

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**



FILED

02/17/26

04:59 PM

A2602013

Application of Brian C. Swanson, AICP for
Rehearing of Resolution T-17900.

**APPLICATION OF BRIAN C. SWANSON, AICP
FOR REHEARING OF RESOLUTION T-17900**

LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit A – January 1, 2026 Public Comment on Draft Resolution T-17900 (Redacted)

Exhibit B – January 15, 2026 Oral Public Comment Script (Business Meeting, Item 41;
Resolution T-17900)

Exhibit C – April 16, 2025 Public Comment on CCTA Countywide Broadband Strategic Plan
(Redacted)

Filed by:

Brian C. Swanson, AICP
69 Ayamonte Court
San Ramon, California 94583
(925) 785-4013 - mobile
briancswanson.fed@gmail.com

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Application of Brian C. Swanson, AICP for
Rehearing of Resolution T-17900.

**APPLICATION OF BRIAN C. SWANSON, AICP
FOR REHEARING OF RESOLUTION T-17900**

Exhibit A

January 1, 2026 Public Comment on Draft Resolution T-17900 (Redacted)



Brian Swanson <briancswanson.fed@gmail.com>

Public Comment (Batch Message 1 of 4): Draft Resolution T-17900- Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) - West Contra Costa County Project and CCTA - East Contra Costa County Project

1 message

Brian Swanson <briancswanson.fed@gmail.com>

Thu, Jan 1, 2026 at 3:56 PM

To: angela.beane@cpuc.ca.gov, Federal Funding Account <federalfundingaccount@cpuc.ca.gov>

Cc: "Ellis, Maria" <maria.ellis@cpuc.ca.gov>

Bcc:

[Redacted content]



California Public Utilities Commission:

My name is Brian Swanson, AICP, a certified planner with extensive experience coordinating the planning, design, environmental review, construction, and mitigation monitoring of terrestrial long-haul and last-mile fiber-optic systems in

both rural and urban environments, as well as submarine cable systems connecting California to East Asia. I also have substantial experience evaluating transportation impacts and the operational behavior of transportation agencies.

My comments pertain specifically to the **Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) – West Contra Costa County** and **CCTA – East Contra Costa County** projects included in Draft Resolution T-17900.

I. PUBLIC ACCESS, TRANSPARENCY, AND ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD INTEGRITY

In addition to the California Public Utilities Commission's (CPUC) noticing requirements, all public comments, staff reports, attachments, and application materials must be permanently visible and easily accessible on the CPUC website:

- Posted adjacent to the specific agenda item,
- In HTML and searchable PDF formats,
- Reachable within one or two clicks,
- With link integrity actively maintained.

This ensures that interested parties can locate, review, and verify the administrative record without unnecessary barriers. CPUC precedent and basic principles of procedural fairness require nothing less.

II. MATERIAL ERRORS: CONFLATION OF EAST AND WEST COUNTY PROJECTS

The draft resolution conflates two entirely separate CCTA projects—one located in West Contra Costa County and the other in East Contra Costa County. While cross-jurisdictional support may indeed exist in theory, its relevance is moot because each project is geographically, operationally, and programmatically distinct. Support must therefore be evaluated within the specific project area, not across unrelated jurisdictions.

The resolution incorrectly attributes support from jurisdictions that have no immediate geographic relationship to each project. This misalignment materially alters the perceived level of regional support and misrepresents the administrative record.

Examples include:

- Antioch, Pittsburg, and Brentwood—all East County jurisdictions—are cited as supporting the West County project.
- El Cerrito and Hercules—both West County jurisdictions—are cited as supporting the East County project.

Even if these jurisdictions expressed general support for broadband expansion, such support cannot be used to justify or validate a project located in a different sub-region of the county. Each project must stand on its own merits (and, in theory, compete against others) within its geographic and community context.

The resolution's current language overstates regional consensus by implying endorsements that do not apply to the specific project areas under review. This factual error must be corrected to maintain the integrity of the Commission's findings.

