home development rather than a larger fee during the initial phase, making the repayment period dependent on the pace of development. He also noted that the agreement requires the City of Sutter Creek to acknowledge the change from a Level of Service (LOS) to Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) as the traffic impact metric in its environmental documentation, reflecting current state law regarding traffic mitigation. Vice Chairman Riordan confirmed that this was his understanding of the city's commitment under the agreement.

Ms. Jamie Lubenko expressed concerns regarding the phased repayment approach, citing the Zinfandel Ridge development in Plymouth as an example where improvements were funded upfront based on anticipated future development that was never completed, resulting in unmet developer commitments.

Chairman Crew commented that failing to reach a compromise would likely result in no reimbursement to ACTC. Mr. Gedney agreed and asked about the approval process for the agreement. Ms. Ebrahimi explained that while the RTMF Committee is not a separate legal entity with authority to approve the agreement, it should receive the item for review and recommendation. She noted that following ACTC approval, the agreement would also require approval by the Sutter Creek City Council. The commission also discussed distributing the agreement to RTMF Committee members in compliance with the Ralph M. Brown Act.

> **Motion:** It was moved by Vice Chairman Riordan, seconded by Commissioner Staples, and carried to accept the agreement as proposed by ACTC and agreed to by the City of Sutter Creek.

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

**#14. Sutter Creek – Sutter Hill Road Additional Funding Request:** Mr. Gedney reviewed the staff report and clarified that the additional funding request was for a project scope change, not a project scale change, meaning an increase in paving materials rather than the length of roadway. He also noted that Mr. Frank Whitmore, City Engineer for the City of Sutter Creek, was present to answer any questions from the board regarding the project.

Mr. Whitmore explained that the original cost estimates were based on preliminary planning. However, during final engineering it was determined that the roadway required additional materials due to its deteriorated condition. He clarified that the project scope is not changing, but the additional work is necessary to address the existing road failures and reduce the need for future repairs.

Vice Chairman Riordan asked for clarification regarding the "Additive Alternative" bid and whether it constituted a project scope or scale change. Mr. Whitmore explained that additional roadway base repairs were needed in failing sections to ensure the pavement overlay would be effective. Vice Chairman Riordan then asked whether the work exceeded ACTC's edge line-to-edge line funding

guideline. Mr. Gedney replied that the guideline was intended to limit ACTC funding to construction phase, with project design and development remaining the responsibility of the local jurisdiction.

Mr. Gedney questioned why the deteriorated road base had not been identified during preparation of the original Project Study Report (PSR). Mr. Whitmore explained that the PSR was based on preliminary estimates and that the roadway deficiencies were identified during the subsequent on-site inspections with construction superintendents. Mr. Gedney noted that the expectation was for those issues to have been identified during the initial PSR. Discussion continued regarding the project timeline and its effect on the original cost estimates.

Chairman Crew asked whether revenue from Measure P was being used to fund the project. Mr. Whitmore and Vice Chairman Riordan noted that Measure P funding was not included. Commissioner Staples commented that collections only began in January, so limited revenue would be available. The board then discussed the anticipated revenue, allowable uses, and funding parameters of Measure P.

Vice Chairman Riordan commented that if ACTC did not provide the additional funding, the City of Sutter Creek would likely be able to secure funding from another source. Mr. Whitmore agreed and noted that, as the program is still relatively new, project cost estimates may require refinement as additional information becomes available over time.

Mr. Gedney expressed hesitation with the current situation because the additional funding was being sought after the design phase was completed. The board then discussed similar requests for additional funding, the goal of maximizing paving projects, and other potential funding sources available to the City of Sutter Creek. Chairman Crew commented that denying the additional funding request would not be detrimental to the project. Vice Chairman Riordan suggested the commission consider sharing the additional cost with the City of Sutter Creek, and Commissioner Staples noted that such action would require a motion.

Commissioner Bottomley commented that project costs often exceed initial estimates due to unforeseen conditions. Mr. Gedney agreed but expressed concern that approving the request could set a precedent for jurisdictions to seek additional funding after project bids are awarded. Commissioner Bottomley responded that jurisdictions should provide accurate estimates throughout the process.

