



Emergency Communications and People with Disabilities: 9-1-1 Communication, Public Alerts, and Social Media

Summary Report from the 2010-2011 Emergency Communications Survey

National emergencies like the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001 and Hurricane Katrina in August 2005, raised awareness of the need to improve emergency communications (contacting emergency services and receiving public alerts) for people with disabilities. In the intervening years, wireless communication technology has experienced dramatic change. The original iPhone, with its touch-screen user interface, built-in GPS, multi-megapixel camera, and easy internet navigation, was launched in June 2007, setting in motion a revolution in mobile consumer electronics.

Simultaneously, use of social media channels like Facebook and Twitter have grown dramatically. Harris Interactive reports that 65% of U.S. adults use social mediaⁱ, and Twitter reports that it added 100 million new accounts in 2010.ⁱⁱ Much of the growth of social media use is via mobile phones. For smartphones in particular, the Facebook app is the most downloaded and the most used, according to Nielsen.ⁱⁱⁱ

This revolution in wireless telecommunication is fundamentally changing how we communicate during emergencies. Sirens, television and radio remain the most prevalent method to receive and verify emergency communication, and landlines still remain important for accurate emergency assistance, especially for people with disabilities. However, we increasingly use our mobile wireless devices, the internet and social media to stay connected during emergencies.

Both the federal government and the wireless industry are exploring this evolution as they develop plans for the next-generation of emergency alerting and 9-1-1 communications systems. Critical to this exploration is consideration of equitable access for Americans with disabilities.

Survey Methodology

Since 2001, the Rehabilitation Engineering Research Center for Wireless Technologies (Wireless RERC) has conducted research and development projects dealing with accessibility of emergency communications, emergency alerting, the Emergency Alert System (EAS), the Commercial Mobile Alert System (CMAS), communications with 9-1-1 services, and e-9-1-1. From October, 2010 through January, 2011, the Wireless RERC conducted its "2010-2011 Emergency Communications Survey" to understand better how people with disabilities communicate during emergencies.

Convenience sampling was used as the basis for participant recruitment. The survey was offered online and via telephone through a toll-free number. The online version was designed and tested to be accessible by screenreaders typically used by people who are blind. Participants were recruited using several channels. Initially, members of the Wireless RERC's Consumer Advisory Network (CAN), a

national network of approximately 1000 people with all types of disability, were invited to take the survey. All CAN members for whom email addresses were available were contacted directly via email. The small minority of CAN members without email addresses were invited to participate via the CAN newsletter which was sent via the U.S. Postal Service.

Colleagues at Georgia Tech’s Center for Accessible Technology and Environmental Access (CATEA) also sent the survey invitation via email to their national consumer network.

Additionally, invitations were posted on several online networks and groups organized by or for people with disabilities (several Yahoo! Groups, National Federation of the Blind listservs focused on technology, and other listservs, including the AAC online user group ACOLUG), and others focused on wireless technology or assistive technology on LinkedIn and Facebook.

Participant recruitment was aided considerably by the staff of the following organizations:

- Center for Assistive Technology and Environmental Access, Georgia Tech
- Rehabilitation Engineering Research Center for Wheeled Mobility
- Center for the Visually Impaired
- Disabled American Veterans
- FEMA’s Office of Disability Integration and Coordination
- Florida Bureau of Preparedness and Response
- Georgia Mayor's Committee For Persons with Disabilities
- Hearing Loss Association of America
- Hearing, Speech and Deafness Center
- Maryland Relay
- National Association of State Relay Administration
- National Association of the Deaf
- National Spinal Cord Injury Association
- New Jersey Centers for Independent Living
- Progressive Center for Independent Living
- Texas Governor's Committee on People with Disabilities

Participant profile

A total of 1384 people responded to the survey, 1150 of whom indicated having at least one disability. Respondents with disabilities ranged in age from 18 to 91, with an average age of 51.5 (see Table 1). Those respondents who did not report a disability were excluded from the analysis presented in this report.

