

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: Thomas Chandler
Sent: Monday, September 25, 2006 9:22 AM
To: Pam Gregory; Francine Crawford
Subject: FW: closed captioning letter from Aberdeen Captioning

FILED/ACCEPTED

OCT 19 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

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

Tom Chandler
Chief, Disability Rights Office
Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
Room 3-B431
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554
(202) 418-1475
(cell) (703) 338-0372
(TTY) (202) 418-0597
thomas.chandler@fcc.gov

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

From: Becky Isaacs [mailto:becky@abercap.com]
Sent: Friday, September 22, 2006 9:27 PM
To: Thomas Chandler
Subject: closed captioning letter from Aberdeen Captioning
Aberdeen Captioning
committed to the WORD

September 20, 2006

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

Dear Commissioners,

We are extremely concerned about the decisions taken by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) on September 12, 2006 and particularly the following comment: *"in the future, when considering an exemption petition filed by a non-profit organization that does not receive compensation from video programming distributors from the airing of its programming, and that, in the absence of an exemption, may terminate or substantially curtail its programming, or curtail other activities important to its mission, we will be inclined favorably to grant such a petition"* This statement appears to open the door to eliminate closed captions from nearly all religious and non-profit programming. This action appears to reverse the FCC position and not comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act which has established closed captioning access to all. We respectfully ask that the FCC reverse its September 12, 2006 decisions and position regarding television captioning waivers.

Our company, Aberdeen Captioning Inc., has specialized in providing closed captioning services to religious video producers and television stations since June 2001. We've built our business (25 employees

and contract employees) based on the laws and position established by the FCC requiring captions and have seen great success serving both small and large ministries. We are able to provide captioning for as little as \$60 per 30 min show for live and \$150 for 30 min show for post production – 50% less than most other companies. This reduced pricing has allowed ministries to provide closed captioning while still carrying on business and maintaining their mission. We can show, without question, that non-profit and ministry organizations can and should be required to provide closed captioning services on their video programming. Aberdeen has over 100 clients captioning weekly or daily programs ranging from KTVB, Daystar, Cornerstone Television to smaller churches. We would be glad to provide our entire customer list and books to show that these companies are actually captioning and paying Aberdeen to perform this service. Nearly all these programmers receive donations/offering from their viewers.

The larger concern is the precedence that will be set if exemptions are granted just because a non-profit states captioning costs will affect their mission. Every one of the companies we caption for could justify that they could provide additional services (mission essential) with the money that they could save from not captioning. It is our position that this reasoning should not be used solely as a reason to grant an exemption because this would most likely lead to all non-profit religious organizations filing for an exemption. In speaking with Thomas Chandler of the FCC, I was made aware of several hundred exemption requests that are not posted on the website. Since previous requests have been posted on the FCC website, how are advocates of closed captioning able to provide feedback to the FCC if we are not made aware of the enormous number of exemption requests prior to the decision being implemented? More importantly, will the non-profit/religious programmers that are currently captioning be granted an exemption? In your due-diligence process of an exemption request, are you asking if they are currently captioning? It surely would be a major disservice to the hearing-impaired community if programs that are currently captioned were allowed to become exempt.

Over the past 5 years the video/television industry has seen incredible growth with additions of channels beyond our imagination 10-20 yrs ago. The United States of America has grown because we are a capitalistic society which invites ingenuity and creativity. Rules/regulations are established and businesses/consumers find ways to meet these rules. This has been the case thus far with captioning. There has been no decline in programming because captioning is necessary. By granting an exemption to video program producers, you are effectively taking airtime away from programmers that would provide captions. By doing so, you are going against the very standards and goals you uphold – closed captioning access to all!

The following are comments by yourselves, the FCC Commissioners, supporting captioning and meeting the needs of the hearing-impaired:

Statements by commissioners in regards to 07-20-05
 FCC Launches Review of Closed Captioning Rules.
 Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (CG Docket No. 05-231, FCC 05-142)

**Quotes from the STATEMENT OF
 CHAIRMAN KEVIN J. MARTIN**

Those consumers that rely on Telecommunications Relay Services and Closed Captioning Services must not be left out of the telecommunications revolution.

The Commission is more committed than ever to ensuring that the goals of the ADA are achieved. The actions we take today join the many others that the Commission has taken over the years to eradicate the barriers that stand in the way of functional equivalency. Functional equivalency means individuals with disabilities having access to the same services as everyone else. This equal access is vital to accessing jobs, education, public safety, and simple communications with family, friends, and neighbors.

