

Kenneth L. Hill

From: Stephen Dunbar [sdunbar@flyingpigs.com]
Sent: Friday, September 22, 2006 9:12 PM
To: Monica Desai
Subject: DA 06-1802, CGB-CC-0005 and CGB-CC-0007

FILED/ACCEPTED

OCT 16 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

*September 22, 2006
FCC Chief, Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau Monica Desai*

Dear Monica Desai,

We 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.

We cannot watch television programs that are not captioned.

Please reconsider these FCC decisions and support closed captioning.

Senator Harkin: You gave praise to the Iowa Association for the Deaf via captioned DVD in your absence during our 125th anniversary. Your comments were well received by all! Imagine if you had not captioned your DVD!

Senator Grassley: My wife, Jessica and I sit in the front row at Prairie Lakes Church with the sign language interpreters. We would be honoured if you would meet with us some Sunday after the 9:00 a.m. service.

Sincerely,

*Stephen and Jessica Dunbar
2212 Erik Rd
Cedar Falls, IA 50613-7948*

Kenneth L. Hill

From: Maureen Dempsey [kitty_mouse_2006@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, September 22, 2006 8:02 PM
To: Monica Desai
Subject: Re: DA 06-1802, CGB-CC-0005 and CGB-CC-0007

FILED/ACCEPTED

OCT 16 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

*September 22, 2006
FCC Chief, Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau Monica Desai*

Dear Monica Desai,

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.

I cannot watch television programs that are not captioned.

Please reconsider these FCC decisions and support closed captioning.

Sincerely,

*Maureen Dempsey
po box 2211
kingston, NY 12402-2211*

Docket No 06-181

FILED/ACCEPTED

OCT 16 2006

Kenneth L. Hill

From: Lennard Davis [lendavis@uic.edu]

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Sent: Tuesday, October 03, 2006 12:17 PM

To: Kevin Martin; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; Deborah Tate; Robert McDowell; Monica Desai

Subject: Change ruling that permits stations to bypass closed captioning in emergencies

I recently learned about the FCC's decision that would permit stations to opt out of closed captioning warnings during emergencies. As a disability studies professor and someone with Deaf parents, I am seriously concerned. This could lead to mini-Katrinās for the Deaf who rely on visual information in times of emergency. I sincerely hope you will reconsider this decision. As a commentator for All Things Considered, on National Public Radio, I am also very aware of the importance of being able to spread news in a timely fashion.

Sincerely,

Lennard J. Davis
Professor
Department of English
Department of Disability and Human Development
Department of Medical Education
Director, Project Biocultures www.biocultures.org

Mailing Address:
University of Illinois at Chicago
Department of English (MC 162)
601 South Morgan Street
Chicago, Illinois 60607-7120
Office: UH 1832
Phone: (312) 413 8910
Fax: (312) 413 1005

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

10/4/2006

FILED/ACCEPTED

Docket No 06-181

OCT 16 2006

Kenneth L. Hill

From: Daniel Dickens [dsdickens@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 21, 2006 12:22 PM
To: Kevin Martin; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; Deborah Tate; Robert McDowell
Cc: Monica Desai
Subject: Closed captioning exemptions
Importance: High

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

To Whom It May Concern:

I'm very disappointed to learn that the FCC has been granting closed captioning exemptions! The regulations have been in place for 10 years now, and that's plenty of time to prepare for closed captioning to be put in ALL programs. I am hearing-impaired, and I get extremely discouraged when I cannot enjoy any given program or movie because they did not put in captioning or subtitling for the deaf/hard of hearing in their program. I realize I am part of the minority in this country, but the right thing to do is to ensure that all Americans have equal viewing opportunities. I therefore ask that you reverse this action immediately!

Thank you for your time, and I look forward to your speedy reply on this emotional issue.