III. TRANSPORTATION AGENCIES RARELY APPLY FOR BROADBAND EQUITY FUNDING

It is highly unusual for a transportation authority to pursue broadband funding with the stated purpose of serving unserved or underserved communities. In practice:

- Transportation agencies primarily use fiber as the backbone infrastructure for Intelligent Transportation Systems.
- In CCTA's case, this most likely supports its Countywide Smart Signals Program, which is designed to increase vehicle throughput and speeds on major arterials and collectors throughout Contra Costa County.
- These facilities often create or reinforce physical and social barriers within communities—particularly disadvantaged ones.

The draft resolution does not meaningfully discuss CCTA's actual intent, purpose, or need, nor does it reconcile the tension between ITS objectives and broadband equity objectives. Stakeholders are denied an honest review of what these projects will actually do.

IV. EQUITY AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION IMPACTS ARE IGNORED

While ownership, right-of-way, and construction efficiencies may overlap between broadband deployment and transportation infrastructure, the draft resolution omits the equity implications of CCTA's approach.

Transportation is typically the second- or third-largest household expense, and disadvantaged communities depend heavily on low-cost, active modes—walking, bicycling, and transit. Yet:

- There is no discussion of existing active transportation conditions along the proposed routes.
- There is no analysis of how increased vehicle speeds and throughput will affect communities that rely on non-automobile modes.
- There is no acknowledgment of the responsibility to maintain, fund, and improve safe and comfortable active transportation facilities when installing new broadband infrastructure that is intended to increase vehicle throughput and speeds.

The arterials and collector roads where CCTA proposes to use a fiber backbone to increase vehicle throughput and speeds will instead *rip* through disadvantaged communities, replicating the harms of past transportation decisions.

Historical examples include:

- I-980 in Oakland, which severed West Oakland from downtown and remains a symbol of transportation-driven inequity.
- The Embarcadero Freeway in San Francisco created a physical and social barrier until its removal.
- Numerous other mid-century freeway projects fractured communities, suppressed economic mobility, and created long-term environmental burdens.

CCTA's proposal, absent any commitment to maintain, improve, or install safe active transportation infrastructure, risks repeating these patterns and creating new barriers to social and economic success in the very communities that broadband equity programs are intended to support.

A broadband-equity program cannot be used to accelerate vehicle speeds through disadvantaged neighborhoods without simultaneously addressing the safety and mobility needs of those communities.

V. DOCUMENTED PATTERN OF MISREPRESENTING BROADBAND EQUITY PROGRAMS

This is not the first time CCTA has distorted the purpose of a broadband grant program intended for unserved or underserved communities.

My April 16, 2025, public comment (attached) details CCTA's misuse of CPUC Local Agency Technical Assistance (LATA) funding to analyze ITS infrastructure gaps rather than broadband service gaps. The same pattern appears to be repeating here.

Given the significant funding at stake, the Commission must scrutinize CCTA's representations with care.

VI. RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO DRAFT RESOLUTION T 17900

To ensure accuracy, transparency, and alignment with the statutory purpose of the California Advanced Services Fund (CASF), I respectfully request that the Commission incorporate the following changes into Draft Resolution T 17900:

1. Correct the Misattribution of Jurisdictional Support

Revise all sections that imply or state that East County jurisdictions support the West County project, and vice versa. Support must be attributed only to jurisdictions with an immediate geographic relationship to the project area.

2. Add a Clear Statement of CCTA's Actual Project Purpose

The resolution must explicitly distinguish between:

- Broadband-equity objectives intended by CASF, and
- Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) objectives that increase vehicle throughput and speeds.

3. Require Disclosure and Analysis of Equity and Active Transportation Impacts

Add a new subsection requiring CCTA to:

- Identify existing active transportation facilities along proposed routes,
- Evaluate how increased vehicle speeds and throughput will affect disadvantaged communities, and
- Describe mitigation measures or infrastructure improvements to ensure safe walking and bicycling.

4. Require Correction of All Maps, Tables, and Narrative Descriptions

All geographic references, project descriptions, and jurisdictional listings must be corrected to reflect accurately:

- The project boundaries,
- The communities served,
- The jurisdictions providing actual support.

5. Require CCTA to Demonstrate Compliance With CASF Program Intent

The resolution should require CCTA to:

- Provide evidence that the proposed projects serve **unserved or underserved communities**,
- Demonstrate that the project is not primarily an ITS infrastructure enhancement, and
- Explain how the project avoids replicating past transportation-driven inequities.

