### [Service Date June 3, 2009] BEFORE THE WASHINGTON STATE UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

PAC-WEST TELECOMM, INC.,	) DOCKET UT-053036
Petitioner,	)
v.	
QWEST CORPORATION,	
Respondent.	
•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	)
LEVEL 3 COMMUNICATIONS, LLC,	) DOCKET NO. UT-053039
Petitioner,	)
<b>v.</b>	<ul> <li>) LEVEL 3 COMMUNICATIONS,</li> <li>) LLC's SECOND SUBMISSION OF</li> <li>) SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITY</li> </ul>
QWEST CORPORATION,	)
Respondent.	) )
	)

Level 3 Communications LLC ("Level 3") hereby submits a copy of the following

documents in Consolidated Dockets UT-053039 and UT-053036:

Exhibit E

Order No. 08-1365 in Core Communications v. FCC, -08-262, dated February 12, 2009, setting forth the schedule in the case.

#### DOCKET UT-053039

Level 3 Communications, LLC Second Submission of Supplemental Authority

Dated this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of June, 2009.

By:

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa F. Rackner McDowell & RACKNER PC 520 SW 6th Avenue, Suite 830 Portland, OR 97204 Tel: (503) 595-3925 Fax: (503) 595-3928 <u>lisa@mcd-law.com</u>

Greg L. Rogers, Esq. LEVEL 3 COMMUNICATIONS, LLC 1025 Eldorado Boulevard Broomfield, CO 80021 (Tel) (720) 888-2512; (Fax) (720) 888-5128 greg.rogers@level3.com

Tamar E. Finn Edward W. Kirsch BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP 2020 K Street, NW Washington, DC 20006 (Tel) (202) 373-6117; (Fax) (202) 373-6001 edward.kirsch@bingham.com tamar.finn@bingham.com

ATTORNEYS FOR LEVEL 3 COMMUNICATIONS, LLC

PAGE 2

# Exhibit E

Order No. 08-1365 in Core Communications v. FCC, -08-262, dated February 12, 2009 Case: 08-1365 Document: 01215508072 Page: 1

# United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

## No. 08-1365

## September Term 2008

FCC-08-262 FCC-73FR72732

Filed On: February 12, 2009

Core Communications, Inc.,

Petitioner

٧.

Federal Communications Commission and United States of America,

Respondents

EarthLink, Inc., et al., Intervenors

Consolidated with 08-1393

#### No. 09-1044

People of the State of New York and the Public Service Commission of the State of New York

#### Petitioners

٧.

Federal Communications Commission and United States of America,

Respondents

Consolidated with 09-1046

# United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

### No. 08-1365

## September Term 2008

**BEFORE:** Tatel, Garland, and Griffith, Circuit Judges

### <u>O R D E R</u>

Upon consideration of the motion to intervene filed by the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (NARUC) in No. 08-1365, and the motion to consolidate, the responses thereto, and the reply, it is

**ORDERED** that the motion to consolidate be granted, and the above-captioned cases be consolidated. It is

FURTHER ORDERED that the motion to intervene be granted. It is

**FURTHER ORDERED** that the following briefing schedule will apply in the consolidated cases:

Joint Brief of NARUC, State Petitioners, and any State Intervenors in Support of Petitioners (not to exceed 10,000 words)	March 27, 2009
Joint Brief of Industry Intervenors in Support of Petitioners (not to exceed 8,750 words)	April 10, 2009
Brief of Respondents (not to exceed 20,000 words)	May 1, 2009
Joint Brief of Intervenors in Support of Respondents (not to exceed 8,750 words)	May 15, 2009
Reply Brief of Petitioner Core Communications (not to exceed 7,000 words)	June 5, 2009
Joint Reply Brief of NARUC, State Petitioners, and any State Intervenors in Support of Petitioners (not to exceed 5,000 words)	June 5, 2009

Case: 08-1365 Document: 01215508072 Page: 3

# United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

## No. 08-1365

## September Term 2008

Joint Reply Brief of Industry Intervenors in Support of Petitioners		
(not to exceed 4,375 words)	June 5, 2009	
Deferred Joint Appendix	June 12, 2009	
Final Briefs	June 19, 2009	

The parties are directed to address in their briefs the timeliness of State Petitioners' petitions for review.

The Clerk is directed to schedule oral argument on the first appropriate date following the completion of briefing.

The court reminds the parties that

In cases involving direct review in this court of administrative actions, the brief of the appellant or petitioner must set forth the basis for the claim of standing.... When the appellant's or petitioner's standing is not apparent from the administrative record, the brief must include arguments and evidence establishing the claim of standing.

See D.C. Cir. Rule 28(a)(7).

The parties are strongly encouraged to file and serve their briefs and the appendix by hand on the date due. Filing by mail may delay the processing of the brief. All briefs and the appendix must contain the date the case is scheduled for oral argument at the top of the cover. <u>See</u> D.C. Cir. Rule 28(a)(8).

The parties will be notified by separate order of the oral argument date and the composition of the merits panel.

#### Per Curiam

FOR THE COURT: Mark J. Langer, Clerk

BY: /s/

/s/ Sabrina M. Crisp Deputy Clerk