Daniel S. Dickens

NON ORIGINAL

Kenneth L. Hill

From: Marie Drew [marie.drew@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, September 25, 2006 5:20 PM
To: Monica Desai
Subject: Repeal the CC exemption NOW

FILED/ACCEPTED

OCT 16 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

How DARE you! I would like for you to be deaf for just one week, and see if you would so glibly vote the same way. I protest the recent Orders granting exemptions from closed captioning issued by CGB. These Orders appear to create a new regulation, carving out a new exemption basis, not in keeping with current regulations. We are outraged and believe the FCC has created a loophole that almost any entity crying "it costs too much" can now use. Please reconsider immediately! We need our closed captioning! Marie Drew Canonsburg, PA

Docket No 06-181

Kenneth L. Hill

From: alice dungan [alicedungan1@prodigy.net]
Sent: Sunday, September 24, 2006 1:12 PM
To: Monica Desai
Subject: EXEMPTION TO CLOSE CAPTIONNIG

FILED/ACCEPTED

OCT 16 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

TO: Monica, Desai, Bureau Chief
Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau

REF: DA 06-1802, CGB-CC-0005, CGB-CC-0007

Dear Ms Desai:

I am Hard of Hearing and I would like to have MORE television shows captioned NOT less as granted by the FCC's recent Order on Closed Captioning Exemption. Any attempt to decrease my access to television is terribly upsetting. There are still far too many shows I want to watch that I can't. Please don't make a bad situation worse by allowing corporations to lessen their responsibility to those of us who struggle constantly to learn and enjoy the things that most people take for granted. One of the factors that is most upsetting about the FCC's change is that I suspect (and I think you do also) that a lot of the companies who say that they "CAN'T" afford to spend ... just "DON'T WANT" to spend. And that the statement that "it might shut us down" is just a ploy to cut expenses. It's human (and corporate!) nature to be greedy!

I want to "see" television just like the rest of the world and for me that means captioning. The more the better which is certainly not the direction (and may I say.. the very autocrat direction) that the FCC's is taking.

Please reconsider.

Regards,
Alice Dungan
6906 Shalkop St.
Phila., Pa. 19128

9/26/2006

persons with hearing loss.

Please let me to turn this around for you, suppose you suddenly became deaf or hard-of-hearing tomorrow ... what would you do? You'd find that your exemptions were wrong and that you're going to be regarded as impaired or defective. But since God allegedly told the government that churches cannot afford total communication access, you won't be afforded the same access that you enjoy as a hearing person.

The Americans with Disabilities Act is a landmark law affording equal protection to persons with disabilities and what you are doing is counteracting this landmark law and bowing to the wrath of the righteous.

The United States Constitution protects the first amendment rights of religious expression and we, as persons who are deaf or hard-of-hearing, have a **HUMAN RIGHT** to be given the same information on the same level. Writing down on a notepad or a piece of paper will not cut it.

Mr. Chairman and Commissioners ... I call upon you to **REVERSE** your ruling and ensure that a policy of no more consideration of exemptions be enacted by the Commission. There is absolutely **NO** reason for any exemptions to be considered or afforded.

Thank you,

Karl A. Ewan

cc:

Monica Desai, Bureau Chief of the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau

Thomas Chandler, Chief of the Disability Rights Office

Senator Paul Sarbanes, Maryland

Senator Barbara Mikulski, Maryland

Congressman Steny Hoyer, Maryland's 5th Congressional District

News @ the National Council of American Churches

Karl A. Ewan

KAEwanSJ@yahoo.com

"Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

"Vigilancia eterna es el precio de libertad."

Stay in the know. Pulse on the new Yahoo.com. [Check it out.](#)

9/26/2006

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: Jay Keithley
Sent: Tuesday, September 19, 2006 10:32 AM
To: Pam Gregory
Subject: FW: We Have the Right to Access Captions....

FILED/ACCEPTED
OCT 16 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

*** Non-Public: For Internal Use Only ***

-----Original Message-----

From: GayleEllis@aol.com [mailto:GayleEllis@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 19, 2006 12:35 AM
To: FCCINFO; Kevin Martin; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; Deborah Tate; Robert McDowell
Cc: Monica Desai; Jay Keithley; Tom.Chandler@fcc.gov; Cheryl King; info@tdi-online.org
Subject: We Have the Right to Access Captions....

September 18, 2006

Kevin J. Martin, Chairman
Michael J. Copps, Commissioner
Jonathan S. Adelstein, Commissioner
Deborah Taylor Tate, Commissioner
Robert M. McDowell, Commissioner

Dear Commissioners,

This is to let you know that I fully support the action alerts from TDI and other national organizations to oppose the decisions taken by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) on September 12, 2006. We respectfully ask that the FCC reverse its September 12, 2006 decisions regarding television captioning waivers.

