CAHILL GORDON & REINDEL LLP
SUITE 950
1990 K STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006-1181

TELEPHONE (202) 862-8900
FACSIMILE (202) 862-8958

EIGHTY PINE STREET
NEW YORK, N.Y. 10005-1702
(212) 701-3000
FAX: (212) 269-5420

AUGUSTINE HOUSE
6A AUSTIN FRIARS
LONDON, ENGLAND EC2N 2HA
(011) 44.20.7920.9800
FAX: (011) 44.20.7920.9825

CHÉRIE R. KISER | 202-862-8950 | ckiser@cgrdc.com

April 19, 2010

Via Electronic Filing

Elizabeth Rolando
Chief Clerk
Illinois Commerce Commission
527 East Capitol Avenue
Springfield, IL 62701

Re: Docket No. 08-0550

Dear Ms. Rolando:

Intrado Inc. ("Intrado"), by its attorneys, respectfully submits this supplement to update the Illinois Commerce Commission with respect to recent actions applicable to the above-referenced case.

On December 2, 2009, Verizon submitted as supplemental authority a copy of an Arbitrators' Order from the Texas arbitration proceeding between Intrado and Verizon Southwest. In response to a motion for reconsideration filed by Intrado, the Public Utility Commission of Texas issued an order on February 4, 2010 granting the motion for reconsideration and remanding the case back to the Arbitrators. The Texas commission found that the Arbitrators' previous decision denying Intrado's request for interconnection "was not based on any evidence" and that issuance of such a decision was "improper." A copy of this order is enclosed as **Attachment 1**. Based on this decision, Intrado and Verizon Southwest are currently filing testimony and preparing for hearings before the Arbitrators on the issue of whether Intrado provides "telephone exchange service" and is entitled to interconnect with Verizon Southwest.

In its supplement dated September 11, 2009, Intrado provided information regarding a decision issued by the North Carolina Utilities Commission in the arbitration between Intrado and AT&T North Carolina. In December 2009, AT&T North Carolina appealed the North Carolina commission's decision to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina.[1] The filings in this court case are a matter of public record, and Intrado would be happy to provide copies upon request.

[1] Case 5:09-cv-00517-BR, *BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. d/b/a AT&T North Carolina v. Finley*, Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief (E.D.N.C. filed Dec. 2, 2009).

On September 16, 2009, Intrado filed a supplement discussing the decision issued by the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio in the arbitration between Intrado and Verizon for Ohio. In that decision, the Ohio commission cites the arbitration proceeding between Intrado and AT&T Ohio. In October 2009, AT&T Ohio appealed the Ohio commission's decision to the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio.[2] The filings in this court case are a matter of public record, and Intrado would be happy to provide copies upon request.

On February 10, 2010, the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission issued an order determining that the interconnection arrangements between AT&T Indiana's 911 network and INdigital's competitive 911 network are governed by Sections 251 and 252, as well as Indiana statutes governing interconnection of communications networks. A copy of this decision is set forth in **Attachment 2**. AT&T has appealed this decision to Indiana state court.

Finally, on April 9, 2010, the Kentucky Public Service Commission ruled that INdigital's competitive 911 service is "telephone exchange service" and ordered AT&T Kentucky to provide interconnection to INdigital in Kentucky pursuant to Section 251(c) of the Act. A copy of this decision is set forth in **Attachment 3**.

If you have any questions concerning this matter, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Chérie R. Kiser

Chérie R. Kiser

Counsel for Intrado Inc.

Attachments

cc: Service List (via electronic mail)

[2] Case 09-CV-00918-ALM-MRA, *The Ohio Bell Telephone Company v. Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, et al.*, Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief (S.D. Ohio filed Oct. 15, 2009).