Docket No. 06-181

ORIGINAL

Pam Gregory

FILED/ACCEPTED
OCT 26 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

From: marilyn taylor [mjt064805@msn.com] **Sent:** Fri 9/15/2006 3:07 PM
To: Monica Desai
Cc:
Subject: Closed caption
Attachments:

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

I am 100 % deaf and without closed caption I would be lost.
Please consider not to change any rules or regulations that would jepordize
my only way of communication. Thanks Jim
Again Thanks for your cobsideration

NAME: Jim Taylor

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: marilyn taylor [mjt064805@msn.com] **Sent:** Mon 10/23/2006 3:52 PM
To: Pam Gregory
Cc:
Subject: RE: Closed caption
Attachments:

FILED/ACCEPTED
OCT 26 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Yes my last name is Taylor. Thanks

>From: "Pam Gregory" <Pam.Gregory@fcc.gov>
>To: "marilyn taylor" <mjt064805@msn.com>
>Subject: RE: Closed caption
>Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2006 10:12:35 -0400
>
>Dear Jim: May I please have your last name for the record? Many thanks in
>advance. Pam Gregory....Pam.Gregory@fcc.gov
>
>_____
>
>From: marilyn taylor [mailto:mjt064805@msn.com]
>Sent: Fri 9/15/2006 3:07 PM
>To: Monica Desai
>Subject: Closed caption
>
>
>
>I am 100 % deaf and without closed caption I would be lost.
>Please consider not to change any rules or regulations that would jepordize
>my only way of communication. Thanks Jim
>Again Thanks for your cobsideration
>
>

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: Chuck Kelley [charles.kelley@gallaudet.edu] **Sent:** Wed 10/4/2006 1:47 PM
To: Monica Desai
Cc: Robert McDowell; Deborah Tate; Jonathan Adelstein; Michael Copps; Kevin Martin
Subject: RE: Granting of captioning exemptions: Cease immediately!
Attachments:

I left out Monica Desai erroneously. My apologies, Monica. This e-mail is also intended for you as the head of Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau.

Thank you,

FILED/ACCEPTED
OCT 26 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Chuck Kelley
Coordinator of Professional Development
Laurent Clerc National Deaf Education Center
Gallaudet University
800 Florida Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002
AIM: Kellcj

VP (202)651-5932

Call me thru the *Sorenson Video Relay Service (VRS):*

1. *Dial toll free 1-866-327-8877*
2. *Follow the automated prompts.*
3. *When prompted, provide my full name (Chuck Kelley), and videophone number (202-651-5932)*
4. *A video relay interpreter will connect us.*

From: Chuck Kelley [mailto:charles.kelley@gallaudet.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, October 04, 2006 1:43 PM
To: 'Kevin.Martin@fcc.gov'; 'Michael.Copps@fcc.gov'; 'Jonathan.Adelstein@fcc.gov'; 'Deborah.Tate@fcc.gov'; 'Robert.McDowell@fcc.gov'
Subject: Granting of captioning exemptions: Cease immediately!

Dear Chairman and Commissioners,

I have just learned that the FCC has made a decision to grant a large number of captioning exemptions. This was a terrible decision in a recent spate of negative decisions in favor of large and small companies and ignoring the needs of people with disabilities, who don't have the power to send programs that even the "smallest" broadcaster can send over the airwaves. That decision should not stand. It should be reversed immediately.

It has been ten years now since the closed captioning rules were put in place. That is plenty of time for programmers to find funding and get set up to caption their programs. The decision sets a very bad precedent. A) It is counter to the regulations at 47 CFR Part 79.1(d) that allow for certain exemptions; and (b) it is de facto rulemaking without notice. They are creating new regulations without a process. This FCC interpretation could have far reaching effects that go well beyond religious programming. The entities who asked for waivers are given consideration while those of use who will be affected are not.