Churches make up a very important part of every community. It is within their mission to support the basic needs of all people within their reach. When Hurricane Katrina struck the Gulf Coast one year ago, they were among the first to offer help with shelter, food, and other assistance to the survivors. Captioning TV programs does meet a legitimate basic need for access to information just like building a ramp to the church door. By providing captions to meet the needs of a significant population group, the churches will find themselves with an expanded TV viewership, which will lead to an increase in their membership and other support from the community. When children and adults are able to read captions on spiritual programs, they are influenced to live up to high moral standards and contribute their part to the community. Hearing loss is the number one growing disability among senior citizens - they will find themselves depending on captioning to listen to the message.

We want to participate fully in all programs and services at our local church because it serves as a vital resource that empowers us to be fully integrated in the community. If one of us who are deaf or hard of hearing sees the services with captions on TV, we can interact with other church members, neighbors, fellow employees, family members, and service professionals in the local community. We stand to benefit from the "local connection" that national religious programs are unable to provide.

We know that all video programmers have had ten years to prepare for the captioning regulations now in place, and temporary waivers when appropriate. When you give full permanent exemptions to the two programmers, it reverses all the access we have worked on for years. We ask that programmers consider other possible revenue options such as sponsorships, long-term captioning service agreements, and aftermarket sales (videotapes or DVDs) to cover and minimize the cost of captioning. Or, they can reduce other expenses in their production budgets to enable the provision of captioning.

9/19/2006

Closed captioning gives me a) access to news that is indispensable to the community, b) entertainment that is an integral part of our lives, and c) education that paves the way for us to become self-sufficient in society. The information that everyone in the community receives is also important to me and I can only get it if it is captioned.

Thank you for your consideration,

Sincerely,

GayleEllis
4538 Kraft Ave
Studio City, CA 91602-2008
GayleEllis@aol.com

cc:

Monica Desai, Chief, Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau
Jay Keithley, Deputy Chief (Policy), Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau
Tom Chandler, Chief, Disability Rights Office
Cheryl King, Deputy Chief, Disability Rights Office

Your US Senator and/or US Congressman

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: Jay Keithley
Sent: Tuesday, September 19, 2006 10:33 AM
To: Pam Gregory
Subject: FW: (no subject)

FILED/ACCEPTED

OCT 16 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

*** Non-Public: For Internal Use Only ***

-----Original Message-----

From: Philosopherm@aol.com [mailto:Philosopherm@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 19, 2006 9:52 AM
To: Monica Desai; Jay Keithley; Tom.Chandler@fcc.gov; Cheryl King; info@tdi-online.org; FCCINFO
Cc: Philosopherm@aol.com
Subject: (no subject)

September 18, 2006

Kevin J. Martin, Chairman
Michael J. Copps, Commissioner
Jonathan S. Adelstein, Commissioner
Deborah Taylor Tate, Commissioner
Robert M. McDowell, Commissioner

Dear Commissioners,

This is to let you know that I fully support the action alerts from TDI and other national organizations to oppose the decisions taken by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) on September 12, 2006. We respectfully ask that the FCC reverse its September 12, 2006 decisions regarding television captioning waivers.

Churches make up a very important part of every community. It is within their mission to support the basic needs of all people within their reach. When Hurricane Katrina struck the Gulf Coast one year ago, they were among the first to offer help with shelter, food, and other assistance to the survivors. Captioning TV programs does meet a legitimate basic need for access to information just like building a ramp to the church door. By providing captions to meet the needs of a significant population group, the churches will find themselves with an expanded TV viewership, which will lead to an increase in their membership and other support from the community. When children and adults are able to read captions on spiritual programs, they are influenced to live up to high moral standards and contribute their part to the community. Hearing loss is the number one growing disability among senior citizens – they will find themselves depending on captioning to listen to the message.

We want to participate fully in all programs and services at our local church because it serves as a vital resource that empowers us to be fully integrated in the community. If one of us who are deaf or hard of hearing sees the services with captions on TV, we can interact with other church members, neighbors, fellow employees, family members, and

9/19/2006

service professionals in the local community. We stand to benefit from the "local connection" that national religious programs are unable to provide.

We know that all video programmers have had ten years to prepare for the captioning regulations now in place, and temporary waivers when appropriate. When you give full permanent exemptions to the two programmers, it reverses all the access we have worked on for years. We ask that programmers consider other possible revenue options such as sponsorships, long-term captioning service agreements, and aftermarket sales (videotapes or DVDs) to cover and minimize the cost of captioning. Or, they can reduce other expenses in their production budgets to enable the provision of captioning.

