

Federal Communications Commission.

Marlene H. Dortch,

Secretary, Office of the Secretary, Office of Managing Director.

[FR Doc. 2011-9251 Filed 4-15-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[DA 10-2318 and DA 11-55]

Emergency Access Advisory Committee; Announcement of Establishment, and of Members and Co-Chairpersons, and Announcement of Date of First Meeting

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice; correction.

SUMMARY: The Federal Communication Commission published a document in the **Federal Register** on December 15, 2010 (75 FR 78244), announcing the establishment of the Emergency Access Advisory Committee (hereinafter “the Committee” or “EAAC”) pursuant to The Twenty-First Century Communications and Video Accessibility Act (“CVAA”), the date of the first meeting, and further announced the membership of the Committee. The Notice contained incorrect and/or omitted names of members or their affiliations and did not designate alternates.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Cheryl King, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, 202-418-2284 (voice), 202-418-0416 (TTY), or *Cheryl.King@fcc.gov* (e-mail).

Correction

In the **Federal Register** of December 15, 2010, in FR Doc. 2010-31513, on page 78244, column 2, correct the last paragraph of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** caption to read:

The Chairman of the Commission is appointing thirty-four (34) members of the EAAC. Of this number, eleven (11) represent interests of persons with disabilities and researchers; seven (7) represent interests of communication service providers; six (6) represent interests of State and local emergency responders and emergency subject matter technologies; three (3) represent vendors, developers and manufacturers of systems, facilities and equipment; four (4) represent Federal agencies; and three (3) represent industry organizations. The EAAC’s membership is designed to be representative of the Commission’s many constituencies, and the diversity achieved ensures a balance among individuals with disabilities and other stakeholders, as required by the CVAA. All appointments are effective immediately and shall terminate

December 7, 2012, or when the Committee is terminated, whichever is earlier.

On page 78244, column 3, paragraph 2 and continuing on page 78245, column 1, paragraph 1, correct the list of appointed members of the EAAC to read:

The membership of the EAAC, designated by organization or affiliation as appropriate, is as follows:

- American Foundation for the Blind—Brad Hodges
- AT&T—Brian Daly, alternate Peter Musgrove
- Avaya Labs—Paul Michaelis, alternate Mark Fletcher
- Center for Public Safety Innovation/National Terrorism Preparedness Institute—Christopher Littlewood
- City of Los Angeles Department on Disability and National Emergency Number Association’s Accessibility Committee—Richard Ray
- Comcast Cable—Angel Arocho
- Communication Service for the Deaf—Alfred Sonnenstrahl
- CTIA, The Wireless Association—Matthew Gerst
- Fairfax County Emergency Management—Bruce McFarlane
- Gallaudet University—Norman Williams
- Hearing, Speech & Deafness Center—Donna Platt
- Intrado, Inc.—John Snapp
- Livingston Parrish (Louisiana) Communication District 911—Ronnie Cotton
- Microsoft—Bernard Aboba, alternate Laura Ruby
- National Association of the Deaf, Telecommunications for the Deaf, Inc. and NorCal Center for Deaf and Hard of Hearing—Sheri A. Farinha, alternate Claude Stout
- Omnitor—Gunnar Hellstrom
- Partners for Access, LLC—Joel Ziev
- Purple Communications—Mark Stern
- RealTime Text Task Force (R3TF)—Arnoud van Wijk
- Research in Motion (RIM)—Gregory Fields
- Speech Communication Assistance for the Telephone, Inc.—Rebecca Ladew
- Telecommunications Systems, Inc.—Don Mitchell
- Telecommunications Industry Association and the Mobile Manufacturers Forum—David J. Dzumba
- Time Warner Cable Communications—Martha (Marte) Kinder
- T-Mobile, 911 Policy—Jim Nixon
- Trace R&D Center, University of Wisconsin (IT&Tel-RERC)—Gregg Vanderheiden
- U.S. Department of Commerce, NIST—Douglas Montgomery

- U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Agency—Marcie Roth
- U. S. Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division/DRS—Robert Mather
- U. S. Department of Transportation, NHTSA—Laurie Flaherty
- Verizon Communications—Kevin Green, alternate Susan Sherwood
- Vonage Holding Corp.—Brendan Kasper
- Washington Parish, LA Communications District—James Coleman

Dated: April 8, 2011.

Federal Communications Commission.

Karen Peltz Strauss,

Deputy Chief, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau.

[FR Doc. 2011-9337 Filed 4-15-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[DA 11-428]

Twenty-First Century Communications and Video Programming Accessibility Act; Announcement of Town Hall Meeting

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In this document, the Commission announces that it held a Town Hall meeting on The Twenty-First Century Communications and Video Programming Accessibility Act (the Act or CVAA) hosted by the California State University at Northridge (CSUN). The Town Hall meeting provided an orientation to the Act, and discussed the advanced communications and video programming changes required by the Act.

DATES: The Town Hall meeting was held on Thursday, March 17th, 2011 from 9:20 a.m. to 11:40 a.m.