Table 1 – Respondent Profile: Disability Status and Age

| | |
|------------------------------------|-------------|
| Total number of respondents | 1384 |
| Number of respondents w disability | 1150 |
| Age range | 18-91 years |
| Age average | 51.5 years |
| Standard deviation (age) | 13.4 years |

The survey sample included people with all types of disabilities (Table 2), including blindness (196, or 17%), low vision (220, or 19%), deafness (202, or 18%), hard of hearing (251, or 22%), difficulty thinking (233, or 20%), difficulty speaking (103, or 9%), difficulty using hands (215, or 19%), and difficulty walking, standing, or climbing stairs (519, or 45%).

The sampling approach was not intended to reflect the prevalence of each disability within the U.S. population. The main goal was simply to ensure that there were substantial numbers of respondents from each disability type to enable analysis of that group. Table 2 shows robust participation by individuals across all sensory, cognitive, and physical disabilities.

**Table 2 – Do you experience any of these functional limitations?
(Please check all that apply)**

| | Frequency | Percent |
|------------------------------------|-----------|---------|
| Blindness | 196 | 17 |
| Low vision | 220 | 19 |
| Deafness | 202 | 18 |
| Hard of hearing | 251 | 22 |
| Thinking | 233 | 20 |
| Speaking | 103 | 9 |
| Using hands | 215 | 19 |
| Walking, standing, climbing stairs | 519 | 45 |

Contacting 911 emergency services

Tables 3 and 4 describe experiences in contacting 911 and preferences for making this contact. By far the most common way that respondents with disabilities have contacted 911 emergency services has been via voice call, using either a landline phone (65%) or a cellphone (47%). These two options are also the most commonly *preferred* way of contacting emergency services, with landline and cell phones equally preferred by 59%.

Table 3 – Have you ever placed an emergency (911) call? If yes, specify how you placed this call. (check all that apply)

| | Percent of all respondents with disabilities who placed a 911 call |
|-----------------|--|
| Landline | 65 |
| Cellphone | 47 |
| TTY | 9 |
| Telephone relay | 3 |
| Video relay | 5 |
| Augmentative | 1 |
| Other | 6 |

Table 4 – If you could choose how to make an emergency call, which way would you prefer? (Check all that apply)

| | Percent of all respondents with disabilities |
|--|--|
| Landline | 59 |
| Cellphone | 59 |
| TTY | 5 |
| Text-based message (email, text messaging, IM) | 33 |
| Telephone relay | 6 |
| Video relay | 14 |
| Non-relay video call | 3 |
| Other | 5 |

However, a substantial percentage (33%) of respondents also indicated a desire to contact emergency services via some sort of text-based communication, which includes text messaging, email and instant messaging. Video relay was preferred by a substantial percentage of respondents (14%) (though only 4% had actually used this method to contact 911). This preference was expressed mainly by respondents with hearing or speaking impairment. Three percent reported a preference for non-relay video calling.

Six per cent of respondents have used TTY for contacting 911, and 5% prefer this method; 2% have used telephone relay, and 6% prefer this method; 1% have used augmentative communication technologies to contact 911; 4% have used other methods, and 5% note a preference for other methods.

Contacting 911 emergency services via text-based message and TTY

Respondents who indicated a preference for “Text-based message” and those who indicated a preference for “TTY” were asked to indicate which of several types of text-based messaging was the single most important mode of communication to them (Table 5).

Table 5 - If you chose “text-based message” or “TTY” above, which of these options is the most important to you? (select one)

| | Prefer text-based message (% , n=361) | Prefer TTY (% , n=56) |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Email | 10% | 5% |
| Real time text via cellphone | 27% | 18% |
| Real time text via computer | 7% | 4% |
| SMS via cellphone | 48% | 30% |
| SMS via computer | 5% | 2% |
| TTY | 2% | 36% |
| No response | 2% | 5% |

Table 5 indicates that text messaging via cellphone (either traditional SMS or real-time text) is preferred by a strong majority (75%) of the respondents who indicated “text-based message” as one of their preferred means of contacting emergency services in the previous survey question. These preferences

are shared by 48% of those who included TTY among their preferred means of contacting emergency services (right column of Table 5).

Notably, for those respondents who included TTY among their preferred modes of communicating with emergency services (presumably these are all TTY users), barely more than a third (36%) said that TTY was the most important option to them.

Table 6 details the diversity in age for 3 types of TTY users:

- those who have ever placed a 911 call via TTY
- those for whom TTY is one of their preferred options for contacting 911
- those for whom TTY is the most important medium for contacting emergency services

Respondents in the first 2 of these groups spanned all age ranges 18 to 75+ years. For the third group (for whom TTY is the most important option), respondents spanned age ranges from 25 to 75+ years.

