

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Memorandum

RECEIVED
OCT 5 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

To: Bill Caton, Deputy Secretary

CC: Geraldine Taylor

From: Sandralyn D. Bailey, Supervisor Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau

Date: 10/2/2006

Re: Comments Received Re: Docket 05-231 Sept '06

The Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau received 2671 (some duplicated) in the above proceeding. Attached is the CD-R to which those documents were copied. Also attached are 3 examples of the documents received.

Sincerely,

Sandralyn D. Bailey

SandraLyn Bailey

From: Linda Geiger [LGeiger2005@optonline.net]
Sent: Monday, October 02, 2006 11:32 AM
To: dtayloratateweb
Subject: Re: DA 06-1802, CGB-CC-0005 and CGB-CC-0007

RECEIVED
OCT 5 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

October 2, 2006
FCC Commissioner Deborah Taylor Tate

Dear Deborah Taylor Tate,

As a mother of a deaf adult, it has been a joy to watch him be able to watch everything from the news to favorite movies and tv shows. To begin to undue this tremendous benefit to over 31 million deaf people in the US, is outrageous! Not only is captioning beneficial to deaf people but for my own mother with deteriorating hearing, it is a blessing to help her with the sounds she misses. Please don't shut the door on us. We need more shows to be captioned, not less!

I protest the FCC approval of almost 300 requests for new programs to be shown without closed captions.

The FCC weakened the closed captioning rules, and appears to have created new standards and new rules for permitting programs to be televised without closed captions. I believe the FCC violated the closed captioning rules.

People who are deaf or hard of hearing want access to televised information and entertainment, just like everyone else.

Closed captioning is an essential part of any televised program. Captioning is not too difficult or too expensive.

Deaf and hard of hearing people cannot watch television programs that are not captioned.

Please reconsider these FCC decisions and support closed captioning.

Sincerely,

Linda Geiger
2 Emerald Ct
Moriches, NY 11955-1424

No. of Copies made 0
List A B C D E

Sandralyn Bailey

From: Sandi Streeter [S.Streeter@surfcity.net]
Sent: Monday, October 02, 2006 3:46 AM
To: Robert McDowell; Deborah Tate; jonathaon.adelstein@fcc.gov; michael.j.copps@fcc.gov; Kevin Martin
Cc: marilynfinn@aol.com; sfarina@norcalcenter.org; bbattat@hearingloss.org; benedictxvi@vatican.va
Subject: Please Do Not Exempt Captioning of TV Programs

RECEIVED
 OCT 5 2006
 Federal Communications Commission
 Office of the Secretary

September 30, 2006

Dear FCC Commissioners,

I'm writing this letter on behalf of Hearing Loss Association of California. We are a non-profit organization, a state organization of Hearing Loss Association of America (formerly Self Help for Hard of Hearing People). We have 29 chapters in the state of California, and 250 chapters across the country.

There are over 30 million deaf and hard of hearing people in the United States, who depend on closed captioning to understand programs on TV. One in ten Americans have hearing loss significant enough to impact their lives. Up until now, we've been very happy with the progress made over the last few years in giving us access to various programs. Overjoyed, really, to hear that all programs were required to be closed captioned by January 1, 2006. I well remember the days when I never watched TV because I could not understand what was being said. Nervous, frustrated and scared when news programs were not captioned and an emergency situation existed. Captioning opened a whole opportunity for access to information and greatly improved my life.

It was therefore to our great dismay to learn that since January 2006, over 550 requests to the FCC have been filed, seeking exemptions to the closed captioning requirement citing "undue burden." Over 300 of these exemptions have been granted to non-profit CHURCH organizations. Not merely temporary exemptions, either, but PERMANENT exemptions! Appalling! Did it ever occur to you that these very deaf and hard of hearing constituents, whom you are excluding by these actions, might not be able to attend and understand a church service any other way? You are denying accessibility to religious freedom to these people, which is, by today's standards, not only unethical, but unlawful. This seems to contradict all the other progress that has been made in recent years. Please stop bending the rules and insist that the churches also caption their programs. If they can afford air time, they can afford captioning to enable the deaf and hard of hearing population to understand and enjoy their broadcasts. Please don't return us to the stone ages!