6. Require Posting of All Materials in HTML and Searchable PDF Formats

The resolution should explicitly require that:

- All public comments, staff reports, attachments, and application materials be posted in HTML and searchable PDF.
- All materials must be placed adjacent to the agenda item.
- Link integrity must be actively maintained.

VII. CONCLUSION

Draft Resolution T 17900 requires correction and clarification before adoption. The conflation of East and West County projects, the mischaracterization of local support, the absence of a clear articulation of CCTA's true intent, and the complete omission of equity and active transportation impacts undermine the integrity of the administrative record and the purpose of the CASF program.

Thank you for your attention to meaningful equity concerns.

Sincerely,

Brian Swanson, AICP
San Ramon, California

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on **January 1, 2026**, I served the foregoing **Public Comment on Draft Resolution T-17900** by transmitting a true and correct copy via electronic mail to the following:

- [CASF Service List](#)
- angela.beane@cpuc.ca.gov
- federalaccount@cpuc.ca.gov

The CASF Service List used for service was downloaded on January 1, 2026, from the hyperlink provided in the December 12, 2025 Notice of Availability of Draft Resolution T 17900. The first field of the downloaded list shows a date of November 7, 2025, which I relied on as the most current version available from the Commission at the time of service.

Due to standard email sending limitations, service to the 1,537 email addresses in the CASF Service List was completed in four separate email messages, each containing a portion of the list. I attempted to transmit all four messages on January 1, 2026. Barring any email delivery service issues, service was completed before 5:00 p.m. on that date.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed January 1, 2026, before 5:00 p.m. San Ramon, California

/s/ Brian Swanson
Brian Swanson, AICP

On Fri, Dec 12, 2025 at 12:21 PM TD_AR <td_ar@cpuc.ca.gov> wrote:

December 12, 2025

NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY

TO: [CASF Service List](#)

This is [Draft Resolution T-17900](#) of the Communications Division. This Draft Resolution will appear on the agenda at the next Commission meeting to be held January 15, 2026, which is at least 30 days after the date of this letter. The Commission may vote on this Resolution at that time, or it may postpone a vote until a later meeting. To confirm when the item will be heard, please see the Business Meeting agenda, which is posted on the Commission's website 10 days before each Business Meeting. When the Commission votes on a Draft Resolution, it may adopt all or part of it as written, amend, modify, or set it aside and prepare a different Resolution. Only when the Commission acts does the Resolution become binding on the parties.

Any member of the public may serve comments on the Draft Resolution as provided in Public Utilities Code, § 311(g) and Rule 14.5 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (Rules).

Comments along with a certificate of service (COS) shall be sent via email to: the [CASF Service List](#), angela.beane@cpuc.ca.gov, and federalaccount@cpuc.ca.gov by January 1, 2026, at 5:00 PM.

Those submitting comments on the Draft Resolution must serve their comments on the entire service list the Draft Resolution was served to on the same date that the comments

are submitted to the Communications Division.

Comments shall focus on factual, legal, or technical errors in the proposed Draft Resolution. Comments that merely reargue positions taken in the advice letter or protests will be accorded no weight and are not to be submitted. Comments should list the recommended changes to the Draft Resolution.

Replies to comments must be submitted no later than January 6, 2026. Replies shall be submitted and served in the same manner as opening comments.

Sincerely,

/s/

Maria Ellis

Director for Broadband Initiatives

Communications Division

California Public Utilities Commission

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I have, by e mail, this day served a copy of a notice letter informing the service list for Resolution T-17900, of the availability of this draft Resolution for public comments at the Commission's web site <https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/>

December 12, 2025, at San Francisco, California

/s/AARON CLARK

Aaron Clark

NOTICE

Parties should notify the Communications Division, Third Floor, California Public Utilities Commission, 505 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102, of any change of address to ensure that they continue to receive documents. You must indicate the Resolution number on the service list on which your name appears.

 **04.16.2025 - BSwanson_Public Comment_ CCTA_AuthorityBoardMeeting_Item #9A_ Countywide Broadband Strategic Plan_Redacted.pdf**
394K

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Application of Brian C. Swanson, AICP for
Rehearing of Resolution T-17900.