**Quotes from the STATEMENT OF
 COMMISSIONER KATHLEEN Q. ABERNATHY**

One of our most important responsibilities is to make sure that there are no telecom "have-nots," and that the wealth of services provided by today's new technologies are available to all consumers."

"Lou Ann Walker, a noted advocate for the hearing-impaired, once said that the inability to hear is a nuisance, but the inability to communicate is a tragedy. ...we are helping to turn tragedies into nuisances."

Quotes from the STATEMENT OF

COMMISSIONER MICHAEL J. COPPS

"Functional equivalency" may sound like Washington jargon, but for 54 million Americans it translates into equal opportunity, equal rights and fuller participation in society.

By granting the petition for rulemaking filed by Telecommunications for the Deaf, the National Association of the Deaf, Self Help for Hard of Hearing People, the Association for Late Deafened Adults and the Deaf and Hard of Hearing Consumer Advocacy Network, we make an effort to keep our rules current and ensure that video programming is accessible to everyone.

**Quotes from the STATEMENT OF
COMMISSIONER JONATHAN S. ADELSTEIN**

I fully support this Notice to seek comment on the adequacy of our current closed captioning rules and on how the rules can be made more effective and efficient.

Both Congress and the Commission have recognized how important it is that all people have access to video programming, which is increasingly affecting how we operate in the home, at the office, and at school.

we must remain committed to ensuring that video programming is not only accessible, but also high quality.

Today's rulemaking takes another step forward toward ensuring that the hearing-impaired community receives functionally equivalent video programming services. I commend my colleagues for their dedication to confronting these issues that are so important for the deaf and hard of hearing community

Our country, the United States of America, was founded on the pursuit of religious freedom. If the FCC begins to grant exemptions in mass numbers to non-profit/religious organizations, entire segments of many television station's air day will be without captions. This goes against every comment made above by the commissioners that video programming be accessible to everyone. Those hearing-impaired individuals that watch religious programming will be left behind and that would be a tragedy!

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. Nearly all religious programming asks for donations or offerings at some point in the show or season. 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 religious 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 are finding themselves depending on captioning to listen to the message.

All video programmers have had ten years to prepare for the captioning regulations now in place, and temporary waivers when appropriate. When you give permanent exemptions to the two programmers, it reverses all the access we have worked on for years. We ask that the FCC reconsider that a cost of as little as \$60 per program is truly an undue burden and worth the risk of tragically eliminating captions from religious programming.

Thank you for your consideration,

Sincerely,

Matthew Cook
President/Owner
Aberdeen Captioning, Inc.
22362 Gilberto, Suite 230
Rancho Santa Margarita, CA 92688
Cell Phone – 949-412-7335
Email: mbcook@cox.net

Becky Isaacs
VP/Owner
Aberdeen Captioning, Inc.
22362 Gilberto, Suite 230
Rancho Santa Margarita, CA 92688
Office Phone – 949-858-4415
Email: becky@abercap.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

US Congressman, Gary G. Miller
US Senators, Dianne Feinstein and Barbara Boxer

All the best,

Becky Isaacs
Managing Partner
Aberdeen Captioning, Inc.
22362 Gilberto, Suite 230
Rancho Santa Margarita, CA 92688
ph. 949-858-4463 or 800-688-6621
cell 949-412-7337
fax 949-858-4405
becky@abercap.com

Please visit our informative website www.abercap.com

FILED/ACCEPTED

Pam Gregory

Docket No 06-181

~~OCT 19 2006~~

From: SHONNA ISAACS [patrickshonna@sbcglobal.net]

Sent: Friday, September 29, 2006 11:36 AM

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

Subject: Close Caption

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. 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!

Shonna Isaacs
2256 Near Drive
Grove City, OH 43123

FILED/ACCEPTED

OCT 19 2006

Docket No. 06-181

Kenneth L. Hill**From:** Darrell Jacobs [jacobs@impactci.org]**Sent:** Thursday, September 21, 2006 3:38 PM**To:** Kevin Martin; Deborah Tate; Robert McDowell; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; Monica Desai**Subject:** DA -6-1802, CGB-CC-0005 & CGB-CC-0007Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

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 will cost too much" can now use. Please reconsider immediately. We need our closed Captioning!!"