Table 6 – Respondents who have placed a 911 call via TTY, who prefer to call 911 via TTY, and for whom 911 is the most important option for calling 911, by age (%)

| | Placed 911 call via TTY (%), n=68 | Prefer to call 911 via TTY as one option (%), n=57 | TTY is most important option for calling 911 (%), n=26 |
|--------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| 18-25 | 3 | 7 | 0 |
| 25-35 | 10 | 5 | 4 |
| 36-45 | 22 | 16 | 20 |
| 46-55 | 37 | 33 | 16 |
| 56-65 | 19 | 23 | 36 |
| 66-75 | 7 | 12 | 20 |
| 75+ | 2 | 4 | 4 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Public Emergency Alerts – Receiving, Verifying, and Sharing

Traditional broadcast media in the form of television and radio are the most frequently used media by which respondents with disabilities receive emergency alerts, with 41% and 25% of respondents, respectively, using these media (Table 7). Email (20%), direct observation (18%) and phone calls (18%) round out the top five. Text messaging is ranked seventh, with 13% of respondents reporting having received alerts via this medium.

The percentage of respondents who have verified alerts they have received is considerably lower than the percentage who have received alerts. Television (27%) and direct observation (22%) are the top two ways of verifying alerts. Radio (15%), internet news (15%) and phone calls (12%) round out the top five. The remaining media for verifying alerts have been used by 7% or less of the respondents.

Interactive media like voice calling (28%), email (16%), and text messaging (12%), are the most commonly used media for passing on alerts to others. The next most frequently used is instant messaging/chat (3%).

Table 7 – If you have ever been alerted during a public emergency or other incident:

- How were you alerted?
- How did you verify the alert?
- How did you pass on the alert?

(Percentage of all respondents who reported a disability)

| | Received alert | Verified alert | Passed on alert |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Television | 41 | 27 | 1 |
| Radio | 25 | 15 | 1 |
| Email | 20 | 7 | 16 |
| Direct observation | 18 | 22 | -- |
| Phone call | 18 | 12 | 28 |
| Sirens, alarms | 16 | -- | -- |
| Text message | 13 | 4 | 12 |
| Internet news | 12 | 15 | 2 |
| Personal alert device | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Instant message/chat | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| TTY | 0.3 | 0.4 | 1 |
| Fax | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.5 |
| Other | 10 | 5 | 8 |

(Percentage of all respondents who reported a disability)

Public Alerts and Individuals who are Deaf or Hard of Hearing

As presented in Table 8, the most commonly used media by individuals who are deaf to receive public alerts are television (33%), email (30%), text messaging (19%), direct observation (17%), and Internet news (16%). The most commonly used media by this group for verifying public alerts are television (21%), internet news (15%), direct observation (14%), email (13%), and text messaging (9%). For passing on public alerts to others, deaf respondents mainly use just two media: email (28%) and text messaging (19%). The next most commonly specified is instant messaging/chat (6%).

Table 8 – If you have ever been alerted during a public emergency or other incident:

- How were you alerted?
- How did you verify the alert?
- How did you pass on the alert?

(Percentage of respondents who are deaf)

| n=202 | Received alert | Verified alert | Passed on alert |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Television | 33 | 21 | 2 |
| Radio | 3 | 2 | 0.5 |
| Email | 30 | 13 | 28 |
| Direct observation | 17 | 14 | -- |
| Phone call | 5 | 3 | 4 |
| Sirens, alarms | 9 | -- | -- |
| Text message | 19 | 9 | 19 |
| Internet news | 16 | 15 | 5 |
| Personal alert device | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| Instant message/chat | 3 | 3 | 6 |

| | | | |
|-------|-----|-----|-----|
| TTY | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Fax | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| Other | 17 | 5 | 10 |

Compared to deaf respondents, hard of hearing respondents (Table 9) use a much broader set of media for receiving alerts, including television (39%), email (22%), radio (19%), direct observation (17%), phone calls (17%), sirens and alarms (16%), text messaging (15%), and Internet news (10%).