Closed captioning gives me a) access to news that is indispensable to the community, b) entertainment that is an integral part of our lives, and c) education that paves the way for us to become self-sufficient in society. The information that everyone in the community receives is also important to me and I can only get it if it is captioned.

Thank you for your consideration,

Sincerely,
Mary Polly Easley
1149 Mulberry Lane
Greenville, NC 27858
Philosophermp@aol.com

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

cc:
Monica Desai, Chief, Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau
Jay Keithley, Deputy Chief (Policy), Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau
Tom Chandler, Chief, Disability Rights Office
Cheryl King, Deputy Chief, Disability Rights Office

Pam Gregory

Docket No. 06-181

From: Jay Keithley
Sent: Wednesday, September 27, 2006 8:25 AM
To: Pam Gregory
Subject: FW: Where is the Separation of Church and State in FCC's Recent Actions??

FILED/ACCEPTED

OCT 16 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

*** Non-Public: For Internal Use Only ***

-----Original Message-----

From: Sheri Farinha [mailto:sfarinha@norcalcenter.org]
Sent: Wednesday, September 27, 2006 1:18 AM
To: Kevin Martin; michael.j.copps@fcc.gov; jonathon.adelstein@fcc.gov; Deborah Tate; Robert McDowell; benedictxvi@vatican.va
Cc: Monica Desai; Jay Keithley; Thomas Chandler; Cheryl King; Gregory Hlibok; Cantos, Olegario D.; jrosen@ncd.gov; TDIExDir@aol.com; crawford@nad.org; Angela Foreman; s.mentkowski@comcast.net; Alice McGill; Karen Peltz Strauss; Cheryl Heppner; bbattat@hearingloss.org
Subject: Where is the Separation of Church and State in FCC's Recent Actions??

September 26, 2006

Dear Commissioner Kevin Martin,

On behalf of NorCal Center on Deafness, a non-profit community-based organization serving Deaf & Hard of Hearing Individuals throughout 24 northeastern counties in California, I am writing to request the FCC Commissioners to place on next month's agenda the issue of granting exemptions primarily to Church groups who can afford air time but whom don't want the responsibility of providing access to 30+ million Americans who are Deaf and Hard of Hearing nor compliance with existing federal mandates.

Additionally, I wish to request that the FCC - - REVERSE its September 12, 2006 decision regarding granting permanent exemptions to any televised video programming. The FCC's charge to regulate interstate and international communications by radio, television, wire, satellite and cable is seriously jeopardized when you co-mingle your decision by crossing the lines between the church and the state to bend the rules and grant exemptions.

In today's society, we have embarked on a high-tech era, whereby technology before us can be exciting except when one has a hearing loss and realizes there are barriers to fully enjoy the same privileges afforded those who can hear. In the case of obtaining access to television, deaf and hard of hearing Americans try to access via the internet, and or high definition TV, plasma or otherwise, but have already noted gaps or zero captioning creating more barriers which we planned to bring to your attention. However, on September 12th, the Deaf and Hard of Hearing Community received a shock, discovering that after 15 years worth of work to advocate that our population's need for access on televised programs via closed captioning was robbed of our dignity, once again. It was a harsh blow dealt to find that the FCC had not

10/4/2006

only granted exemptions to two non-profit church organizations to waive them from their responsibility to caption their services televised, they were granted **permanent** exemptions! The outrage across the nation can be felt in ripples. Many of us who are tax-paying citizens in the United States of America, feel strongly, this decision is a step back in towards the *Stone Age*.

I would like to remind the Commission, of the Supreme Court's decision in *Olmstead v. L.C.*, 527 U.S. 581 (1999), which said, " whenever possible, people with disabilities should be provided services in the community, rather than in institutions. For the promise of full integration into the community to become a reality, people with disabilities need safe and affordable housing, access to transportation, access to the political process, **and the right to enjoy whatever services, programs, and activities are offered to all members of the community at both public and private facilities**".

Just recently, Deaf and Hard of Hearing Americans were overjoyed seeing our nation reach its benchmark requiring all programs to be closed captioned on or by January 1, 2006. Little did we realize that the National Association of Broadcasters who's duty is to assist stations in responding to industry issues and promoting their extensive public service efforts, and whom also has lobbied heavily against full access to closed captioning requirements, have instructed new or existing local televised programs - - predominately non-profit church organizations - - that they can't continue to air their church services until they insert closed captioning for their programs. These church organizations in turn, hundreds of them, filed requests with the FCC, to exempt them from closed captioning requirements.

