# AMADOR TRANSIT (AT) MINUTES
## September 3, 2026 – 9:03 a.m.
## ACTC Board Room-117 Valley View Way Sutter Creek, CA 95685

The Amador Transit Board of Directors met on the above date, and the following proceedings were had, to wit:

**Present on Roll Call:**
Patrick Crew - Board of Supervisors, Chairman
Brian Oneto - Board of Supervisors
John Plasse - Citizen at Large
Dan Riordan - City of Sutter Creek, Vice Chairman
Sandy Staples - City of Amador City

**Absent:**
Wendy Bottomley - City of Plymouth

**Also Present:**
April Miller, Amador Transit General Manager
Levi Regadanz, Amador Transit Maintenance Manager
John Gedney, ACTC Executive Director
Felicia Bridges, ACTC Program Manager
Caitlin Kleven, ACTC Administrative Analyst
Jamie Lubenko, Supervisor-Elect, Amador County Board of Supervisors

**AGENDA:**

**Motion:** It was moved by Director Staples, seconded by Director Oneto, and carried to approve the agenda as presented.

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

**PUBLIC MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA:** None

**CONSENT AGENDA (Items 1-7):**

**#3. Performance Report, July 2026:** Director Plasse noted that ridership and Vehicle Revenue Miles (VRM) have doubled, which Ms. Miller confirmed. He referenced the FY 2024/25 audit, noting the significant increase in driver hours and wages and attributing the increased ridership and VRM to those additional hours. Ms. Miller agreed, adding that the increase was due to the expansion of Dial-a-Ride (DAR). Director Plasse stated that while the increased ridership is positive, the associated costs should continue to be closely monitored.

**#6. Budget/Statement of Net Position, August 2026:** Director Plasse noted that two (2) months into the new fiscal year, line item 50200 Salaries and Wages – DAR, is at 23% of budget, while approximately 16% of the fiscal year has elapsed. He cautioned that if the trend continues, the line item could be significantly over budget by year-end and encouraged Ms. Miller to monitor such issues early. Ms. Miller stated that she was aware of the overage and explained that it is likely due to the recent

departure of two (2) drivers, which required vacation payouts, including approximately 300 hours for one (1) driver.

Vice Chairman Riordan asked when a budget amendment may become necessary. Director Plasse stated that an amendment would be warranted if the current trend continues. Chairman Crew suggested reviewing the budget at the midpoint of the fiscal year to determine whether an amendment is necessary. Director Plasse agreed, noting that some expenses, such as insurance, are front-loaded and may make the budget appear over early in the fiscal year but should balance out during the first half of the year. Chairman Crew agreed that a mid-year review would provide a more accurate financial picture.

Director Oneto noted that DAR was based on need and at what point would it be worth evaluating fixed routes versus DAR on the basis of need. Director Plasse commented that subject was currently being evaluated. Specifically noting there recent reduction in fixed routes and added that future route reduction may be necessary. He also noted that the fixed routes continue to underperform in terms of farebox ratio.

> **Motion:** It was moved by Vice Chairman Riordan, seconded by Director Plasse, and carried to approve the consent agenda Items 1-7.

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

**REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:**

**#8. Discuss and provide direction regarding the proposed response to the Amador County Grand Jury:** Ms. Miller reported that the Grand Jury report, discussed by Director Oneto at the August board meeting, was published on June 23, 2026, with a board response required by September 23, 2026. She stated that the proposed responses to the findings were included in the agenda item and had been reviewed by AT legal counsel and Chairman Crew. Ms. Miller asked the board for any additional changes, edits, or suggestions.

Vice Chairman Riordan asked whether a Request for Proposal (RFP) for bus wrap advertising was required and whether that process should have been followed previously, noting that the next agenda item included such an RFP. Ms. Miller confirmed that AT has a clear procurement policy that was not previously followed. She explained that some responses partially disagree with the Grand Jury findings because insufficient historical documentation prevents staff from confirming or denying whether the appropriate procurement process occurred. While some records date back to 2015, they do not clearly establish what process was followed. Ms. Miller stated that AT can acknowledge the lack of documentation and ensure procurement policies are followed going forward.