Vice Chairman Riordan moved to split the additional project cost equally between ACTC and the City of Sutter Creek, with the city's share funded through Measure P revenue. During public comment, Ms. Bridges noted that PSRs are used as a relatively fixed number that is then provided to the board through the RTP 'Call for Projects' process. The PSR is used for funding and helps determine the sustainability of funding sources. She cautioned that If the PSR is seen as more flexible with additional requests for funding that are readily approved, that could negatively impact the sustainability model moving forward and affect the funding of future projects. She suggested that future PSRs may need to include contingency funding or local funding commitments to address unforeseen costs.

Ms. Bridges asked the board to identify the funding source for ACTC's share of the additional project cost. Chairman Crew questioned whether funding the request would affect other programmed projects. Mr. Gedney noted that several ACTC funding sources have legal spending limitations. Ms. Bridges explained that the project's Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds were fully programmed and committed to existing obligations, leaving no available balance. She recommended using the Local Transportation Fund (LTF) Trust account to fund ACTC's share, noting that doing so would require future Transportation Development Act (TDA) audit compliance. Vice Chairman Riordan

clarified that ACTC's share of the additional cost would be approximately $58,500 and asked staff which funding source they would recommend if the request was approved. Mr. Gedney replied that the funding would need to come from the LTF.

Commissioner Staples asked whether unused ACTC funding from the Eureka Street project had been returned. Ms. Bridges replied that it had not, explaining that the original funding resolution was amended and a new resolution reflecting the final project cost was approved instead prior to the reimbursement.

Commissioner Bottomley asked how the City of Sutter Creek would proceed if ACTC did not approve the additional funding. Vice Chairman Riordan replied that the city would seek other funding sources, noting that the underlying road deficiencies would still need to be addressed to avoid premature pavement failure. He added that the city requested ACTC funding first as the preferred option. Commissioner Staples agreed and noted that Mr. Whitmore was present on behalf of Tom Du Bois-Sutter Creek City Manager.

Mr. Gedney noted that rebidding the project was also an option, citing precedent from other county projects. Vice Chairman Riordan commented that the lowest bid was submitted by a local contractor, which would likely minimize mobilization costs.

Prior to the vote, Mr. Gedney requested clarification on the PSR and bidding timeline. Mr. Whitmore explained that the roadway deficiencies were identified after the PSR was completed and incorporated into the bid as an additive alternate. Chairman Crew suggested postponing the item until the next meeting due to concerns about using LTF revenues and two (2) of the board members being absent. Vice Chairman Riordan noted that a quorum was present and that the project was scheduled to begin within the next few weeks. Discussion also clarified that the project had previously been approved for funding by ACTC.

> **Motion:** It was moved by Vice Chairman Riordan, seconded by Commissioner Staples, and carried to approve the City of Sutter Creek and ACTC splitting the difference equally for the additional funding request for the Sutter Hill Road project for $117,000, of which ACTC would be responsible for $58,500.

| | |
|---|---|
| Ayes: | Bottomley, Riordan, Staples |
| Noes: | Crew |
| Absent: | Oneto, Plasse |

**#15. Approve Monthly Expenses:**

> **Motion:** It was moved by Vice Chairman Riordan, seconded by Commissioner Bottomley, and carried to approve the revised monthly expenses.

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

**#16. ACTC Commissioner Reports:** Commissioner Staples notes that there has been an increase in building in Amador City. Noting one (1) new home constructed last year and one (1) this year, which completed in February. She stated that she does have the check for the RTMF program to provide to ACTC today.

Additionally, the recent Request for Qualifications that Amador City had issued has received one (1) response.

Commissioner Staples also noted for clarity in reference to the earlier paving project discussion, String Bean Alley does not fall within the Amador City limits.

**#17. ACTC Reports:** Ms. Bridges highlighted that it was Ms. Kleven's one (1) year anniversary with ACTC. The board congratulated Ms. Kleven.

**#18. Future Agenda Items:**

- Continued discussion regarding the legal aspects and jurisdictional cooperative agreements for the Pilot Paving Project

**#19. ADJOURNMENT:** At 11:33 a.m. the Vice Chairman adjourned the regular meeting to Thursday August 6, 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.