The regulation regarding closed captioning specifically states requirements of the Telecommunications Act, found in Section 713, was to ascertain more and more television is made accessible for people who are hard of hearing or deaf: "Closed captioning is a technology that provides visual text to describe dialogue, background noise, and sound effects on television programming".

Furthermore, the FCC, in its decision on compliance with closed captioning (*64Report and Order 13 FCC Rcd 3200-01 ¶ 60*) specifically gave a ten year transition period for captioning of pre-rule programming and required that 75% of all pre-rule nonexempt programming delivered to consumers must be captioned. This compliance with the requirement was to be measured channel-by-channel, averaged over each calendar quarter. In trying to be fair to the broadcasters, video programmers the FCC believed it reasonable to "generally exempt video programming providers with annual revenues of less than \$3 million and note that this criteria was based on a determination that 2% of such revenues would provide only two hours of captioning per week". Additionally, in this same report, the FCC also stated, that they "recognized that new networks, in contrast to well established services, experience significant financial burdens unique to the initiation of service that warrant special treatment.

However, through this exemption, the FCC specifically stated in that order that they would provide such networks additional discretion for *phasing in captioning*. "We expect such networks to begin efforts to caption programming during the exemption period and, therefore, will require captioning at the level in effect at the expiration of their exemption" (Commissioner Kennard).

Since that ruling was made final, the FCC has actually granted few exemptions (approximately 70 in the last 8 years). Contrary to the present day, since January 2006, over 550+ requests requesting exemption citing undue burden, has reached the FCC's "desk", and already almost 300 of them have been granted and that the majority of these requests purposely denying deaf and hard of hearing persons access are from CHURCH organizations! Unbelievable!

Surely the FCC Commission can see why it is upsetting *thousands of constituents* across the nation who are deaf and hard of hearing, upon learning that our communication needs via the television, appear to be pushed aside and suddenly "permanent" exemptions are granted of which are majority by church organizations who seemed to have joined in on the business side of faith, with the Broadcasters political bandwagon, citing "undue burden"! My question, how is it as non-profits, they are even able to afford to buy air time!? Where is the integrity, as "servants of God", to ensure their viewers who have a hearing loss, has access to these televised services?

Moreover, the FCC may very well be in contradiction with President Bush executive order (2001), regarding the Faith-based Initiative. This Faith-based federal program requires the Bush administration to follow federal regulations which includes **removing barriers** so as to allow faith-based organizations, and others to apply for the grants that are distributed and yet, this initiative also requires that these very programs are to be implemented in a manner **consistent with applicable statutes and the requirements of the Constitution**, including the Establishment, Free Exercise, and Free Speech Clauses of the First Amendment. It does not say, bend the rules when it comes to churches! What's more, the Faith-based initiative specifically states **such funds are not to be utilized for worship services!** There are specific **nondiscrimination clauses** required by non-profits, any group and/or organization, or company who receives state and federal funds: may not in providing program assistance supported by such funding, discriminate against a program beneficiary or prospective program beneficiary on the basis of religion or religious belief!

I am appalled to learn that the FCC took these requests from church organizations, *at their word only*, and did not request full disclosure from these church groups. By this action alone, was the FCC negligently shirking its responsibility? Not only was the FCC lax on closed captioning exemption "tests" requiring full financial disclosure from 300 requests, but also, hasn't even checked to verify if these churches receive federal funding, faith-based or other types, for any of their programs, and if so, to order compliance!

Where is the Separation of Church and State by the FCC actions? Where is the separation of Church and State, by these religious organizations? The line needs to be drawn to this blatant social injustice barring human rights to access communication!

"In addition, there is the right to *religious freedom* and the development of an *economy* that is at the service of the human person and of the common good, with respect for social justice, the principles of human solidarity and subsidiarity, according to which «the rights of all individuals, families, and organizations and their practical implementation must be acknowledged»." (Second Vatican Council, Pastoral Constitution *Gaudium et spes*, 75).