Chairman Crew recalled that former General Manager Ms. Karla Meyers initially contracted with Ms. Helen Foraker for bus wrap advertising as a trial and that, at the time, it was a single-source arrangement. He noted that the service should have been put out for procurement after a couple of years. In response to Director Plasse's question regarding how far back the board wanted to review the matter, Chairman Crew stated that was the extent of his recollection. Director Plasse recalled that the board had previously been approached by another vendor but rejected the proposal due to concerns regarding the proposed profit-sharing percentage. He noted that the current arrangement is a 50/50 profit split and requested that the upcoming RFP allow applicants to propose a different profit-sharing structure. Vice Chairman Riordan asked what would constitute sole-source justification in this case. Director Plasse responded

that if an RFP is issued and only one (1) proposal is received, a sole-source justification could then apply.

Director Plasse asked which provision of AT's procurement policy the Grand Jury found had been violated and whether the policy differs from applicable state and federal bidding and RFP requirements. Ms. Miller stated that the policy is consistent with state and federal regulations and was last approved by the board in 2023. She offered to bring the policy back for board review the following month.

Director Plasse also questioned the Grand Jury report's reference to more than $100,000 in contractor revenue. Ms. Miller stated that figure was incorrect and clarified that the procurement policy does not specify a required profit split. Under the current 50/50 arrangement, AT receives approximately $60,000 in advertising revenue, with the contractor receiving an equivalent amount. Vice Chairman Riordan asked whether the profit-sharing structure should be addressed in the policy, and Ms. Miller stated that could be discussed when the policy returns to the board.

Director Plasse noted that he did not believe the policy authorized the General Manager to enter into a $100,000 contract without board approval and reiterated his interest in reviewing the policy against state and federal requirements. Ms. Miller stated that the General Manager's contracting and/or bidding authority is limited to $25,000 and that procurements exceeding $100,000 are subject to a more stringent process. Director Staples noted that excerpts from AT's procurement policy are included on page 87 of the Grand Jury report.

Chairman Crew noted that the procurement and bidding process would be addressed further under the next agenda item and asked the board to focus on the Grand Jury report. He asked whether there were any fundamental disagreements with the proposed responses and commended Ms. Miller for her work on preparing the responses. The board agreed that the responses were acceptable as presented. Direction was given to submit the responses to the Grand Jury as presented in the agenda.

**#9. Review and approve Draft RFP for Bus Advertising:** Chairman Crew reiterated his comments from the previous agenda item regarding the advertising revenue profit split, suggesting that a specific percentage not be included in the RFP to allow for potentially more favorable proposals. Director Plasse noted that the RFP appeared to allow competition on the percentage split. He questioned the current 50/50 arrangement, while acknowledging that the contractor provides graphics, design, and other advertising-related services. The board discussed whether the split percentage should be specified in the RFP.

Ms. Miller acknowledged that while the current split may be high, the vendor performs a significant amount of work that could otherwise require an additional employee. Director Plasse agreed that additional staff was unnecessary but believed the services could be provided for less than 50% of gross sales. Ms. Miller agreed that it may be appropriate to seek improved terms on the split percentage from the vendor. Chairman Crew added that an increase in the number of buses and advertising volume could support a more favorable split, such as 60/40.

Director Oneto asked how potential vendors would determine the minimum annual payment when reviewing the RFP. Ms. Miller explained that vendors may propose their own guaranteed minimum annual payment and may request historical advertising revenue information to inform their proposals. She noted that Zenith Billboards, whose inquiry prompted the Grand Jury investigation, requested and

received this information. As an example, if annual advertising revenue is approximately $58,000, a vendor could propose a guaranteed minimum of $60,000.

Vice Chairman Riordan asked when the RFP would be released. Ms. Miller stated that while the dates were left open, the current contract expires in December and recommended issuing the RFP as soon as possible. The board agreed that prompt distribution of the RFP was the best course of action.

> **Motion:** It was moved by Director Staples, seconded by Vice Chairman Riordan, and carried to approve the draft Request for Proposals for bus wrap advertising and direction was given to distribute.