Darrell L. Jacobs
Impact, INC.
Staff Interpreter/Interpreter Coordinator
2735 E Broadway
Alton, Ill. 62002

9/26/2006

FILED/ACCEPTED

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

OCT 19 2006

From: vmjohnson1@comcast.net
Sent: Thursday, September 14, 2006 1:18 PM
To: Kevin Martin; Michael Capps; Jonathan Adelstein; Deborah Tate; Robert McDowell
Cc: Monica Desai
Subject: Captioning Exemptions

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Chairman and Commissioners,

I am angry, outraged, upset and disappointed at the recent actions taken by the FCC. 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.

-- Lise Hamlin, Regional Emergency Preparedness Specialist, CEPIN

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.

-- Brenda Battat, Associate Executive Director of the Hearing Loss Association of America

OCT 19 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Pam Gregory

Docket No. 06-141

From: Glenn Johnson [mahvin@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, September 14, 2006 6:04 PM
To: Kevin Martin; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; Deborah Tate; Robert McDowell; Monica Desai
Subject: Captioning Exemptions

Dear Chairman, Commissioners, and Bureau Chief:

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.

I am asking politely, that you all reconsider this exemption action along with the repercussions they will have on consumers with hearing loss/deafness. Those of us who come to rely on captioning for communication would be adversely affected by this move. Please reconsider your stance. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Glenn M. Johnson
Portland, Oregon

OCT 19 2006

Pam Gregory

Docket No. 06-181

From: Manny Johnson [mannyjohnson@gmail.com]**Sent:** Sunday, September 17, 2006 1:32 PM**To:** Kevin Martin; Michael Capps; Jonathan Adelstein; Deborah Tate; Robert McDowell; Monica Desai**Subject:** FCC captioning exemptionsFederal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

I am angry, outraged, upset and disappointed at the recent actions taken by the FCC. I have just learned that the FCC has made a decision to grant a large number of captioning exemptions.

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. The above decision should not stand. It should be reversed immediately.

Sincerely,

--

James "Manny" Johnson
President of NCOD Alumni Chapter

"Be Normally Abnormal"
-Bob Meehan

Pam Gregory

Docket No. 06-181

FILED/ACCEPTED

OCT 19 2006

From: Ann and Ron Jones [annron@charter.net]
Sent: Wednesday, September 13, 2006 10:55 PM
To: Monica Desai

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Subject: Captioning

I am very alarmed at the recent actions by the FCC granting 550 captioning exemptions directly to petitioners without notifying the public. As a deaf consumer, I am totally dependent on captioning, and have no understanding of what is being said without them. I am very concerned about a precedent being set here, and it bothers me that these actions are counter to the regulations in place. Closed captioning rules were put in place ten years ago, and I do not see how there could be any excuse for a programmer to not have captions by now. But the secretive way that the FCC has granted these exemptions without notifying the consumers affected, is even more inexcusable.

9/19/2006

Pam Gregory

Docket No. 06-181

FILED/ACCEPTED

From: Helen Justice [Justice1118@comcast.net]

Sent: Wednesday, September 13, 2006 11:46 PM

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

Cc: Cheryl Heppner; Monica Desai

Subject: FCC and its actions all wrong.....

OCT 19 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Chairman and commissioners,

This is an outrage at the recent actions taken by the FCC. I am very upset and angry. I just heard that the FCC has made a decision to grant a large number of captioning exemptions. It is ignoring the needs of deaf and hard of hearing like me who rely on reading captions on TV programs. It is very frustrated when a TV program is not captioned. The decision should not stand. It should be reversed immediately. Programmers had ten years to seek for funding to have 100 % captioning by January 1, 2006 and should not be granted exemption. Please have it reversed.

Thank you,
Helen Justice

Pam Gregory

Docket No. 06-181

FILED/ACCEPTED

From: Rheta Johnson [rhjson@comcast.net]**Sent:** Saturday, September 16, 2006 10:31 AM**To:** Kevin Martin**Cc:** Deborah Tate; Robert McDowell; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; Monica Desai**Subject:** In Re: DA 06-1802,CGB-CC-0005, & CGB-CC-0007

OCT 19 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Chairman Martin:

I protest the recent Orders granting exemptions from closed captioning issued by CGB. These Orders obviously create a new regulation, which carves out a new exemption basis not in accordance with current regulations. I'm outraged and believe the FCC has created a loophole that almost any entity that complains that "it costs too much" can now use. Please reconsider immediately! Closed captioning is needed!