The most commonly used media by this group for verifying alerts are television (24%), direct observation (20%), Internet news (16%), radio (12%), and phone calls (11%). For passing on alerts to others, hard of hearing respondents primarily use 3 media: phone calls (20%), text messaging (16%), and email (15%). The next most commonly specified is instant messaging/chat (4%).

Table 9 – If you have ever been alerted during a public emergency or other incident:

- How were you alerted?
- How did you verify the alert?
- How did you pass on the alert?

(Percentage of respondents who are hard of hearing)

| n=251 | Received alert | Verified alert | Passed on alert |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Television | 39 | 24 | 1 |
| Radio | 19 | 12 | 1 |
| Email | 22 | 5 | 15 |
| Direct observation | 17 | 20 | -- |
| Phone call | 17 | 11 | 20 |
| Sirens, alarms | 16 | -- | -- |
| Text message | 15 | 4 | 16 |
| Internet news | 10 | 16 | 1 |
| Personal alert device | 6 | 1 | 0 |
| Instant message/chat | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| TTY | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Fax | 1 | 0.4 | 1 |
| Other | 10 | 6 | 8 |

Public Alerts and Individuals who have Blindness or Low Vision

Like hard of hearing respondents, blind respondents also use a broad range of media for receiving and verifying public alerts (Table 10). For receiving alerts, blind respondents most commonly use radio (46%), television (41%), sirens and alarms (22%), phone calls (21%), direct observation (20%), email (16%), Internet news (13%), and text messaging (9%).

For verifying alerts, blind respondents most commonly use direct observation (25%), radio (23%), television (19%), phone calls (16%), and Internet news (10%). For passing on alerts, blind respondents mainly use phone calls (37%), and also use email (11%). The next most commonly specified is text messaging (5%).

Table 10 – If you have ever been alerted during a public emergency or other incident:

- How were you alerted?
- How did you verify the alert?
- How did you pass on the alert?

(Percentage of respondents who are blind)

| n=196 | Received alert | Verified alert | Passed on alert |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Television | 41 | 19 | 1 |
| Radio | 46 | 23 | 1 |
| Email | 16 | 4 | 11 |
| Direct observation | 20 | 25 | -- |
| Phone call | 21 | 16 | 37 |
| Sirens, alarms | 22 | -- | -- |
| Text message | 9 | 2 | 5 |
| Internet news | 13 | 10 | 2 |
| Personal alert device | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Instant message/chat | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| TTY | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Fax | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Other | 10 | 6 | 8 |

Respondents with low vision use perhaps the broadest set of media for receiving alerts among those with sensory limitations. These media include television (45%), radio (29%), phone calls (24%), direct observation (21%), sirens and alarms (17%), email (16%), internet news (11%) and text messaging (10%). For verifying alerts, respondents with low vision use television (29%), direct observation (25%), radio (21%), phone calls (19%), internet news (16%), and email (9%). To pass on alerts, these respondents use primarily phone calls (35%), email (14%) and text messaging (13%). The next most commonly specified is instant messaging/chat (3%).

Table 11 – If you have ever been alerted during a public emergency or other incident:

- How were you alerted?
- How did you verify the alert?
- How did you pass on the alert?

(Percentage of respondents who have low vision)

| n=220 | Received alert | Verified alert | Passed on alert |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Television | 45 | 29 | 1 |
| Radio | 29 | 21 | 1 |
| Email | 16 | 9 | 14 |
| Direct observation | 21 | 25 | -- |
| Phone call | 24 | 19 | 35 |
| Sirens, alarms | 17 | -- | -- |
| Text message | 10 | 6 | 13 |
| Internet news | 11 | 15 | 2 |
| Personal alert device | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Instant message/chat | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| TTY | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Fax | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Other | 10 | 4 | 78 |

Platforms for Accessing Social Media

Almost two-thirds (63%) of respondents with disabilities use social media. Desktop and laptop platforms are the most commonly used devices for accessing social media, with 41% and 31% of respondents, respectively, using these platforms. At the time of this study, cellphones were the least commonly used platforms (22%) for accessing social media. This may increase as smartphones and tablets proliferate.

