

**EXHIBIT BJJ-41 TO THE
DIRECT TESTIMONY OF
BONNIE J. JOHNSON
ON BEHALF OF
INTEGRA TELECOM**

From: Clauson, Karen L.
Sent: Monday, May 23, 2011 3:05 PM
To: 'Hunsucker, Mike R'; Nodland, Jeff; Gardner, Linda K; Hammack, Carolyn; 'New Cr, Cmp'
Cc: Oxley, J. Jeffery; Johnson, Bonnie J.; Denney, Douglas K.; Isaacs, Kimberly D.
Subject: RE: CEMR/MEDIACC and MTG

Mike and Linda:

We appreciate the Company clarifying that one of the two Change Requests (CRs) has been moved from deferred to withdrawn status. As our emails since the Company indicated it would change that CR's status indicate, the Company's plan to nonetheless proceed with its plans means that, despite that change in status of one of the two CRs, our concerns remain unaddressed. The revised timeline that the Company posted to its website last week continues to identify a date of December 12, 2011 for: "Begin Deployment Process": "System . . . Available to CLECs"; "Begin Scheduling Migration Dates." See <http://wholesalecalendar.qwestapps.com/detail/289/2011-03-16>. As indicated in my email below, this timeline is inconsistent with the merger agreements and orders, and the Company's ongoing actions based on this timeline heighten our concerns.

We have been articulating our concerns since the first comment opportunity after Qwest brought its CRs out of deferment status on November 10, 2011. Available to you are CLECs' written comments in CMP, including the matrix, and our emails exchanged both in CMP and with you (see, e.g., email exchanges below). We believe we have provided ample information for you to understand and address our concerns. In response to our January 4, 2011 CMP comments, Qwest indicated on January 13, 2011 that Legal would respond. It is now nearly four months later, and the time for you to respond is overdue. You cannot expect that you can take months to respond without revising your own proposed schedule. The longer that the Company waits to make a decision and begin to work toward a modified plan, the longer its current proposed timeline will be extended. We have asked some fairly straightforward questions such as whether, if CLECs and regulators agree to a waiver of the two-year (modified to 30 month) moratorium time period, the Company would distinguish repair systems as a unique situation and would comply with all the subparts to Integra settlement agreement paragraph 12. Given that Qwest and CenturyLink signed on to those commitments last year, we should not still be waiting for a response in May to those questions. We fully expect and require a written response from the Company to those questions.

Your email below states: "we are still awaiting final approval from the executive committee on the replacement system, MTG. Review and approval of MTG is currently scheduled for June 6th." You do not state what the executive committee is approving, so we don't know whether it addresses any of our concerns. June 6th is not timely.

You propose a call with Integra next week, but it is unclear what purpose a call would serve when the Company has not made a decision. As indicated, we have fully laid out our issues and are awaiting responses from you. If there are responses you can provide next week, let us know what they are. Additionally, these are issues of interest to other CLECS as well, and the consent of carriers and regulators is needed to modify commission-ordered commitments. The Company should come prepared to discuss all of these issues, including the merger conditions, in CMP. When describing such a CMP call in a notice to CLECs, the Company could indicate that, because the merger conditions will be discussed, attorneys for the carriers are encouraged to join the CMP call. Qwest has held a CMP call with additional attorney participation in the past, such as when TRRO issues were discussed on a CMP

call. The alternative to CMP, given the need for more parties' participation, is for the Company to file notices with the commissions so carriers may comment there. If the Company would like to obtain feedback before making such a filing, CMP is an available avenue for doing so.

Currently, the Company has scheduled a call in CMP regarding CEMR/MEDIACC/MTG for June 8th, but that call appears to be in furtherance of the current, objectionable timeline and non-consensus approach. It does not take into account our objections and our request for a collaborative approach to developing a plan and timeline, followed by later technical discussions based on a collaboratively-developed timeline and approach. The type of call that we are describing would be a better use for that time slot on June 8th. It would have to be a preliminary call, given that the company is required via its merger commitments to file its proposed plan with regulators and CLECs are allowed to comment there, but perhaps some idea could be gained of what may or may not be acceptable to CLECs for proposal to regulators.

Karen