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

**#10. Discussion of current and upcoming operating shortfalls and approval of reserve transfers:**
Ms. Miller reported that significant cash flow shortfalls were identified in August, requiring a $100,000 transfer from reserves to meet payroll obligations. She requested retroactive board approval of the transfer in accordance with policy and noted that additional reserve transfers may be necessary. However, following a meeting the previous day with the Finance Committee and ACTC staff, a potential alternative was identified that could address operational cash flow needs without using reserves. Ms. Miller added that AT expects delivery of three (3) new buses in October and November, which will require reserve funds, and asked whether the board wished to discuss options for addressing future cash flow shortfalls.

Vice Chairman Riordan noted that the ACTC agenda would be amended to address the current funding issue and potential ongoing solutions. Mr. Gedney explained that, for ACTC to take action, the agenda would need to be amended, and a draft resolution presented for approval. He requested that the AT board formally request ACTC's assistance so the matter could be properly agendized. Mr. Gedney added that a new funding strategy had been identified during the previous day's meeting that was not included in the staff report and recommended discussing the strategy prior to the ACTC meeting.

Director Oneto asked why the required audit was not submitted timely. Ms. Miller explained that AT's State Transit Assistance (STA) funding is delayed when ACTC's audit is submitted late. Mr. Gedney confirmed that ACTC's audit has been late for the past two (2) years, noting that the current audit was recently submitted to the State Controller's Office (SCO). He explained that separate auditing firms were used for ACTC and AT following concerns regarding operational shortfalls and reserve transfers characterized as loans that were not repaid. AT's audit, conducted by Macias, Gini & O'Connell (MGO), required extensive analysis and reconciliation of issues identified over several years, contributing to the delay. Mr. Gedney added that the underlying issue was identified during an audit meeting in June 2025 and was followed by a staff transition.

Mr. Gedney explained that delays in ACTC's previous two (2) audits caused the SCO to withhold the fourth-quarter STA payment, which is normally received in September but was not received until December. The delay subsequently affected later payments and contributed to AT's cash flow difficulties. Ms. Miller inquired if the SCO delay in payment was due to AT's audits being late or ACTC's. Mr. Gedney clarified that the payment delay resulted specifically from ACTC's late audit, not AT.

Director Plasse summarized the previous day's discussion regarding addressing AT's cash flow shortfall by front-loading its Local Transportation Fund (LTF) claim. He explained that LTF revenues are received monthly by ACTC and distributed among ACTC, AT, and the Bicycle/Pedestrian (Bike/Ped) Fund. Due to the flexibility of the Bike/Ped Fund, funding could be used to advance AT's LTF claim without increasing its total annual allocation. This would allow AT to address cash flow needs while awaiting STA funding. Chairman Crew asked whether the funds would be repaid once STA funding was received. Director Plasse stated that the arrangement could be structured as a loan or as an advance of AT's annual LTF claim.

Vice Chairman Riordan noted that due to uncertainties regarding the timing of incoming funding, AT would submit a monthly claim to ACTC identifying the amount needed to meet operating expenses. Funding would be authorized through an emergency resolution to be considered at the ACTC meeting. He stated that this approach would preserve AT's reserves, minimize impacts to ACTC's cash flow, and provide AT with sufficient funding to meet its operational obligations.

Mr. Gedney stated that Ms. Miller provided ACTC with AT's estimated monthly operating costs so a check could be prepared for consideration at the ACTC meeting. He noted that the ACTC claims list includes AT's monthly LTF allocation of approximately $73,000, and the additional proposed check would cover the difference between that allocation and AT's estimated monthly operating expenses. Director Staples asked Mr. Gedney if ACTC needed a resolution from the AT board. Mr. Gedney clarified that the AT board only needed to make a formal request for the use of Bike/Ped funds, with the specific findings and language to be addressed at the ACTC meeting.

Chairman Crew returned the discussion to the retroactive approval of the reserve transfer. When the reason for requiring retroactive approval was raised, Director Plasse suggested that discussion be addressed at another time.

> **Motion:** It was moved by Vice Chairman Riordan, seconded by Director Staples, and carried to approve the retroactive transfer of $100,000 in funding from reserves to the operating fund.