I personally am not a consistent church-goer like many Deaf people in our community will tell you, simply because as a Deaf person myself, the lack of sign language interpreters available prevent me from attending on a regular basis, and when church services of any kind are aired locally, and/or nationally with closed captioning, it is a gratifying experience. Being denied this experience in every which way with the church's now asking for exemption, is in my view, a violation of theological intent: "Extremely sensitive situations arise when a specifically religious norm becomes or tends to become the law of a state without due consideration for the distinction between the domains proper to religion and to political society. In practice, the identification of religious law with civil law can stifle religious freedom, even going so far as to restrict or deny other inalienable human rights". (John Paul II, *Message for the 1991 World Day of Peace: «If you want peace, respect the conscience of every person»*, 4: AAS 83 (1991), 414-415).

On a final note, Chairman Martin, I appeal to your sense of moral responsibility to reverse the "300" exemptions, follow the letter of the law that's before you. May it come to be that some need to be temporary exemptions until these groups can show further cause with full financial disclosure, and time to find contributions to cover captioning costs which basically affords an individual their basic human right to full community access to every day life! To the church organizations, I likewise appeal as such groups simply have a responsibility to comply with the laws as do the rest of us - - non-profits organizations.

Deaf and Hard of Hearing Americans will never *achieve full access in the community* as long as our government, i.e., the FCC continues to be allowed to bend the rules for political, religious and other unexplained reasons.

Sincerely,

Sheri Farinha Mutti, CEO
NorCal Center on Deafness.
4708 Roseville Rd., Suite 111
North Highlands, CA 95660

CC: The Congress of the United States

Sheri Farinha Mutti
Chief Executive Officer

NorCal Center on Deafness
4708 Roseville Rd, Ste 111
North Highlands, CA 95660
Email: SFarinha@norcalcenter.org
Pager: [Sheri@mycingular.blackberry.net](tel:Sheri@mycingular.blackberry.net)
For more info about NorCal's Services
go to: www.norcalcenter.org

10/4/2006

Kenneth L. Hill

Docket No. 06-181

From: Candy Fitzpatrick [donfitz@nctc.com]
Sent: Monday, October 02, 2006 11:53 AM
To: Monica Desai
Subject: Closed captioning

Please leave the closed captioning alone. Many hearing impaired people need this in order to enjoy television. Thank you.

FILED/ACCEPTED

OCT 16 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: Joyce Feo [FeoJoyce@BellSouth.net]
Sent: Saturday, September 30, 2006 4:22 PM
To: Monica Desai
Subject: Re: DA 06-1802, CGB-CC-0005 and CGB-CC-0007

FILED/ACCEPTED

OCT 16 2006

September 30, 2006
FCC Chief, Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau Monica Desai

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Monica Desai,

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.

My friends who are deaf cannot watch television programs that are not captioned.

Please reconsider these FCC decisions and support closed captioning.

Sincerely,

Joyce Feo
4215 N Landar Dr
Lake Worth, FL 33463-8908

Pam Gregory

Docket No. 06-181

From: Finnegan, Margaret [FinnegMH@flagler.edu]
Sent: Thursday, September 28, 2006 9:53 AM
To: Monica Desai
Subject: Closed Captioning Exemptions
"In Re DA 06-1802, CGB-CC-0005 and CGB-CC-0007

FILED/ACCEPTED

OCT 16 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Ms. DeSai:

I am writing this email to protest the recent Orders granting exemptions from closed captioning issued by CGB. These Orders appear to create a new regulation, carving out a new exemption basis, not in keeping with current regulations. As the parent of a Deaf Child and a professional in the field of Deaf Education, I am outraged and believe the FCC has created a loophole that almost any entity crying "it costs too much" can now use. Please reconsider this action as we have worked very hard to lose this very important right...if individuals are allowed to use cost as a measure to escape responsibility, it sets a very dangerous precedent. Deaf people need closed captioning and under the law have every right to expect it!

Margaret H. Finnegan, Ph.D.
Coordinator, Education of the Deaf and Hard of Hearing
Flagler College
74 King Street
Saint Augustine, FL 32084
904-819-6250
finnegmh@flagler.edu

This email contains CONFIDENTIAL information intended only for the use of the addressee (s) named above. If you are not the intended recipient of this email, you are hereby notified that any dis

Docket No 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: Cabin607f@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, September 26, 2006 9:17 AM
To: Monica Desai
Subject: closed captioning

FILED/ACCEPTED

OCT 16 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Ms. DeSai,

I can't believe exemptions were granted to certain TV shows that allow them not to use closed captioning. Please reconsider this as when you are hard of hearing you rely on the captioning so you can enjoy a program. Otherwise, you are constantly asked a family member to tell you what happened or you change the channel because you can't understand the show. This is not a good thing to do to people with disabilities. All shows should have closed captioning. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Terri Fedele
529 Jewett Ave
Staten Island, NY 10302