Chuck Kelley
Coordinator of Professional Development
Laurent Clerc National Deaf Education Center
Gallaudet University
800 Florida Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002
AIM: Kellcj

VP (202)651-5932

Call me thru the *Sorenson Video Relay Service (VRS):*

1. *Dial toll free 1-866-327-8877*
2. *Follow the automated prompts.*
3. *When prompted, provide my full name (Chuck Kelley), and videophone number (202-651-5932)*
4. *A video relay interpreter will connect us.*

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: CileWyatt@aol.com [CileWyatt@aol.com] **Sent:** Wed 9/27/2006 11:05 AM
To: Monica Desai
Cc:
Subject: Exemption to Religious Organizations from Providing Closed Captioning
Attachments:

Please note my strong objection to granting permanent exemptions to religious organizations so that they no longer have to provide closed captioning services to the hard of hearing. It has been almost ten years since closed captioning was mandated, and that is more than enough time for these organizations to have made accommodations.

Please reverse this unfair and discriminatory ruling immediately.

Sincerely,

Lucile Wyatt
Dallas, Texas

FILED/ACCEPTED
OCT 26 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: Claudia Foy [foyclaudia@yahoo.com] **Sent:** Wed 9/20/2006 1:48 PM
To: FCCINFO; ?Kevin.Martin@fcc.gov; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; Deborah Tate; Robert McDowell
Cc: Monica Desai; Jay Keithley; Tom.Chandler@fcc.gov; Cheryl King; ?info@tdi-online.org; Sheila Conlon Mentkowski
Subject: TDI Alert
Attachments:

FILED/ACCEPTED
OCT 26 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

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.

Religious organizations, including churches synagogues and other sites of worship, are a very important part of the 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 religious organization door. By providing captions to meet the needs of a significant population group, organized religion will find them 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 Ð they will find themselves depending on captioning to listen to the message.

We want to participate fully in all programs and services at our religious organization 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 members, neighbors, fellow employees, family members, and service professionals in the local community. We stand to benefit from the Òlocal connectionÓ 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.

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Thank you for your consideration,

Sincerely,
Claudia Foy
3411 North 16th Street
#1065
Phoenix, AZ 85016
(602) 234-2394 TTY
email: foyclaudia@yahoo.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

Honorable Senator John McCain (fax)

Do You Yahoo!?
Tired of spam? Yahoo! Mail has the best spam protection around
http://mail.yahoo.com

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: Craig Kubanoff [runner6771@comcast.net] **Sent:** Sun 10/1/2006 11:08 AM
To: Monica Desai
Cc:
Subject: exemptions for closed captioning
Attachments:

Dear chairman and commisioners:
I am upset about the captioning exemptions by the Fcc.
Television is an avenue that the deaf have to be informed entertained and to learn about products. This decision should not stand. Society is judged not by how it treats the majority but by how it treats the minority.
Please consider the ones who can't hear. But by the grace of god go I.
Thankyou
Craig kubanoff

FILED/ACCEPTED
OCT 26 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: Cynwalsh33@aol.com [Cynwalsh33@aol.com] **Sent:** Tue 10/3/2006 8:35 AM
To: Monica Desai
Cc:
Subject: TV Closed Captioning
Attachments:

Dear Monica DeSai

We,all deafies, hard of hearies, and others want to save TV Closed Captioning...We can't stand it without C.C. on TV... We would like to keep TV C.C. forever for our sakes....even deaf grandchildren.... We can't imagine if it would be without TV C.C. and we would be lost and don't understand or can't hear what do TV says... Thank you for your patience and please agree with us....

Cynthia McElroy from Bloomington, Illinois

FILED/ACCEPTED
OCT 26 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Docket No. 06-181

DIVISION OF DISABILITY AND ELDER SERVICES

COUNCIL FOR THE DEAF AND HARD OF HEARING
1 WEST WILSON STREET
P O BOX 7851
MADISON WI 53701-7851

Telephone: 608-266-5841
FAX: 608-264-9899
TTY: 608-266-3118
www.dhfs.state.wi.us

Jim Doyle
Governor

Helene Nelson
Secretary

State of Wisconsin
Department of Health and Family Services

FILED/ACCEPTED
OCT 26 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

October 3, 2006

Kevin J. Martin, Chairman
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20054

Dear Chairman Martin,

On September 21, 2006, the Governor's Council for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing had its regular meeting and one of the topics discussed was the Federal Communications Commission's September 12, 2006 decision regarding granting permanent exemptions to any television video programming. The Council is deeply concerned about the decision.

