

Control Number: 51224



Item Number: 39

Addendum StartPage: 0

ADMENDMENT TO 'MR. BLALOCK'S RESPONSE TO MERCY WATER SUPPLY CORPORATION'S MOTION TO COMPEL RESPONSE TO 'MERCY'S FIRST REQUEST OF INFORMATION TO COMPLAINTANT'

This amendment to the original documentation is to act as clarification for statements in the original that Mr. Blalock did not feel were clear enough in what was being said.

For clarification on paragraph two (2). Mr. Blalock believed that he had 10 business days from the time that he received the original Request for Information ("RFI"), and that what the Texas Administrative Code was referring to were days that the offices for the Public Utility Commission ("PUC") would be open.

Amendment to paragraph two (2). Mr. Blalock would like to add that he first informed the lawyers at the Carlton Law firm of his objections the following day after he received the RFI, as noted by the email that the Carlton Law Firm included as an exhibit to their motion to compel response. Mr. Blalock did this so that he and the attorneys representing Mercy Water Supply Corporation ("Mercy") could try and deal with the issue without involving the Administrative Law Judge ("ALJ") first, as is required by Order No. 7. Mr. Blalock waited on a response from the attorneys, but got none. He then filed his response to Mercy Water Supply Corporation's first RFI, which included his objections to each RFI, and was filed within 10 days, not including weekends and/or federal holidays of his receiving the first RFI.

For clarification on Paragraph four (4). Mercy, through their attorneys, have already stated it as fact that Mr. Blalock is not eligible for service nor does he meet the requirements for Membership. So, there is no reasoning they would need anything showing any alleged delinquency of payment Mr. Blalock has with a previous water service provider ("WSP") to determine if Mr. Blalock is eligible to receive service. Mercy has never requested that type of documentation, before the filing of the formal complaint from, nor before they shut-off the meter servicing the Northern Tract, which would mean that it would not have played a part in their decision that led to the formal complaint before the PUC at this time. Therefore, Mr. Blalock believes that it should not play a part in the decision by Commission Staff on if Mercy had acted properly, nor does Mr. Blalock believe that it would have anything to do with Mercy Water Supply Corporation's water service to the Northern and Southern Tracts, nor with the facilities directly used to provide such service.

COMMIS

RECEIVED

However, if the ALJ finds that Mr. Blalock acted outside what is allowed by Commission Rules, the Texas Administrative Code ("TAC"), or the rules and limitations set by Order No. 7 in reference to his objections, then Mr. Blalock will answer the RFIs without reservation.

Respectfully Submitted By, /s/ John Preston Blalock