**APPLICATION OF BRIAN C. SWANSON, AICP
FOR REHEARING OF RESOLUTION T-17900**

Exhibit B

January 15, 2026 Oral Public Comment Script (Business Meeting, Item 41; Resolution T-17900)

One-Minute Public Comment – Item #41 - CPUC Updated Resolution T-17900 –

January 15, 2026

Good morning Commissioners. My name is Brian Swanson a taxpayer, voter, and resident of Contra Costa County, California.

I need to place a procedural concern on the record. The staff summary of my January 1 written comments on pages 15–16 of Item #41, Resolution T-17900 is not merely incomplete — it is **materially misleading**. Staff reduced a detailed, evidence-supported analysis of the Contra Costa Transportation Authority’s conduct to a single vague reference about ‘equity implications for transportation infrastructure.’ That is not an accurate representation of what I submitted, and it deprives the Commission of the ability to evaluate the issues I raised.

My comments documented a pattern of CCTA repeatedly distorting the purpose of CPUC broadband programs to advance transportation-throughput objectives — objectives that historically sever disadvantaged communities, increase vehicle speeds on arterials, and create long-term physical and social barriers. These are precisely the communities the Federal Funding Account is intended to prioritize.

I also submitted an attachment detailing CCTA’s prior misuse of other CPUC grant programs. Staff omitted that entirely. And the Resolution continues to rely on letters of support from jurisdictions outside the project areas, which misstates the level of local alignment.

I respectfully urge each Commissioner to read my full written comments and attachments yourselves. The staff summary does not reflect the substance of my filing and fails to inform the Commission of the actual equity, jurisdictional, and program-integrity concerns raised by these projects.

Please do not authorize broadband infrastructure that functions, in practice, as transportation infrastructure — infrastructure that will sever, bifurcate, and permanently diminish the physical and social cohesion of the very disadvantaged communities this program is supposed to protect.

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Application of Brian C. Swanson, AICP for
Rehearing of Resolution T-17900.

**APPLICATION OF BRIAN C. SWANSON, AICP
FOR REHEARING OF RESOLUTION T-17900**

Exhibit C

April 16, 2025 Public Comment on CCTA Countywide Broadband Strategic Plan (Redacted)



Brian Swanson <briancswanson@gmail.com>

Public Comment: Item #9A: Countywide Broadband Strategic Plan - Authority Board Meeting - April 16, 2025

1 message

Brian Swanson <briancswanson@gmail.com>

Tue, Apr 15, 2025 at 4:59 PM

To: Jaclyn Reyes <jreyes@ccta.net>

Cc: Council City <citycouncil@sanramon.ca.gov>, planningcommission@sanramon.ca.gov, gjury@contracosta.courts.ca.gov, maria.ellis@cpuc.ca.gov, brewster.fong@cpuc.ca.gov, cheryl.mccormick@dof.ca.gov, julie.munekawa@cpuc.ca.gov, angie.williams@cpuc.ca.gov, broadband.techassist@cpuc.ca.gov, broadbandcaseworkers@cpuc.ca.gov, middlemile@state.ca.gov, bryan.beyer@dot.gov, elias.karam@dot.ca.gov,

[REDACTED]

Dear Authority Board Members:

These comments pertain to Item #9A: Countywide Broadband Strategic Plan of your April 16, 2025 meeting. They resemble many of the comments I previously made before and after the March 20, 2025, Technical Coordinating Committee Meeting, which may not have been delivered to committee members or posted in full to the CCTA meeting archive website, bringing into question ALL CCTA's meeting policy and public comment procedures, recent changes specifically to the Planning Committee meeting public comment policies, including "read aloud or summarized, as specified by the Chair," and compliance in full. Please also review my public comments for the April 16, 2026, Authority Board Meeting regarding Advisory Committee Appointments, Regional Coordination, Transparency, Public Engagement, and Electronic Record Maintenance.

These comments must be visible, easily found, and accessible (limiting the number of "clicks" to access) to all interested parties and the public in perpetuity in HTML (link integrity and functionality must be judiciously maintained, kept current, and/or updated, as needed) and PDF format.