The Council respectfully asks that the Federal Communications Commission reverse the decision. Closed captioning gives Deaf and Hard of Hearing citizens, not just in Wisconsin but nationwide access to news, entertainment, education and religion. This access allows us to be productive, fully informed tax-paying citizens.

Video programmers have had ten years to prepare for captioning regulations now in place. Granting full waivers and exemptions sends a wrong message and reverses all the access and work done especially by National Association of the Deaf and TDI, Inc.

The Council also encourages the Federal Communications Commission to address captioning quality, digital captioning and to establish a user-friendly system that would allow consumers to register a complaint quickly and effectively.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Dan C. Koblitz

Dan Koblitz, Chair

CC: Wisconsin Council for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing
Wisconsin Office for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing
Commissioner Michael J. Copps
Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein
Commissioner Deborah Taylor-Tate
Commissioner Robert M. McDowell
US Senator Russell Feingold
US Senator Herbert Kohl
US Representative F. James Sensenbrenner
US Representative Ron Kind
US Representative Gwen Moore
US Representative David R. Obey
US Representative Thomas E. Petri
US Representative Tammy Baldwin
US Representative Paul Ryan
US Representative Mark Green

Attachments can contain viruses that may harm your computer. Attachments may not display correctly.

Pam Gregory

From: Dan Koblitz [dckoblitz@wisc.edu] **Sent:** Tue 10/10/2006 12:09 PM
To: KJMWEB
Cc: Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; dtaylortateweb; Robert McDowell; Michael Copps; Alice Sykora; Linda Huffer; Monica Desai
Subject: Closed-Captioning Exemptions
Attachments: council.pdf(117KB)

FILED/ACCEPTED
OCT 26 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Chairman Martin,
Please read the attachment regarding the FCC's recent decision to allow closed-captioning exemptions to video producers Anglers for Christ Ministries and New Beginning Ministries.
Thank you,

Dan Koblitz

Chairman
Wisconsin State Council for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing

FILED/ACCEPTED
OCT 26 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: Dana Gantt [dgantt@numail.org] **Sent:** Mon 10/9/2006 8:43 AM
To: Kevin Martin; Deborah Tate; Robert McDowell; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; Monica Desai
Cc:
Subject: FCC Action on Captioning
Attachments:

In reading the information below, I am unsettled by the fact the FCC doesn't considered those of us with sensory disabilities when addressing close caption and calling it an undue burden. I ask you to put yourself in our shoes for a moment - you at home and hear or see nothing, suddenly a tornado hits your home but because you couldn't hear or see the warning you are killed. If only the warning had been available adequate cover could have been found. Same scenario but a work, you sense, hear feel co workers running but can't hear/see what the excitement is about, suddenly the tornado hits the building and you lose your life. If the warning over had been available with close caption a life would have been saved.
I ask you, to try to watch a television program with your family or friends and be unable to because it's not available in closed caption and the FCC has ruled it's an undue burden for the programmers, TV stations, directors to make it accessible for all. In other words if they can't make more money from sensory disabilities we are an undue burden. Thank you for making us that burden instead of just a person who happens to have a sensory disability.
I sincerely hope, none of you ever have to walk in my shoes and be left out of services so freely taken care of by the FCC for the general public simply because you are blind or have to wonder what a disaster happens how you will know what to do, hide in the closet, get the boat out, don't drink the water, evacuate the premises. Obviously, those of us who need all aspects of closed captioning are not considered an equal citizen of the U.S. as those of the sighted world. Strange, we pay taxes, own homes, work, play just like everyone else but our own government agency doesn't think we deserve the opportunity to have closed captioning available for all sensory disabilities and can cause the stations, programmers, director to have the face an undue burden financially. I guess that shows where the thought process is behind this decision, those who have the biggest wallet get what they want, while those without just don't even get consideration are a financial undue burden. I thought I was a citizen period not a burden to the U.S. obviously in your eyes we are an undue burden who will just be left out in the cold yet again.