**Table 12 – Do you access social media on the following devices?
(check all that apply)**

| Devices | Yes (%) |
|------------------|---------|
| Desktop computer | 41 |
| Laptop computer | 31 |
| Cellphone | 22 |

A substantial percentage of respondents with disabilities (25%) use more than one of these devices (e.g., desktop and laptop, laptop and cellphone) for this purpose. Of these, 6% use both a desktop and laptop, 7% use a desktop and cellphone, and 7% use a laptop and cellphone. A small percentage (5%) access social media using all three types of devices.

Table 13 – Do you access social media on the following devices?

| | Percent |
|--------------------------------|-----------|
| Desktop only | 23 |
| Laptop only | 12 |
| Cellphone only | 3 |
| Desktop and laptop | 6 |
| Desktop and cellphone | 7 |
| Laptop and cellphone | 7 |
| Desktop, laptop, and cellphone | 5 |
| TOTAL | 63 |

Public Alerts and Social Media

At the time of this study, social media were used by a small, but not inconsiderable percentage of people with disabilities to receive and verify public alerts. Twenty-three percent of people with disabilities had received public alerts via one or more social media, and 16% had verified public alerts using social media.

By far the social media outlet most commonly used by respondents with disabilities is Facebook, with 12% reporting having received a public alert via this channel, and 9% having verified an alert via this channel. Twitter is the second most commonly used (5% and 3%, respectively). Listservs, Yahoo!, YouTube and MySpace fill out the top 6 social media channels used for receiving and verifying public alerts. Google Buzz, LinkedIn, Foursquare, Second Life, and Ning are currently used by smaller numbers.

**Table 14 – Have you have ever received or verified a public alert through any of these social media?
(Check all that apply)**

| Percentage of respondents with disabilities and the number of social media outlets used | | |
|--|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Number of social media outlets used | Received alert (%) | Verified alert (%) |
| 0 | 77 | 84 |
| 1 | 16 | 12 |
| 2 | 5 | 3 |
| 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 4 | 1 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 100 | 100 |

**Table 15 – Have you have ever received or verified a public alert through any of these social media?
(Check all that apply)**

| | Received alert | Verified alert |
|-------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Facebook | 12 | 9 |
| Twitter | 5 | 3 |
| Listserve | 4 | 2 |
| Yahoo | 4 | 2 |
| YouTube | 1 | 1 |
| MySpace | 1 | 1 |
| Google Buzz | 1 | 1 |
| LinkedIn | 0 | 1 |
| Foursquare | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| Second Life | 0.1 | 0.3 |
| Ning | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Other | 6 | 4 |

Percentage of respondents with disabilities.

Conclusion

This summary presentation of the data from the Wireless RERC's survey on emergency communications and people with disabilities provides a glimpse into the ongoing transformations in the way people with disabilities and the public at large use electronic and mobile communications during personal and public emergencies. These transformations are occurring against the backdrop of profound technological changes in both handheld devices and the communications infrastructure connecting these devices.

These transformations are occurring at a rapid and accelerating pace, a pace that requires a commensurate transformation in the public infrastructure that allows citizens to contact emergency services and that allows federal, state and local government to provide information and instructions to the public during emergencies. The risks are great for all citizens, and even greater for more vulnerable members of society with disabilities.

Acknowledgement

The Rehabilitation Engineering Research Center for Wireless Technologies is sponsored by the National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR) of the U.S. Department of Education under grant number H133E060061. The opinions contained in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the U.S. Department of Education or NIDRR.

Citation

Our data-gathering and analysis methods are designed to enhance understanding of the needs of people with disabilities regarding wireless technologies. We appreciate this opportunity to share our data and welcome requests for additional details of our findings. We request the opportunity to review any text that cites the data in this report.

Appendix

Survey on Emergency Communications

Thanks for taking part in this important survey on emergency communication services. You will be asked to share some information about yourself, your experiences, and your preferences for communicating in emergencies. Your answers will be used to improve accessibility of emergency communications for people of all ages and abilities.

Part 1 — Emergency calls

1.1. Have you ever placed an emergency (911) call?

No

Yes (Specify how you placed this call. Check all that apply.)