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

**#11. Review Pine tree removal quotes, give direction if needed:** Ms. Miller reviewed the staff report, noting that two (2) quotes were received with an approximately $2,000 difference between them. She requested direction from the board regarding whether to proceed and which funding source to use. Director Plasse suggested using the Building/Facilities Reserve, which Ms. Miller confirmed would be appropriate.

Director Plasse recommended proceeding with the tree removal before the parking lot repair and asked about the timeline for the State of Good Repair (SGR)-funded paving project. Ms. Miller stated that Brixco was selected after no additional quotes were received by the August 21 deadline and that work was anticipated to begin the following month. She confirmed that the tree removal could be funded through the Building Reserve. Director Oneto recommended verifying all required licenses and insurance and requiring completion of the tree removal before paving begins. Mr. Regadanz noted that the low bidder, Amador Tree Service, could perform the work after business hours or on a weekend to

minimize operational impacts and that alternate bus parking was available nearby. Director Oneto also confirmed that the tree removal quotes appeared reasonable.

Ms. Miller asked whether the board wished to proceed with the $4,500 quote from Amador Tree Service for the tree removal.

> **Motion:** It was moved by Director Oneto, seconded by Director Staples, and carried to approve the quote for tree removal from Amador Tree Service in the amount of $4,500, using funding from the building reserve account and to ensure the contract stipulates all work will be completed prior to the paving project commencement.

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

**#12. AT Staff verbal reports:** Ms. Miller reported that Brixco was selected as the contractor for the parking lot repair and repaving project and that the project will move forward.

**#13. Approve Monthly Claims List:** Director Plasse stated that he was reviewing expenditures for potential cost savings to improve AT's cash flow and questioned the effectiveness of its advertising and marketing expenses. He noted that approximately $900 was spent under Advertising & Marketing and suggested using methods such as discount codes to measure whether advertising efforts increase ridership. Ms. Miller agreed that this could be explored and noted that the current annual advertising budget is approximately $12,000, which has been reduced from prior years.

Director Plasse suggested increasing the use of social media advertising, particularly Facebook, as a potential strategy to reach younger riders given the decline in youth ridership. The board discussed the audiences reached through social media, radio, and television advertising. Ms. Miller confirmed that AT has a Facebook account with approximately 800 followers and stated that a portion of the existing advertising budget could be shifted toward social media. The board also discussed social media advertising methods and associated costs.

Vice Chairman Riordan supported evaluating the effectiveness of AT's current advertising without creating a burdensome process and suggested adding language to advertisements that would allow AT to track rider responses. He noted that simply diversifying advertising would not determine whether existing efforts are effective. The board discussed preliminary findings from the Cambridge Systematics study indicating limited benefits from advertising. Chairman Crew suggested that temporarily reducing advertising could help determine its impact on ridership. Ms. Miller explained that some level of advertising is necessary for grant reporting and that 5310 grant funds reimburse eligible advertising expenses. Director Plasse suggested evaluating whether those grant funds could be used more effectively for other eligible expenses.

Director Plasse questioned the $942 expenditure under line item 52500 - Facility Security System and asked Ms. Miller to evaluate whether the expense was appropriate for AT's security needs. He also asked Mr. Regadanz about current tire pricing. Mr. Regadanz stated that he had not recently compared prices, and the board discussed recent tire purchases and discounts available through local vendors.

During public comment, Ms. Jamie Lubenko, Amador County Board of Supervisors Elect – District 5, suggested utilizing the local radio station's in-house social media marketing services to produce

advertising videos for AT. She noted that reallocating a portion of the marketing budget to professionally produced social media content could be beneficial and would avoid adding the time-intensive task of video production to existing staff workloads.

**Motion:** It was moved by Director Staples, seconded by Director Plasse, and carried to approve the monthly claims list.

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

**#14. Future Agenda Items:**

- Review of Procurement Policy
- Continued discussion on marketing possibilities

**ADJOURNMENT:**

At 9:57 a.m. the Chairman adjourned the regular meeting to Thursday, October 1, 2026 at 9:00 a.m. at 117 Valley View Way, Sutter Creek, CA 95685.

Patrick Crew, Chairman
Amador Transit

ATTEST:

Caitlin Kleven, Recording Clerk

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