Dana Gantt

On Wed. Sept 13, 2006, the FCC issued an Order granting two requests for exemptions from the requirement to close caption. The proof currently needed to get an exemption for the captioning requirement is "undue burden." The statute defines "undue burden" to mean "significant difficulty or expense."

In its Order, the FCC stated that it is "inclined favorably" to grant new exemption
requests to organizations that do "not receive compensation from video programming distributors from the airing of [their] programs," and who also say they "may terminate or substantially curtail [their] programming" or "[curtail] other
>activities important to [their] mission" if forced to caption. This is a devastating weakening of the requirement.
But utilizing the wording they have, the Order creates a new category of exemption. By using the language, "or curtail other activities important to their mission." (Note, this is not SIGNIFICANTLY curtail, just curtail) the FCC is creating a test so lenient that almost any non-commercial educational entity would qualify regardless of its funding and resources.
What is more alarming is that this change of interpretation was done without following the accepted procedure of posting a notice and allowing public comment; furthermore there have been a number of reports in the last week that the FCC has sent out large numbers of letters granting waivers to closed captioning obligations.
How does this affect us? One of the issues pertinent to those of us with sensory disabilities is the remarkable impact technology and telecommunications has had on our lives as individuals and as communities. But it is important to realize how vulnerable that access is to regulatory changes and orders.
As is often mentioned in our literature on video description, as of January 1st of this year, 100% of all new television must be closed captioned for the deaf and video description is the equivalent for people who are blind and visually impaired.
Even once video description passes as legislation, entities may still be able to make
>an "end run" around the requirement using this new exception created by the FCC. We will have fought through Congress only to find the FCC unwilling to support the video description requirement. These actions by Chairman Martin
>put into serious jeopardy the potential for >success for requiring the description of not>only television programs, but it extends also to critical emergency information.
As an example put forward by the National Association of the Deaf: "In August, the FCC said TV stations in big cities do not have to caption emergency information and it will not consider uncaptioned emergency information to be a violation of closed captioning rules. Worse, the FCC will not second guess a TV station's decision to not caption emergency information."
What it appears is that the FCC is saying is that people with sensory disabilities need not have full access to programming; and what is far worse, that it is acceptable to not provide emergency information to people with sensory disabilities in a manner they can access.

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: Deanna Lynam [Dlynam@peoplepc.com] **Sent:** Tue 9/26/2006 12:54 PM
To: Kevin Martin; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; Deborah Tate; Robert McDowell
Cc: Monica Desai
Subject: captioning exemptions
Attachments:

Dear Chairman and Commisioners,
I have heard of the recent decision to grant a large number of captioning exemptions of certain programs. I would like to ask you to reverse these immediately. This will greatly effect those who are hearing impaired, as these programs wouldn't be accessible to them.
Thank you for your prompt reply to this request.
Sincerely,
Mrs. Deanna Lynam

FILED/ACCEPTED
OCT 2 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: Debbie Titus [dtitus@ieccil.org] **Sent:** Tue 10/3/2006 5:55 PM
To: Kevin Martin; Michael Copps; Deborah Tate; Robert McDowell; Monica Desai
Cc: dtitus@ieccil.org; daniel@ncil.org
Subject: QUESTIONS IN REGARDS TO THE EXEMPTION RULE GRANTED:INDEPENDENT LIVING ADVOCATE SPEAKING TO FCC AS OF 10/03/2006
Attachments:

FILED/ACCEPTED

OCT 26 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

To the Federal Communications Commission Officials:

This email writing from one of the hearing impaired Greater Washington DC Area residents who is an Independent Living Advocate for the Independence Empowerment Center (IEC), Manassas, VA and is presenting you some items of concern before an exemption rule is either granted or becomes activated.