Pam Gregory

Docket No. 06-181

FILED/ACCEPTED

From: Carol [carol@nrctraining.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 27, 2006 12:56 AM
To: Kevin Martin
Cc: Monica Desai; Jonathan Adelstein; Michael Copps; Robert McDowell; Deborah Tate
Subject: Closed Captioned TV
Importance: High

OCT 16 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear FCC Chairman,

We protest the recent Orders granting exemptions from closed captioning issued by CGB. These Orders appear to create a new regulation, carving out a new exemption basis, not in keeping with current regulations. We are outraged and believe the FCC has created a loophole that almost any entity crying "it costs too much" can now use.

The deaf and hearing impaired people in this country need our closed captioning! **Please reconsider immediately!**

Carol and Hal Finkelstein
1200 South Ocean Blvd. Apt. 3G
Boca Raton, FL 33432

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

10/11/2006

Pam Gregory

Docket No. 06-181

From: Angela Freeman [ajfree2@earthlink.net]
Sent: Saturday, September 16, 2006 1:24 PM
To: Monica Desai
Subject: Closed Caption
"In Re DA 06-1802, CGB-CC-0005 and CGB-CC-0007"

FILED/ACCEPTED

OCT 16 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

> Dear FCC Chief:

I protest the recent Orders granting exemptions from closed captioning issued by CGB. These Orders appear to create a new regulation, carving out a new exemption basis, not in keeping with current regulations. I am outraged and believe the FCC has created a loophole that almost any entity crying "it costs too much" can now use. Please reconsider immediately! We need our closed captioning! Do you release that one out of every ten Americans suffer for hearing impairments? Do the math and see how many thousands and thousands of Americans this will affect. Three people alone out of four in my household use closed caption. One out of those three is deaf and the other two have hearing impairments. There are many families that are in the similar situation. Don't forget our elderly either so many of them rely on TV for information and entertainment as it is difficult for them to get out. Please reconsider immediately!

Sincerely,

Angela J. Freeman
535 Woody Dr.
Lebanon, MO

9/19/2006

Pam Gregory

Docket No. 06-181

FILED/ACCEPTED

From: Karen Foster - x4209 [kfoster@paraquad.org]

OCT 16 2006

Sent: Thursday, September 14, 2006 12:34 PM

To: Monica Desai

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Subject: Captioning

Please do not take captioning away from any Religious organizations' programs. People with hearing loss should be able to watch any programs they wish to. They would need captioning to be able to understand what people are saying on the programs. I am Deaf myself. I rely on Captioning 100 percent of the time. I would want to watch a religious program with captioning.

Karen Foster
Deaf IL Specialist

PARAQUAD
5240 Oakland Ave
St. Louis, MO 63110
314-289-4209 TDD
314-289-4200 Voice
314-289-4201 Fax

Email: kfoster@paraquad.org
Website: www.paraquad.org

Pam Gregory

Docket No. 06-181

From: pjfoody@frontiernet.net
Sent: Thursday, September 14, 2006 8:36 PM
To: Monica Desai
Subject: exemptions to captioning

FILED/ACCEPTED

OCT 16 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

I am totally outraged at the decisions to grant permanent exemptions to religious organizations for captioning their programs. I only watch captioned programs. Also, there is a large elderly/infirm population that is homebound. Their only religious contact is these programs. You have just contributed to further isolating this population. Pamela Foody

Pam Gregory

FILED/ACCEPTED

From: Elizabeth Furber [railliz@sbcglobal.net]

OCT 16 2006

Sent: Saturday, September 16, 2006 9:34 PM

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

To: Kevin Martin

Cc: Deborah Tate; Robert McDowell; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; Monica Desai

Subject: In Re DA 06-1802, CGB-CC-0005 and CGB-CC-0007

I am writing to protest the recent orders granting exemptions from closed captioning, which open the door for abuse by any organization that can now claim "it costs too much."

We who have a hearing loss depend on captioning in order to navigate what people with normal hearing can enjoy with no difficulty. No organization should be given the opportunity to deny us this essential access.

Elizabeth Furber
35 28th Ave., #101
San Mateo, CA 94403

9/19/2006