

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



Pasadena Avenue Monterey Road Committee,

Complainant,

vs.

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority; Los Angeles to Pasadena Metro Blue Line Construction Authority, now known as Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority; and City of South Pasadena

Defendants.

Case No. 06-10-015

Certified Mail

7004 0550 0000 1509 6093 (MetroTransAuthority)

7004 0550 0000 1509 6109 (Metro Blue Line)

7004 0550 0000 1509 6116 (South Pasadena)

INSTRUCTIONS TO ANSWER

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Attn: Roger Snobel, CEO
One Gateway Plaza
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Los Angeles to Pasadena Metro Blue Line Construction Authority
now known as Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority
Attn: Jose E. Guzman, Jr.
Nossaman, Guthner, Knox & Elliott LLP
50 California Street, 34th Street
San Francisco, CA 94111

City of South Pasadena
Attn: Lilian Myers
City Manager
1414 Mission Street
South Pasadena, CA 91030

Dear Defendants:

You are hereby notified that the above-entitled complaint has been filed against you as defendant. You are directed to answer the complaint in writing within 30 days after today. The answer shall be in compliance with Rule 4.4 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. Your answer shall be sent to California Public Utilities Commission, Attn.: Docket Office, 505 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102.

Roger Snobel, CEO, LACMTA
Jose E. Guzman, Jr., Esq., LATPMBLCA
Lilian Myers, City Manager, CSP
Instruction to Answer Letter
October 23, 2006
Page 2

This matter has been assigned to Commissioner Dian M. Grueneich and Administrative Law Judge Anne E. Simon. It has been determined that the complaint will be categorized as Adjudicatory. A hearing will be scheduled by the assigned Administrative Law Judge, unless the matter is otherwise resolved by the parties.

Dated at San Francisco, California this 23rd day of October, 2006.

/ s / ANGELA K. MINKIN

By Martin Nakahara

Angela K. Minkin

Chief Administrative Law Judge

AM/mak

Enclosures: Complaint and Rule 4.4

cc: Complainant

cc via email only, w/o copy of encls.: Cmmr. Grueneich and ALJ Simon

4.4. (Rule 4.4) Answers

The answer must admit or deny each material allegation in the complaint and shall set forth any new matter constituting a defense. Its purpose is to fully advise the complainant and the Commission of the nature of the defense. At least one of the defendants filing an answer must verify it, but if more than one answer is filed in response to a complaint against multiple defendants, each answer must be separately verified. (See Rule 1.11.) The answer should also set forth any defects in the complaint which require amendment or clarification. Failure to indicate jurisdictional defects does not waive these defects and shall not prevent a motion to dismiss made thereafter.

The answer must state any comments or objections regarding the complainant's statement on the need for hearing, issues to be considered, and proposed schedule. The proposed schedule shall be consistent with the categorization of the proceeding, including a deadline for resolving the proceeding within 12 months or less (adjudicatory proceeding) or 18 months or less (ratesetting or quasi-legislative proceeding). (See Article 7.)

Answers must include the full name, address, and telephone number of defendant and the defendant's attorney, if any, and indicate service on all complainants.