Before the exemption rule is granted by the internal votes of the FCC rulemaking body of representatives, there are some questions we need to closely explore with good rationale and cost-effective avenues:

- Has there been any most recent survey collected from the hearing impaired or deaf TV viewers? The assumption or unilateral consensus should not be the only outcome for the exemption rule.

- Has the survey batch been carefully tabulated at whatever programming affiliations with closed captioning feature to see if they receive viewer responses as such as to local news, regular network programming and/or cable programming? Do the major TV broadcasters receive programming surveys on a regular basis that may yield to ongoing captioning or cease captioning? Do they present valid or invalid reasons for ongoing captioning or ceasing captioning?

- Which major TV broadcasting channel(s) receive(s) federal funds if any at all? If so, are they of "catch-all" tendency as mentioned in the FCC fact sheet, or public interest information? (keep in mind that emergency preparedness announcement or "red flag" alerts are important to the deaf/hard of hearing population)

- Are there any movies/cinemas/musical drama/sporting events sponsored by the private or philanthropic agencies/organizations to maintain or add the closed captioning feature to them?

- Should all entertainment and documentary programs and musical drama be federal-funded, or separated from the federal funding, therefore should they have been independently sponsored by the private-sector to maintain closed captioning? (Which is where we need to draw a line as to whether it is of public interest or individual viewer choice). Nowadays, do we as the viewers understand the difference between open captioned and closed captioned feature for what/which programs that are of public interest or belong to the choices of individual viewers? The next question in a particular situation to weigh reasonable or unreasonable responses, does every modern TV set have on-screen menu that is capable of choosing captioning or non-captioning mode, therefore what is the basis for enforcing or granting exemption rule to whoever is going to be waived? And why? Does it have to do with federal funding being appropriated or should the viewers lobby the TV broadcasters to support closed captioning feature as independent of the federal government interference?

The last question before considering and voting on the exemption rule, where does in the ADA law

support any reasonable way or an unreasonable basis for communicating with and disseminating essential public information to the deaf and hard of hearing population?

Please forward your responses back to me at dftfaith2001@yahoo.com or dtitus@ieccil.org which I will appreciate your keen analysis of this controversy. Thank you.

Sincerely, Deborah (Debbie) F. Titus, hearing impaired IEC Independent Living Advocate, IEC, Manassas, VA

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: Laura Skwirut [Laura38c@comcast.net] **Sent:** Fri 9/29/2006 3:09 PM
To: Monica Desai
Cc:
Subject: DA 06-102, CGB-CC-0005, GSB-CC-0007
Attachments:

As one of the millions of hard of hearing persons, I am appalled at the FCC granting a recent Order of Closed Captioning Exemption. As a matter of fact, every show, whether to entertain or of public interest should be captioned. If anything there is greater need for **more** closed captioning, not an order to exempt. Those who have requested such action have no idea of the disability , or as has been said many times, "you know not until you have walked in the shoes of those particularly disabled." Exempting closed captioning is taking from the hard of hearing their freedom of choice, one of our many freedoms in America.

I broach the question, since when has any government authority taken it upon themselves to grant exemptions without first learning from those exempted who will suffer as a result of the exemption. Our government was established on principles to serve all of the people, not a select group. This FCC action will have deprived a very large segment of the population who are hard of hearing.

The "Christian Angler" apparently are not in need of closed captioning or, fortunately for them, have no hard of hearing persons in their faith-based organization. If such religious groups are claiming burden of expense to provide closed captioning, those non-profit groups obtain free software to produce captions from their text.

If this is a timely maneuver before the mid-term political elections, those politicals who subscribe to the exemption will be sorely defeated in the elections.

