

1. I am deaf or hard-of-hearing. Video Relay Service (VRS) is how I maintain my relationships with my family and friends who are not deaf. To be able to contact my family and friends through VRS is crucial for me. I would like to submit comments to the Federal Communication Commission's (FCC) on its Public Notice on the "Structure and practices of the video relay service (VRS) program and on proposed VRS compensation rates." Deaf people communicate every day using VRS. I think changing the current VRS program is not in the best interest of deaf people. I do not like the idea of changing the way we deaf people use VRS equipment. I do not want to be required to buy, install, and maintain my VRS equipment. I can't imagine being required to do this. I do not currently have the knowledge to do this and I don't want the hassle. In addition, I want to continue to be able to choose my own VRS company. And I don't want other VRS companies to go out of business due to the FCC's proposals. Again, I am opposed to the FCC's proposed changes! Please consider my feedback and the feedback of other deaf Americans.

2. CG Docket Nos. 03-123 and 10-51

I am writing in response to the FCC's request for comments on the "Structure and practices of the video relay service (VRS) program and on proposed VRS compensation rates." I am opposed to the changes being considered. VRS has created a more level playing field for deaf people like me, empowering us to communicate via videophone in our native language, ASL. The work I do requires that I be able to use the phone to communicate with colleagues, clients and business associates regardless of whether they are hearing or deaf. Without high-quality VRS service I would not be able to do my job effectively. The changes the FCC is considering would drastically change VRS. The quality of the videophone technology used is critical to VRS. The products provided by VRS companies have been developed specifically for the needs of the deaf. Yet, the FCC is proposing that we be forced to use off-the-shelf products and government-mandated software. Using products developed for people who are hearing would be a huge step backwards! The FCC cannot consider this to be a reasonable replacement for the specialized VRS technology we use every day. The rate changes being considered by the FCC would also directly affect the availability, reliability and quality of VRS. If the FCC slashes the rates paid to VRS providers, as suggested, many companies will simply stop providing this vital service. This will put me and all deaf individuals at a significant disadvantage. VRS is a shining example of what Congress intended with the Americans with Disabilities Act. It is essential that any changes maintain the access, innovation and reliability that define the VRS program today.

3. Part of the Americans with Disabilities Act's (ADA) promise to deaf Americans is functional equivalence. This mandate extends to functional equivalence in access to emergency 911 services. I am worried that the recent proposals by the Federal Communication Commission (FCC) would negatively impact deaf Americans' access to quality 911 services. I am concerned that the quality of VRS - especially during an emergency call - will be affected and that I might experience longer hold

times waiting for an interpreter. I am also concerned that if the FCC's proposals to go into effect, I will be required to use sub-standard VRS equipment - equipment that was not made specifically for me. I do not want to have to use government-required equipment and government-required software. I like the VRS equipment and I currently use! And I like choosing the VRS provider I want. Please do not change this! I do not want the FCC's proposals to go into effect as I do not want the quality of my VRS to be impacted. Please maintain VRS as it currently is - with quality equipment, quality service, and quality interpreters. Please consider my comments before making changes to the way I access VRS and my 911 VRS services.

Thank you, Jared M. Gunn