Voice call over landline phone

Voice call over cell phone

TTY

Telephone relay service

Video relay service

Telephone-enabled augmentative and alternative communication (AAC) device

Other: Please specify _____

1.2 If you could choose how to make an emergency call, which way would you prefer? (Check all that apply.)

Voice call over landline

Voice call over cell phone

TTY

Text-based message (for example: text messaging, email, or instant messaging)

Telephone relay service

Video relay service

Non-relay video call

Telephone-enabled augmentative and alternative communication (AAC) device

Other: Please specify _____

1.3 If you chose “text-based message” or “TTY” above, which of these options are most important to you?

Text message over cell phone

Text message over computer

Email

TTY

Real-time text over cell phone

Real-time text over computer

1.4 If you chose “video relay service” above, which of these options are most important to you?

Video relay with the sign language interpreter visible only to you

Video relay with both you and the sign language interpreter visible to the 911 operator

Part 2 — Public Alerts

Please answer these questions if you have ever been alerted during severe weather, terrorist or other manmade incidents, amber alerts (missing child), crime alerts, health threats, traffic/roadway closures, or school closures.

2.1 Briefly describe ONE of these events or emergencies

2.2 In what year did this event happen?

2.3 Where did it happen?

City:

State:

2.4 How were you alerted? (Check all that apply)

- Sirens, other alarms
- Direct observation of your surroundings
- Phone call (landline or mobile)
- TTY
- Fax
- Television
- Radio
- Text message
- Instant messaging/chat
- Email
- Internet news or information source
- Personal alerting device: Please specify _____
- Other: Please specify _____

2.5 Did you verify the public alert? (Check all that apply)

- No
- Yes (How did you verify the alert? Check all that apply)
 - Direct observation of your surroundings
 - Phone call (landline or mobile)
 - TTY
 - Fax
 - Television
 - Radio
 - Text message
 - Instant messaging/chat
 - Email
 - Internet news or information source
 - Personal alerting device: Please specify _____
 - Other: Please specify _____

2.6 Did you pass on the public alert to someone else?

- No
- Yes (How did you pass on the alert? Check all that apply)
 - Phone call (landline or mobile)
 - TTY
 - Fax
 - Television
 - Radio
 - Text message
 - Instant messaging/chat
 - Email
 - Internet news or information source
 - Personal alerting device: Please specify _____
 - Other: Please specify _____

Part 3 — Alerts through social media

3.1 How often do you access social media (like Facebook, Twitter, MySpace, Google Buzz, etc)?

- N/A (Not Applicable)
- Desktop computer: How many times/day or times/week:
- Laptop computer: How many times/day or times/week:
- Cell phone: How many times/day or times/week:

3.2 Have you ever received a public alert through any of these social media? (Check all that apply)

- N/A (Not Applicable)
- Facebook
- Foursquare
- Google Buzz
- IdeaBox
- LinkedIn
- listservs
- MySpace
- Ning
- Second Life
- Twitter
- Yahoo
- YouTube
- Other: Please specify _____

3.3 Have you ever verified a public alert through any of these social media? (Check all that apply)

- N/A (Not Applicable)
- Facebook
- Foursquare
- Google Buzz
- IdeaBox
- LinkedIn
- listservs
- MySpace
- Ning
- Second Life
- Twitter
- Yahoo
- YouTube
- Other: Please specify _____

Part 4 — About You

4.1 What is your age? _____

4.2 Do you experience any of these functional limitations? (Please check all that apply).

- Seeing
- Blindness
- Low vision
- Hearing
- Deaf
- Hard of hearing
- Thinking (learning, remembering, or concentrating)
- Speaking
- Using your hands
- Walking, standing, or climbing stairs

Thanks for helping to improve accessibility of emergency communications. In order to be entered into the drawing for the \$250 Amazon gift card, please submit your contact information below. The drawing will be held on January 31, 2011; the winner will be contacted privately.

Name:

Email:

Phone:

Street Address:

City:

State:

Zip Code:

ⁱ Harris Interactive, The Pros, Cons and Learning Curve of Social Media, January 1, 2011. Accessed May 4, 2011, www.harrisinteractive.com/vault/Hi-Harris-Poll-Social-Media-Online-Privacy-2011-01-18.pdf - 2011-01-18.

ⁱⁱ Twitter, Meaningful growth, December 15, 2010. Accessed May 4, 2011, <http://blog.twitter.com/2010/12/stocking-stuffer.html>.

ⁱⁱⁱ Nielsen, The State of Mobile Apps, June 1, 2010. Accessed May 4, 2011, http://blog.nielsen.com/nielsenwire/online_mobile/the-state-of-mobile-apps/