Please reverse the Order of Closed Captioning Exemption. Thank you.
Laura Skwirut
Villanova, PA 19085

FILED/ACCEPTED
OCT 26 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: Donna R Hunt [Donna.R.Hunt@ncmail.net] **Sent:** Thu 9/21/2006 10:09 AM
To: Monica Desai
Cc:
Subject:
Attachments:

In reference to the recent decisions relating to closed captioning exceptions, I am a hearing person but at times due to other situations that may arise within my surroundings I benefit from the programming that provides closed captioning. Although the sound is muted I can still be informed of what is being discussed. I find that in some of the programming a statement is made and it is not clear what is said and the closed captioning affords me and others the opportunity (due to the delivery delay in typing) to capture what was either missed or mistakenly heard. As for our other citizens of this country who rely heavily on closed captioning for all forms of communication due to deafness or hard of hearing issues, the considerations being made are certainly not in this sectors interest. We should always afford our constituents every opportunity to know what is happening within our society. We have hundreds of thousands (possibly millions) of people who give everyday to our communities abroad the globe and they are hearing impaired. Pleases do consider how important this decision is and how it will effect their lives.
Thanks
Donna Hunt
Wilson North Carolina

FILED/ACCEPTED
OCT 26 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: Don Hoagland [dhhoagie@yahoo.com] **Sent:** Sat 9/16/2006 12:53 PM
To: Monica Desai
Cc:
Subject: Closed Caption
Attachments:

I hope I am wrong but it is my understanding that the F C C is thinking about letting some groups present t v programs without closed caption. Closed caption is like audio to those of us that have a hearing problem. I know the F C C would not allow programs without audio. I would encourage the F C C to make sure that all programs are closed caption. That would fit in with looking forward and addressing some of the problems we have with hearing disabilities. Thank You Don Hoagland Saint Louis

FILED/ACCEPTED
OCT 26 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

October 6, 2006 Docket No. 06-181

FILED/ACCEPTED

OCT 26 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Chairman and Commissioners,

I am writing to you on behalf of The Staten Island Center for Independent Living in reference to the FCC's recent policy changes regarding closed captioning during television programs, news broadcasts, and emergency announcements.

Many Americans view television programs as a major source of information. This comes as a result of their convenience and accessibility; that is, unless the American referred to is an individual who is deaf or hard of hearing. The FCC's decision to grant caption exemptions will virtually eliminate the ability of these individuals to gain valuable information from news programs and emergency alerts. For example, broadcasters relate crucial details, such as food or drug recalls, that individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing will be unaware of if there are no visual cues available.

Similarly, auditory emergency alerts are not always followed by or simulcast with text. These circumstances, combined with your disbelief in the necessity for such visual data, pose a problem. For instance, if the announcement involves a major storm that requires particular preparatory procedures and/or evacuation plans, an individual who is deaf or hard of hearing will be in a very dangerous, possibly fatal predicament because they cannot hear the bulletins. An even more disturbing and heart wrenching example of the devastating effect that your caption exemptions will have on deaf and hard of hearing individuals comes in the form of the story of a woman's desperate search for information about her husband on September 11th. She is totally deaf and her husband worked in the firehouse closest to the World Trade Center.

When the planes struck and the towers crumbled, the closed captioning disappeared. She was frantic and desperately sought another way to locate her husband. When she tried to use her TTY phone, it too was not functioning. There she was—alone, afraid, and stuck in a whirlwind of frightening, graphic, wordless chaos. She had no way of communicating with the world outside; no way of understanding the reports that the broadcasters were giving; no way to call for help or information; no way to find her husband. Fortunately, her husband had been out on another call and had not been in the firehouse when it had been destroyed but, she had no way of knowing this. It took two days for her husband to have the ability to contact her and assure her that he was safe. If only the closed captioning had been working, she could have had two days less of worry, despair, and sadness. What about the individuals who are deaf and hard of hearing who were unable to hear the warning of Hurricane Katrina and died as a result? Do you want your actions to end in millions of stories like these? Would you want a loved one who is deaf or hard of hearing desperately searching for a way to communicate with others and/or to find communication through television broadcasts that is not forthcoming because of your new policies? These are the questions you should be asking yourselves.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I trust that, upon reading this letter and others like it as well as reviewing your decisions regarding closed captioning, you will have a better understanding of the outrage and disdain with which your actions have been met. I am confident that you will do all that is necessary to reverse these abhorrent policies as soon as possible. Some people say that silence is golden but, for those individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing and may not be aware of a disaster before it strikes or while it is occurring, silence is deadly.