As per the normative CCTA non-transparent procedure, the Countywide Broadband Strategic Plan is buried in the attached meeting materials. That said, the Executive Summary is a complete *snow job*. This so-called "*strategic*" plan does not address broadband network service gaps in unserved or underserved communities or attempt to "bridge the digital divide" (see pages 5-8 of 32 at [lata-grantee-manual-062822.pdf](#)). Contra Costa County is generally relatively affluent, and developed areas are **NOT** experiencing gaps in broadband service. At a half million dollars spent, this so-called "*strategic*" document's Comprehensive Vision to "...promote improved internet service..." is neither meaningful nor results-driven. This point is driven home by the statement in CCTA's plan's project purpose section, which blatantly states, "CCTA will explore leveraging existing and planned fiber infrastructure to facilitate broadband expansion." Broadband expansion is not a first priority.

Instead, this is another more pervasive and deliberately hidden effort by CCTA to set up future funding for the City of San Ramon, specifically, the City's Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Master Plan ([San-Ramon-ITS-Master-Plan.pdf](#)) and its fiber backbone along Bollinger Canyon Road (BCR), which purposefully intends to **INCREASE SPEEDS AND TRAFFIC FLOW**. Increasing speeds and traffic flow along BCR, where Complete Streets Initiatives and Policies supposedly exist, contradicts the purpose of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC) Priority Development Area designation and will be incompatible with MTC's Regional Active Transportation Network, which includes segments of BCR. Speeding vehicle traffic **harms the economic development potential of the City of San Ramon's "downtown."** The San Ramon City Council should be encouraging the use of BCR Iron Horse Trail (IHT) Overcrossing by implementing traffic calming measures (specifically not widening and increasing speeds and traffic flow) and providing active transportation infrastructure connections along BCR and in and around its civic facilities, including City Hall, Community Center, Central Park, City Library, Sports Basement (a community bicycling activity provider), and even City Center Bishop Ranch.

CCTA also continues to reinforce the City of San Ramon's lack of a coordinated approach to transportation by its purposeful decision to have two City of San Ramon representatives who are responsible for traffic and transportation issues, not community development or housing, that disproportionately dominated the CCTA's Broadband Advisory Group, who was supposed to provide meaningful guidance to the consultant preparing the Countywide Broadband Strategic Plan. The assignment of two San Ramon members is not a coincidence. Neither is it a coincidence that the CCTA consultant who prepared this so-called **"strategic"** plan is the same one who prepared the City of San Ramon's ITS Master Plan. Project 10.1, identified as the second highest priority project in Table E-3 in the Executive Summary, is situated in relatively recently developed areas within the City of San Ramon, specifically **NOT** a community underserved by broadband service. Of course, the City of San Ramon's needs can't be the highest priority. That would be overly obvious and **"spill the beans"** on the true intent of this so-called **"strategic"** plan.

Internet Service Providers (ISPs) know precisely where they will gain a substantial return on investment in building out their physical networks and gain relatively price-agnostic (due mainly to the limited competition among ISPs within California) long-term paying customers. Given a San Ramon household's average disposable income and as a resident that has coordinated the planning, design, permitting, and construction of both international submarine and terrestrial interstate, intrastate, local/middle-mile, and last-mile broadband networks for all types of network developers and service providers, I can assure you that broadband service is **NOT** lacking within the City of San Ramon, especially given the relative age of development in the areas identified in Table E-3 of the Executive Summary. Except for any adverse terrain issues, which can potentially complicate installation, broadband service is also **FAR** from lacking in Orinda—the location of the highest priority project, Project 2.1, listed in Table E-3 of the Executive Summary. The segment of Camino Pablo in Orinda between Brookwood Road and Miner Road is a collector road, not reaching into properties of significant acreage, which, similar to San Ramon, indicates considerable wealth, specifically **NOT** underserved by any measure. A golf course exists at the intersection of Camino Pablo and Miner Road. Classifying these communities as underserved is **"pure comedy."**

Again, this so-called **"strategic"** plan concerns ITS deployment and installing fiber optic cable to support signal timing coordination and other traffic system needs. It is no mistake that **roads** designate the projects identified in the Executive Summary and that it hides the County's relative affluence, providing relatively few clues as to the communities involved by only labeling the jurisdictions or the "legal" entities. Also, while it may be cost-prohibitive, although certainly **NOT** for San Ramon- or Orinda-based customers, the Executive Summary does not mention the increasing availability of comparable satellite service via Dish or other higher-speed service providers.

