



**FILED**  
6-22-16  
04:59 PM

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

*In the Matter of the Application of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority for an order authorizing the construction of two-track, at-grade crossing for the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor Project Light Rail Line across West 59<sup>th</sup> Street, Slauson Avenue, West 57<sup>th</sup> Street, West 54<sup>th</sup> Street, West 52<sup>nd</sup> Street, West 50<sup>th</sup> Street and across West 48<sup>th</sup> Street in the City of Los Angeles.*

Application 13-01-012  
(Filed March January 23, 2013)

**MOTION SUBMITTED BY PETITIONER CHANDRA V. MOSLEY  
CONTAINING CORRECTIVE REVISIONS TO THE  
PRE-HEARING TRANSCRIPT DATED MAY 24, 2016 ON THE ABOVE  
REFERENCED MATTER**

Chandra V. Mosley  
Individual  
4113 W. 59<sup>th</sup> Street, Los Angeles CA 90043  
Tel: (323) 823-4566  
E-mail: Bareessence24@hotmail.com

June 22, 2016

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

*In the Matter of the Application of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority for an order authorizing the construction of two-track, at-grade crossing for the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor Project Light Rail Line across West 59<sup>th</sup> Street, Slauson Avenue, West 57<sup>th</sup> Street, West 54<sup>th</sup> Street, West 52<sup>nd</sup> Street, West 50<sup>th</sup> Street and across West 48<sup>th</sup> Street in the City of Los Angeles.*

Application 13-011-012  
(Filed January 23, 2013)

**MOTION SUBMITTED BY PETITIONER CHANDRA V. MOSLEY  
CONTAINING CORRECTIVE REVISIONS TO THE  
PRE-HEARING TRANSCRIPT DATED MAY 24, 2016 ON THE ABOVE  
REFERENCED MATTER**

In accordance with Rule 11.1 C of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedures, this Petitioner Chandra V. Mosley respectfully submit this written Motion to Administrative Law Judge W. Anthony Colbert requesting permission to make corrective revisions to the Pre-Hearing Transcript, dated Tuesday, May 24, 2016 regarding the above matter.

It is this Petitioner's submission that the above referenced Transcript did not reflect entire statements the Petitioner attempted to make. Therefore, it is imperative that all statements of importance are made complete as follows:

1. Page 14, Lines 14 - 16 “When I learned about the application process from Metro it was after May, 2016.”
2. Page 15, Lines 16 - 21, “information was not shared with the community as close as a mile away from the site in which the transit project is being constructed.”
3. Page 16, Lines 23-28, “I was not a party to the current or previous organizations that you have mentioned who were involved in this application process. Also this process was not made known to everyone in the community.”
4. Page 17, Lines 5-7, “ I believe that the businesses along the corridor were probably aware and also individuals whose properties were purchased.”
5. Page 18, Lines 13-19, “Metro responded to my Petition and stated that this project was in compliance with their Grade Crossing Policy for Light Rail Transit. I researched their reference and learned that the “policy” referenced was outdated and changed to Grade Crossing Safety Policy.”
6. Page 20, Lines 6-8, “The Grade Crossing Safety Policy, adopted September 23, 2010, specially states “special attention to schools, parks and social service facilities, areas of high pedestrian activity and anticipated changes in land use or demographics. These analyses will allow for community input, and for the evaluation of subjective community considerations, such as safety and economic development, which do not lend themselves easily to quantitative analysis.” Further, a final determination of each grade crossing or separation decision shall be made by the Metro Board of Directors, based on a balanced evaluation of technical consideration, such as traffic flow and queuing, and community-based consideration, such as public safety and economic development.”

7. Page 26, Lines 23-28, “And when you have a school zone that is congested with over 2,750 students between 48<sup>th</sup> Street and 59<sup>th</sup> Place on both sides of Crenshaw Blvd. that presents a great concern to me as a resident of this community.”
8. Page 27, Line 5, “We have private schools.”
9. Page 29, Lines 16-17, “My argument, your Honor, is that the new Grade Crossing Safety Policy was not appropriately used in Metro’s analysis of the community’s safety concerns as required because Metro used an outdated policy that is no longer in valid.”
10. Page 29, Lines 19-20, “The Commission’s General Order 75D coincides with Metro’s new policy adopted 2010.”
11. Page 55, Lines 11-113, “And it did state that it would be better suited for the Park Mesa Heights segment of the community between 48<sup>th</sup> Street to 59<sup>th</sup> Place.”

Dated: June 22, 2016

Respectfully submitted,

/Chandra V. Mosley/

Chandra V. Mosley

Retired City of Los Angeles Employee]

Individual

Tel: (323) 823-4566

E-mail: Bareessence24@hontial.com