Courtney Gross
SI Center for Independent Living, Inc.

dorothy.doran@verizon.net

Attachments can contain viruses that may harm your computer. Attachments may not display correctly.

Pam Gregory

From: Dorothy Doran [dorothy.doran@verizon.net] **Sent:** Fri 10/6/2006 11:24 AM
To: Monica Desai
Cc: Kevin Martin; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; Deborah Tate; Robert McDowell
Subject: Response to FCC Captioning Policy Changes
Attachments: letter to FCC about CC changes.doc(25KB)

Attached please find my letter which is full of concerns about this decision.

FILED/ACCEPTED
OCT 26 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Courtney Gross

SI Center for Independent Living

470 Castleton Avenue

Staten Island, NY 10301

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: Emily McCullum [emily@digitallyhip.com] **Sent:** Fri 9/22/2006 1:45 PM
To: Monica Desai
Cc:
Subject: Recent Changes to Closed Captioning Rules
Attachments:

I believe the recent change to closed captioning requirements is short-sighted for several reasons. First, demographic: baby boomers are aging and, therefore, becoming increasingly deaf. Secondly, closed captioning can be used for indexing, searching and retrieving video. And thirdly, of course, the deaf and hearing-impaired community, will be excluded from enjoyment of those programs that do not have closed captioning. This last item has a ripple effect to the families and friends of the hearing disabled, which creates a much wider impact than has perhaps been taken into consideration.

Emily

Digitally Hip Corporation

Emily McCullum
Digitally Hip Corp.
voice: 604.947.9141
fax: 604.947.9142
emily@digitallyhip.com

FILED/ACCEPTED
OCT 26 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Pam Gregory Docket No. 06-181

From: Heather Kirby [Heather.Kirby@state.tn.us] **Sent:** Tue 10/10/2006 12:24 PM
To: Monica Desai
Cc:
Subject: closed captioning
Attachments:

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

Dear FCC Chairman, 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!

I am 31 years old and am hearing impaired and use this service daily in order to enjoy watching TV. I do not know what I would do without it. It helps me understand news and weather shows. Please reconsider.

Sincerely,
Heather Higdon Kirby
Chemist State of TN Agriculture Dept.
Nashville, TN 37204

Home Address:
6007 Westfork Drive
Smyrna TN 37167

FILED/ACCEPTED
OCT 26 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: Henderson Wiltshire [ashjamar@sbcglobal.net] **Sent:** Mon 10/16/2006 4:53 PM
To: Monica Desai
Cc:
Subject: closed Captions
Attachments:

FILED/ACCEPTED
OCT 26 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Commissioner:

I protest the recent orders granting exemptions from closed captioning issued by CGB. As a person with profound hearing loss, your action will isolate me from from many things that you and other hearing people find basic and necessary. I need my closed captioning.

Henderson Wiltshire
5708 Prescott Drive
Arlington, TX 76018

Pam Gregory Docket No. 06-181

From: Irene Alexander [alexanderosb@hotmail.com] **Sent:** Sat 9/16/2006 10:52 AM
To: Monica Desai
Cc: cheppner@nvrc.org
Subject:
Attachments:

I am distressed to know that the FCC has determined to push caption TV to be lessen. I have begone to enjoy TV for the first time in many years. I am deaf in one ear and hard of hearing in the other. You can understand why caption i important to my viedwing TV. In particular the news media and WTVA programs.

Please address the thoughts of reducing caption on TV. I believe over 1/3 of your audience need and use caption.

Sr. Irene Alexander

9535 LNTON HALL ROAD

BRISTOW, VA 20136

FILED/ACCEPTED
OCT 2 6 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Docket No. 06-181

Attachments can contain viruses that may harm your computer. Attachments may not display correctly.