All the above points to a more significant core issue: the Executive Summary focuses on reducing CCTA's ITS infrastructure gaps, specifically **NOT** filling broadband service gaps in unserved or underserved communities. CCTA, through its consultant, is using a needs-based program to pay for additional analysis of the County's ITS infrastructure gaps, as evidenced by heavy reference to the CCTA's Countywide Smart Signals Program. (The maps included in the Executive Summary do not identify their source. Nor does the basemapping include topography or development intensity.) The purpose of CCTA's utilizing grant funding from the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) Local Agency Technical Assistance (LATA) Program couldn't be **further** than providing unserved or underserved communities with broadband service and bridging the "digital divide."

If you overlay the maps depicting each CCTA's Countywide Strategic Broadband Plan and Smart Signals Program and the City's ITS Master Plan "on top of one another," which CCTA, of course, has not produced publicly, you will observe the **undeniable overlap and correlation**. How relatively short, limited, or specific purpose-only segments (only valuable for CCTA, where no connections to institutions are noted, only generally referred to - very low-value utility to all other parties other than CCTA) dominate CCTA's documented priorities (This is in part a result of the fact that while ITS infrastructure relies heavily on a fiber-optic cable backbone, although wireless technologies can also be used.), not longer community pairs, or entire communities. (CCTA does display other purpose networks that more logically serve a broader community, precisely Caltrans' needs, to confuse its underlying purpose.) While Caltrans facilities are a beneficial base resource, given their wide disturbed or paved rights-of-way, nothing prevents broadband network developers from finding other routes if they are willing to obtain approvals and permits. Even more to the point, in a recent presentation to the CCTA Technical Coordinating Committee, CCTA staff attempted to assert that the purpose of its broadband plan is to

provide unserved or underserved communities with broadband service specifically focused on the areas surrounding Mount Diablo. While it's a no-brainer that wireline broadband service may be lacking in the Mount Diablo vicinity, mainly due to adverse terrain and the resulting installation difficulties, it is highly doubtful that property owners in this specific area and in the City, with their high relative disposable income, are going without broadband service. **To assert such a claim is pure comedy.**

I sincerely hope Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc., who, given my broadband network development knowledge and experience, does not have considerable experience consulting on countywide community-serving broadband network projects, conferred with the CPUC Program staff before this perverse distortion of the plain-meaning requirements detailed in the CPUC award letter of June 30, 2023, signed by Maria I. Ellis ([Contra Costa Transportation Authority LATA award \(1\).pdf](#)) for this highly oversubscribed needs-based funding program. In fact if you review the current maps CPUC relies on for its Federal Funding Account Programs (<https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/9fb1e88c59c44178b1768c1f03d77543/page/Page>), in which the LATA Program was the precursor, you will find very few underserved communities in Contra Costa County.

ITS and broadband services to unserved and underserved communities can be jointly developed and co-located. However, that effort requires **enormous** coordination, which is not CCTA's strong suit. Still, the document's Executive Summary claims about this potential connection between these two issues are **laughable**. It is more probable that Contra Costa County's and each separate jurisdiction's community development and housing specialists are more knowledgeable of where broadband service gaps exist if not non-profits like #OaklandUndivided and the Center for Accessible Technology (see [New Training Resources for CPUC Engagement on Broadband – and Beyond - California Forward](#)), precisely not a money-hungry City of San Ramon transportation services division manager and senior traffic engineer.

The so-called Countywide Broadband Strategic Plan is not one bit **"strategic."** It takes blatant advantage of the substantially oversubscribed CPUC LATA Program, which is needs-based and mainly intended for unserved and underserved populations, anchor institutions, tribal entities, and agricultural regions. CCTA's use of this CPUC LATA grant funding for selfish parochial interests promulgated in this so-called **"strategic"** plan could intensely sour the CPUC's taste for potentially awarding related program funding to other transportation agencies whose interests, capabilities, experience, existing business model are indeed genuinely focused on bridging the digital divide, not just on signal timing, or limited utility ITS infrastructure.