Sincerely,

Sandi Streeter
 Immediate Past President
 Hearing Loss Association of California

No. of Copies received
 LISTABODE

0

P. O. Box 483
Beaumont, CA 92223

Sandralyn Bailey

From: Cheryl Heppner [CHeppner@nvrc.org]
Sent: Sunday, September 24, 2006 8:53 AM
To: Monica Desai; Kevin Martin; Jonathan Adelstein; Michael Copps; Deborah Tate; Robert McDowell
Cc: Hope Hamilton
Subject: Captioning Waivers

(Forwarded at the request of M. Hope Hamilton)

Dear Chairman and Commissioners:

RECEIVED
 OCT 5 2006
 Federal Communications Commission
 Office of the Secretary

Please, please re-consider your recent decision to grant exemptions from TV captioning. You are the Federal COMMUNICATIONS Commission. You should be encouraging communications, doing everything in your power to ensure that everyone is able to communicate with and be part of the great media in this country—not obstructing communication for the deaf and hard-of-hearing. You should be helping organizations to find ways to process the captioning, instead of telling them: “Okay, you don’t have to do captions.” You are saying essentially that you do not care if everyone has access to television programs.

But you are concerned about their costs and their being able to put their programs on the air. You are concerned about “...hindering the production and distribution of programming.” But that is exactly what you ARE doing with these exemptions. You are hindering the distribution to a large segment of society. Every organization that puts programs on the air has money to do so. Why are you concerned about their costs anyway? That’s not your concern; that’s their problem. And, it’s not a big problem anyway; it’s just that they don’t care, don’t want to bother. Your statement that an organization may “...terminate or substantially curtail its programming...” because of having to do captions is quite ridiculous. Why in the world are you concerned about that anyway? Do you really believe that a program is going to NOT be done just because they have to put captions on it? Wake up. They will do their programs if they want to whatever the cost.

Why are we hard-of-hearing people excluded from mainstream America? Why is it so difficult for those of you who hear well to understand the needs of hearing impaired persons. We want to be able to watch and understand TV shows just like you, but we really need the captioning. Where is your concern for us who need captions to be able to be part of the great communication media? What about us? Why have you chosen to ignore us so completely?

Why does anyone need exemptions from the captioning requirement anyway? Cost? Since when is anyone allowed to not obey a law because it costs too much? It’s ridiculous! If they have the many thousands of dollars to make a TV show, then they have a few more dollars to do the captioning. Anyway, captioning is a very very small part of the cost of putting on a TV show or a movie.

We are struggling to have better captioning, and here you are taking away the poor captioning that we already have. That’s very mean and thoughtless and uncaring.

Are you aware that in the next few years there are going to be many more millions of people who will be needing captions? The “boomer generation” is getting older and many many of them will have impaired hearing because of the extremely loud music they have been listening to.

No. of Copies rec'd 0
 List A B C D E

Thank you for reading this, and please give your consideration to the thoughts I have expressed.

Sincerely,
M. Hope Hamilton
72 N. Center St., Redlands CA 92373
PerfectPages@msn.com

DOCKET NO. 05-23)

Attachment A

DOCUMENT OFF-LINE

This page has been substituted for one of the following:

- o This document is confidential (**NOT FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION**)
- o An oversize page or document (such as a map) which was too large to be scanned into the ECFS system.
- o Microfilm, microform, certain photographs or videotape.
- o Other materials which, for one reason or another, could not be scanned into the ECFS system.

The actual document, page(s) or materials may be reviewed (**EXCLUDING CONFIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS**) by contacting an Information Technician at the FCC Reference Information Centers) at 445 12th Street, SW, Washington, DC, Room CY-A257. Please note the applicable docket or rulemaking number, document type and any other relevant information about the document in order to ensure speedy retrieval by the Information Technician

D 18K