Pam Gregory

From: Jamie Berke [deafness.guide@about.com] **Sent:** Tue 9/19/2006 8:07 PM

To: FCCINFO; Michael Copps; Deborah Tate; Robert McDowell; Monica Desai; Jay Keithley; Tom.Chandler@fcc.gov; Cheryl King; info@tdi-online.org

Cc:

Subject: RESCIND THE CAPTIONING WAIVERS NOW

Attachments: AVG certification .txt(213B)

I am taking time out of my busy schedule to write you to insist that you immediately rescind the television captioning waivers that were issued recently.

It has been MANY years since the television captioning regulations were published. Producers of ALL kinds of programming have had PLENTY of time to plan for and budget for, captioning as a ROUTINE matter of production costs. Captioning is, and should be viewed as, no different from planning for the cost of sound, video, and editing.

NO television programs should be granted captioning waivers at this point in time because of "cost." It is an embarrassment to the Federal Communications Commission. Captioning is not a charitable activity, it is not a luxury, and it should not be treated as an afterthought! If the producers can't afford to caption their programs, maybe they should consider measures such as broadcasting in black and white instead of color, to cover the cost of captioning.

If the FCC grants captioning waivers to the producers of certain types of programming, what is there to stop the FCC from granting waivers for other types of programming? This is a dangerous, slippery slope that the FCC is getting itself onto.

Jamie Berke
About Deafness/Hard of Hearing
deafness.about.com

www.About.com
About.com is part of The New York Times Company

FILED/ACCEPTED
OCT 26 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: hepstein [hepstein@cox.net] **Sent:** Mon 10/2/2006 11:24 PM
To: Monica Desai
Cc:
Subject: Closed Captioning
Attachments:

CGB Chief Monica DeSai@fcc.gov

FILED/ACCEPTED
OCT 26 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

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

Dear FCC Chairman,

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 are outraged and believe the FCC has created a loophole that almost any entity crying "it costs too much" can now use. Closed captioning is essential for the deaf but there increasing numbers of people who have sufficient hearing impairment that they cannot understand dialogue without the help of closed captioning. Thus, one must not just count the numbers of deaf people who rely on closed captioning and the numbers of people who have sufficient hearing impairment is becoming much more prevalent. My husband cannot understand most programming on television.

Please reconsider immediately! We need our closed captioning! We need to understand the spoken word in whatever context dialogue or speech is presented on television and movies.

Helen T. Epstein
5525 South Toledo Avenue
Tulsa, OK 74135

Docket No 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: John Maloof [john@maloofstudio.com] **Sent:** Tue 9/26/2006 6:09 PM
To: FCCINFO; Kevin Martin; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; Deborah Tate; Robert McDowell; Monica Desai; Jay Keithley; Tom.Chandler@fcc.gov; Cheryl King; info@tdi-online.org
Cc:
Subject: Attn:Commissioners
Attachments:

FILED/ACCEPTED
OCT 26 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

> 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 FCC on September 12, 2006.
>
> I respectfully ask that the FCC reverse its September 12, 2006
> decisions regarding television captioning waivers.
>
> Captioning TV programs does meet a legitimate basic need for access
> to information, just like building a ramp to the church door.
>
> 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.
>
> Closed captioning gives everyone access to news that is
> indispensable to the community, entertainment, and education.
>
> Thank you for your consideration.
>
> Sincerely,
> John Maloof
John@maloofstudio.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
> TDI
> Congressman Dutch Ruppersberger
>
> _____
> Do You Yahoo!?
> Tired of spam? Yahoo! Mail has the best spam protection around
> http://mail.yahoo.com
>

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: JTomM129@aol.com [JTomM129@aol.com] **Sent:** Tue 9/26/2006 12:45 AM
To: FCCINFO; Martin@fcc.gov; Copps@fcc.gov; Adelstein@fcc.gov; Tate@fcc.gov; McDowell@fcc.gov
Cc: Monica Desai; Jay Keithley; Cheryl King
Subject: Television captioning waivers
Attachments:

FILED/ACCEPTED
OCT 26 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary
DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

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.

Closed captioning gives me a) access to news that is indispensible 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,
Tom Mengel
7373 S. Ivy Way
Centennial CO 80112
JTomM129@aol.com