I fully comprehend CCTA's role in providing transportation infrastructure within the County, but attempting to ensure broadband service to unserved and underserved communities is outside its limited experience. The same is true for providing public transportation service, save for the minimal scope of autonomous shuttle pilots, which contractors, not CCTA staff, operate. Specifically, these are time-limited PILOTS, not yet long-term self-sustaining services. This Executive Summary proves CCTA's glaring lack of experience in complex program or project coordination and persistent heavy reliance on outside consultants in planning, design, environmental review, value engineering, risk assessment, construction, compliance, and operations. CCTA's insufficient knowledge, skills, abilities, experience, and propensity to be **brain-numbingly counterproductive and arrogant is displayed plain as day**. CCTA's approach to using CPUC LATA grant funds to analyze the gaps in its Countywide Smart Signals Program is almost a carbon copy of its modus operandi in supporting and funding contradictory and counterproductive transportation infrastructure within the City of San Ramon (**unproductive habits are difficult to break**).

This Executive Summary is also an extraordinary display of CCTA's lack of transparency, a gross and perverse distortion of the purpose of the CPUC LATA grant, and a misinterpretation of the data that grantees should use to identify broadband service gaps. Instead, the CCTA has used CPUC LATA funding to identify and analyze gaps in its Smart Signals Program and, specifically, to bring more certainty to the City of San Ramon's only remaining significant transportation infrastructure project need based on its current poorly communicated long-term vision to install the fiber backbone to support its signal timing coordination needs along BCR, which will further increase speeds and traffic flow along BCR, again, contradicting the explicit purpose of the BCR Iron Horse Trail (IHT) Overcrossing, ignoring both MTC's Priority Designation Area and inclusion of BCR in the MTC's Regional Active Transportation Network, and potentially providing a yet another (for a total of five recent or future) lost opportunity to take advantage of construction crew mobilizations to install connecting safe and comfortable active transportation infrastructure in and around the BCR IHT Overcrossing and City Hall.

In direct contradiction to Mr. Hoang's remarks made during his presentation of the Item during the March 20, 2025 meeting, the CPUC's LATA is **ALL** about economics, a community's, and more importantly, a family's disposable income which could be spent on broadband service. Please review the other grantee's awarded CPUC LATA grants (see [webposting-with-awarded-021224-\(4\).pdf](#)), recognizing the high speeds, not specific needs, being sought and the fact that CCTA is the **ONLY** transportation authority grant recipient (meaning it must set an example, not lead with arrogant parochial interests). CPUC's project summary of CCTA's project mentions nothing about smart signal timing coordination gaps (yes, based on specific applications, wireless technology CAN be used, but the backbone is critical). The other grantees focus explicitly on analyzing and providing **COMMUNITY** service, not filling ITS infrastructure or single timing gaps. Mr. Hoang, in his presentation, also gave the wrong impression to Authority Board members relative to the

purpose of the CPUC's Federal Funding Account and Broadband Equity, Access, and Deployment (BEAD) Program, managed by the National Telecommunication and Information Administration (NTIA). The CPUC's Federal Funding Account and BEAD Program's explicit purpose, if not more focused on actually unserved and underserved communities, is very similar to the CPUC LATA Program, the earlier incarnation of the Federal Funding Account program, specifically not ITS infrastructure or smart signal timing.

CCTA's continued lack of transparency, gross and perverse distortion of program purpose and data, and persistent kowtowing to the City of San Ramon's incoherent, typically wasteful, contradictory and counterproductive efforts and funding demands only lead to more distrust in government at all levels by Contra Costa County taxpayers, especially at a time when all government funding is uncertain due to concerns of waste, fraud, and abuse.

Given the recent attention the National Telecommunications and Information Administration's Broadband, Equity, Access, and Deployment (BEAD) Program has received, imagine the potential field day Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation Chairman Texas Senator Ted Cruz would have making CCTA the Nation's laughing stock on broadband and transportation issues. (Simultaneously drawing his attention to the San Francisco Bay Area's proposed regional tax measure.)

Thank you for considering responsible good governance and real-world perspective.

Sincerely,

Brian Swanson, AICP
San Ramon, California

If CCTA administrative staff will try to redact my email address before posting these comments publicly, please make sure the effort is complete. A complete effort usually means not only "blacking out my email in the address header" but also just below, where CCTA's email system notes it does not often receive messages from my email address (just above the "[External Email]" warning).

