

Deanne M. O'Dell
717.255.3744
dodell@eckertseamans.com

March 26, 2010

Via Electronic FilingSecretary
PA Public Utility Commission
PO Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265Re: Core Communications, Inc. v. AT&T Communications of Pa., LLC and TCG Pittsburgh, Inc., Docket Nos. C-2009-2108186 and C-2009-2108239

Dear Secretary:

On March 5, 2010, Complainant and Respondents each filed separate Petitions for Interlocutory Review and Answer to Material Questions. In accordance with 52 Pa. Code § 5.302(b), both parties filed their briefs regarding the petitions on March 15, 2010. On the same day, a "Joint Brief of Choice One Communications of Pennsylvania, Inc. and CTC Communications Corp. (collectively, "One") and XO Communications Services, Inc. ("XO")" was filed. One and XO are not parties to this proceeding as there are two separate complaints filed by Core against each which are currently stayed pending resolution of the Material Questions here.

Core questions whether the joint brief filed by XO and One is appropriate under the Commission's rules of procedure for several reasons. First, 52 Pa. Code § 5.302(b) permits parties to file briefs and sets a page limit for the briefs. XO and One are not parties to this case and by permitting this brief, an additional 15 pages has been submitted to support Respondents' position. Second, 52 Pa. Code § 5.502(d) which refers to amicus curiae briefs generally requires the amicus to take the record as submitted. Here, XO and One crafted their own material questions which they then answered.

While Core questions whether the filing of amicus curiae briefs is appropriate in response to a Petition for Interlocutory Review and Answer to Material Question, the fact that XO and One did so makes clear that Commission direction is needed regarding the jurisdictional issues raised by this case. Until such direction is provided, as clearly evidenced by the amicus brief filed here, these carriers have every intention of continuing to take a free ride on Core's network and embroiling Core's attempts to seek assistance from the Commission in prolonged procedural maneuvers with the goal of evading payment obligations. Such a result is not in the public interest and, therefore, Core respectfully asks that the Commission grant its Petition for

Secretary
March 26, 2010
Page 2

Interlocutory Review and make clear that it will assert jurisdiction over the termination of ISP-bound traffic exchanged between two competitive local exchange carriers.

Sincerely yours,



Deanne M. O'Dell, Esq.

DMO/lww

cc: Chairman James H. Cawley
Vice Chairman Wayne E. Gardner
Commissioner Tyrone J. Christy
Commissioner Robert F. Powerlson
Cheryl Walker Davis, OSA
Pamela Polacek, Esquire
Robert Marinko, OSA
Cert. of Service

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE


I hereby certify that this day I served a copy of Core Communications, Inc.'s Letter upon the persons listed below in the manner indicated in accordance with the requirements of 52 Pa. Code Section 1.54.

Via Email and First Class Mail

Michelle Painter, Esq.
Painter Law Firm
13017 Dunhill Dr.
Fairfax, VA 22030
painterlawfirm@verizon.net

Theodore A. Livingston, Esq.
Kara K. Gibney, Esq.
Mayer Brown LLP
71 S. Wacker Dr.
Chicago, IL 60606
tlivingston@mayerbrown.com
kgibney@mayerbrown.com

Dated: March 26, 2010


Deanne M. O'Dell