I am responding to the following topics:

Should the FCC require that VRS be provided 24/7? YES

Should the FCC require VRS providers to satisfy the same speed of answer requirement that is currently placed on regular relay services? That requirement is that 85% of the calls be answered within 10 seconds.placing a call in a queue does not constitute answering a call. If you feel it should not be the same as regular relay, what should it be and why? YES, because the whole purpose of VRS is to provide EQUAL ACCESS - deaf individuals right now can not just pick up the phone and make a call, they often have to wait for up to 30 minutes to make a call! That is not equal access. And I'm also not saying it must be 85% within 10 seconds... maybe 85% within 60 seconds??

Should the FCC require interpreters to stay with a call for a minimum of 10 minutes, regardless of content, difficulty understanding the caller, etc. (This is the requirement for traditional relay, and is currently required of VRS as well). If you feel that this requirement should be waived for VRS, why do you feel it should be waived? This should definitely be waived when "effective communication" is not happening - for the deaf consumer AND the interpreter. A smooth switch just like happens now can be easily accomplished.

Should VRS interpreters be permitted to ask questions to the VRS caller during call set-up so that the interpreter can gain an understanding of the content before beginning to relay the actual call? Under the current standards, this is prohibited. If you believe interpreters should be permitted to ask questions, be sure to explain why you feel this is necessary. If you don't think they should ask questions, explain your reasoning behind this as well. YES, I believe the interpreter should be able to ask questions to make the interpreting process as smooth as possible - again equal access, BUT the deaf consumer should also have the right to decline answering them... with the education about interpreting - that if the interpreter is not prepped with anything, they may struggle through some parts of the conversation, etc.

Should VRS interpreters be required to interpret obscene, sexually explicit, or threatening phone calls? What should be done about things that an interpreter can see happening on the screen if they witness something obscene or even criminal? To quote from the question as stated by the FCC in soliciting comments, "We also seek comment on whether the TRS provider or CA (FCC refers to interpreters as CAs) should, in any particular context, be given the discretion to make the determination that a call is abusive and can be terminated."
NO, absolutely not. Again, equal access (not that I condone this type of phone call, but that deaf consumers should have equal access with NO ONE controling their communication). A deaf consumer being abusive TOWARD the CA is a different story. Then, effective communication probably could not happen, and therefore the interpreter should switch with another.

What should an interpreter be doing during "idle time" on a call

(when the caller is on hold)? Should they use a privacy window? Should they be permitted to "chat" with the caller?
Again equal access - the interpreter could always look away from the screen, but be accessible if the caller chooses to hang up during the hold time to make another call. The interpreter should never be "chatting" with the deaf consumer - that is not equal access... the phone doesn't "chat" with a caller when the caller is hearing.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my feedback regarding these topics!