On Thu, Apr 10, 2025 at 3:55 PM Contra Costa Transportation Authority <info@ccta.net> wrote:

Contra Costa Transportation Authority
Meeting Update

[View this email in your browser](#)

Greetings,

The Authority Board regular meeting agenda for the meeting on **April 16, 2025 at 6:00 PM** is now available at [ccta.net](https://www.ccta.net).

The Authority Board meeting will be accessible in-person, via telephone, and live-streaming to all members of the public. For participation, please refer to the below Teleconferencing Special Notice, which can also be located on the agenda.

To observe the meeting by audiocast live stream, please use the link to the Public Meetings webpage on the Authority's website at <https://www.ccta.net/public-meetings/>.

To observe the meeting by teleconference, please click the link at the noticed meeting time: <https://ccta-net.zoom.us/j/84333580300?pwd=S5zCOoJCE5epWTgfCZkrEQZ6TXxebI.1> and use Passcode 600388.

Instructions on how to join a teleconference are available at <https://support.zoom.us/hc/en-us/articles/201362193%0a-Joining-a-Meeting>.

To observe the meeting by phone, please call 1 (669) 900 9128 at the noticed meeting time, then

enter the Webinar ID: 843 3358 0300. When asked for a participant id or code, press #.

Instructions on how to join a meeting by phone are available at <https://support.zoom.us/hc/en-us/articles/201362663%0a-Joining-a-meeting-by-phone>.

How to Submit Public Comments:

1. Members of the public may submit written public comments by emailing jreyes@ccta.net with the Agenda item number identified in the subject line of the email. For example: "Public Comment - Not on the Agenda" or "Public Comment - Agenda Item #". All written comments should be 350 words max, which corresponds to approximately 3 minutes of speaking time. Public comments received by 5:00 PM the day before the scheduled meeting will be distributed to the Authority Board members before the meeting and posted on the Authority's website; comments submitted after that time will be distributed to the Authority Board members and posted as soon as possible. Written public comments received after this 5:00 PM cutoff time will be distributed to the Authority Board members and eventually posted to the website but only if received before the start of the meeting.

2. To comment by video conference, click the "Raise Your Hand" button to request to speak when the Public Comment period is opened on an Agenda item. You will then be unmuted when it is your turn to make your comments for up to 3 minutes. After the allotted time, you will then be re-muted. Instructions for how to "Raise Your Hand" are available at <https://support.zoom.us/hc/en-us/articles/205566129-Raising-your-hand-in-webinars-and-meetings>.

3. To comment by phone, you will be prompted to "Raise Your Hand" by pressing "*9" to request to speak when the public comment is opened on an Agenda item. You will then be unmuted when it is your turn to make your comments for up to 3 minutes. After the allotted time, you will then be re-muted.

4. To comment in-person, please complete a Public Speaker card and hand it to the Clerk of the Board.

The Authority cannot guarantee that the public's access to Zoom via phone or other device or the livestream via YouTube will be uninterrupted, and technical difficulties may occur from time to time. Unless required by the Brown Act, the meeting will continue in-person despite technical difficulties for participants using the Zoom or YouTube option.

Thank you. Stay safe!

Copyright © 2025 Contra Costa Transportation Authority, All rights reserved.

You are receiving this email because you expressed an interest in staying informed about the activities of the Contra Costa Transportation Authority.

Our mailing address is:
Contra Costa Transportation Authority
2999 Oak Road, Suite 100
Walnut Creek, CA 94597

[Add us to your address book](#)

[unsubscribe from this list](#) [update subscription preferences](#)

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Application of Brian C. Swanson, AICP for
Rehearing of Resolution T-17900.

**APPLICATION OF BRIAN C. SWANSON, AICP
FOR REHEARING OF RESOLUTION T-17900**

VERIFICATION / DECLARATION

I, Brian Swanson, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the facts stated in this Application for Rehearing are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.

Executed on February 17, 2026, at San Ramon, California.

/s/ Brian C. Swanson

Brian C. Swanson, AICP
69 Ayamonte Court
San Ramon, California 94583
(925) 785-4013 - mobile
briancswanson.fed@gmail.com