ADDRESSES: The Manchester Grand Hyatt Hotel, One Market Place, Room H-I, San Diego, CA 92101.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Pam Gregory, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, 202-418-2498 (voice), 202-418-1169 (TTY), or *Pam.Gregory@fcc.gov* (e-mail); or Jamal Mazrui, Wireline Competition Bureau, 202-418-0069, *Jamal.Mazrui@fcc.gov* (e-mail).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On October 8, 2010, President Obama signed The Twenty-First Century Communications and Video Programming Accessibility Act, Public

Law 111–260, as amended by Public Law 111–265. The Commission hosted a Town Hall meeting at the 26th Annual International Technology and Persons with Disabilities Conference, hosted by CSUN. The purpose of the Town Hall meeting was to educate the public about the Act's provisions, and answer consumers' questions regarding the Act. The Town Hall meeting was one of the many steps that the Commission has taken to obtain public feedback as it implements the Act. The Town Hall meeting at CSUN began with an orientation to the CVAA that focused on what the CVAA means to consumers with disabilities. The FCC then conducted an open dialogue on the Act's provisions, providing an opportunity for attendees to express their opinions on ways the FCC can best implement the CVAA. For purposes of the Commission's *ex parte* rules regarding permit-but-disclose proceedings (47 CFR 1.1206(b)(2) of the Commission's rules), any comments made at the Town Hall on the implementation of the CVAA that pertain to the Act's provisions on advanced communications services, video description, the deaf-blind equipment distribution program, and TRS contributions by VoIP providers, were deemed oral *ex parte* presentations in the pending rulemaking proceedings to which they relate. A written transcript of the Town Hall meeting (captured from computer-aided real-time transcription) was placed in the dockets of the relevant proceedings to comply with the disclosure requirements of the *ex parte* rules. The event was free and open to the public.

Synopsis

The CVAA is designed to ensure that people with disabilities have access to emerging twenty-first century communications and video programming technologies. The Act seeks to implement many recommendations of the National Broadband Plan, and will ensure access to advanced communications equipment and services, expand the availability of hearing aid compatible telephones used with those services, enhance the scope of and contributions to the nation's telecommunications relay services, and create an equipment distribution program for people who are deaf-blind. In addition, the law will fill accessibility gaps in video programming through the provision of video description on television and closed captioning on television programming re-shown on the Internet, ensure the accessibility of video programming devices, and require televised

emergency programming to be accessible by people who are blind or visually impaired. As it works through its implementation of the CVAA, the Commission is collaborating closely with consumer and industry stakeholders through two mandated advisory committees.

Federal Communications Commission.

Karen Peltz Strauss,

Deputy Chief, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau.

[FR Doc. 2011–9339 Filed 4–15–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[WT Docket No. 11–35; DA 11–613]

Wireless Telecommunications Bureau Extends Period for Filing Comments and Reply Comments on Petition for Declaratory Ruling Asking To Clarify the Scope of Preemption of Wireless Entry Regulation

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice; extension of filing and reply comment period.

SUMMARY: In this document, the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau extends the deadline for filing comments and reply comments in response to the Public Notice seeking comment on the December 3, 2010 petition for declaratory ruling (Petition) filed by CTIA—The Wireless Association (Petitioners). The Petitioners asked the Federal Communications Commission (Commission) to clarify “the scope of Section 332(c)(3)(A)’s ban on state and local entry regulation.”

DATES: Interested parties may file comments on or before June 10, 2011, and reply comments on or before July 11, 2011.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by WT Docket No. 11–35, by any of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.
- *Federal Communications Commission's Web Site:* <http://fjallfoss.fcc.gov/ecfs2/>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.
- *People with Disabilities:* Contact the FCC to request reasonable accommodations (accessible format documents, sign language interpreters, CART, etc.) by *e-mail:* FCC504@fcc.gov or *phone:* 202–418–0530 or TTY: 202–418–0432.

For detailed instructions for submitting comments and additional information on the rulemaking process, see the supplementary information section of this document.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Jennifer Salhus, Spectrum and Competition Policy Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, 202–418–1310.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission's Public Notice released on April 5, 2011. The full text of the public notice is available for public inspection and copying during business hours in the FCC Reference Information Center, Portals II, 445 12th Street, SW., Room CY–A257, Washington, DC 20554. It also may be purchased from the Commission's duplicating contractor at Portals II, 445 12th Street, SW., Room CY–B402, Washington, DC 20554; the contractor's Web site, <http://www.bcpweb.com>; or by calling (800) 378–3160, facsimile (202) 488–5563, or e-mail FCC@BCPIWEB.com. Additionally, the complete item is available on the Federal Communications Commission's Web site at <http://www.fcc.gov>.

On February 25, 2011, the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau (Bureau) released a Public Notice seeking comment on the CTIA petition for declaratory ruling asking the Commission to clarify “the scope of Section 332(c)(3)(A)’s ban on state and local entry regulation.” The Petitioners stated that the Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control (Connecticut PUC) “ordered that wireless providers must apply for and obtain a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (CPCN) from the [Connecticut PUC] before they can request permission to access public rights-of-way.” The Petitioners asked the Commission to declare that Connecticut's CPCN requirement is a form of entry regulation that is prohibited by section 332(c)(A)(3).

On April 1, 2011, the Petitioners along with the Connecticut PUC (collectively, the “Parties”) submitted a joint request for a 60-day extension of the comment and reply comment deadlines in this proceeding. The Parties state that the Connecticut PUC recently published draft changes to the requirements at issue in this matter and that a 60-day extension is “in the public interest because it will allow commenters a meaningful period of time to review, analyze, and respond to any final actions the [Connecticut PUC] takes on the draft decision.”

The Bureau finds that granting the Parties' request and extending the