Rheta Johnson
12 Scherer Ct
Lawrenceville NJ 08648

9/19/2006

FILED/ACCEPTED

Pam Gregory

Docket No. 06-181

OCT 19 2006

From: DCJ2066@aol.comFederal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary**Sent:** Saturday, September 16, 2006 10:29 AM**To:** Kevin Martin; Deborah Tate; Robert McDowell; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; Monica Desai**Subject:** 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. The recent orders seem to have created a new exemption loophole. A way for any business to use the excuse that they cannot afford to continue to provide Closed Caption.

I am a hearing person, but I am an advocate for the cause and concerns of the Deaf and Hard of Hearing. I currently interpret for the Deaf and I am quite aware of the need to have our spoken language translated for them. If providing this service is too costly, then what would be the loss in profits if this large population could no longer make use of the commercial advertisements which keep many of these business running? Closed Captioning is not just for entertainment. In light of the recent health warnings, storm alerts, and other important communications I believe the Captioning rules should not be changed.

Please reconsider!

Darlene Jones
812 Ross Ave # 1
Pittsburgh PA 15221

9/19/2006

FILED/ACCEPTED

Pam Gregory

Docket No. 06-181

OCT 19 2006

From: Jay Keithley
Sent: Tuesday, September 19, 2006 10:32 AM
To: Pam Gregory
Subject: FW: Curtailing Closed Captions for the Deaf

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

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

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

From: RaeBooksMD@aol.com [mailto:RaeBooksMD@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, September 18, 2006 7:50 PM
To: FCCINFO; Kevin Martin; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; Deborah Tate; Robert McDowell
Cc: Monica Desai; Jay Keithley; Tom.Chandler@fcc.gov; Cheryl King; TDIEXDir@aol.com
Subject: Curtailing Closed Captions for the Deaf

It's not really clear to me how the Federal Communications Agency can make decision that limit my access to information. I pay just as much taxes as do my neighbors who have no problems with being able to hear information available through the media. Yet, you think it is all right for me to pay taxes that keep the FCC going and then curtail my right to know. Explain that, please. Make sure that information is accessible to me. Thank you.

Rae Johnson
Laurel, MD 20708-2858

Pam Gregory

Docket No 06-181

FILED/ACCEPTED

From: ElizaBeth A Jackson [snsbeth@sbcglobal.net]**Sent:** Friday, September 15, 2006 2:15 AM**To:** Monica Desai**Subject:** Captioning

OCT 19 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Chairman and Commissioner;

I recently loss my hearing and am totally dependent upon captioning. I am a 39 yr. old widow, raising 3 kids. It's bad enough to lose my hearing after losing my husband, but now the main way I can stay connected to the world on a daily basis easily is through the captions on TV show, movies, phone calls, etc.

If you were in my shoes and lost your hearing it would become a vitally important issue to you. I guess until you are, you just don't know what the overall effect is. Please, for the people who cannot hear, we need your voice to be our 'hearing ears' in this matter.

Sincerely,

Beth Jackson

9/20/2006

Kenneth L. Hill

Docket No. 06-181

FILED/ACCEPTED

From: Deborah Jacobs [jpdlij@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, September 25, 2006 3:12 PM
To: Monica Desai
Subject: Re: DA 06-1802, CGB-CC-0005 and CGB-CC-0007

OCT 19 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

*September 25, 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,

*Deborah Jacobs
15100 Interlachen Dr Apt 1001
Silver Spring, MD 20906-5609*

Kenneth L. Hill

Docket No. 06-181

FILED/ACCEPTED

From: Anna Jockisch [Songbirddancer58@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, September 22, 2006 10:32 PM
To: Monica Desai
Subject: Re: DA 06-1802, CGB-CC-0005 and CGB-CC-0007

OCT 19 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,

*Anna Jockisch
PO Box 5035
Cary, NC 27512-5035*

September 19

Docket No. 06-181

Bonnie Jones (consumer) called to say that she did not think that the exemption re: closed captioning was beneficial or "right."

Kenneth L. Hill

Docket No 06-181

From: Mark Kusnetz [Ozzman859@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 04, 2006 1:22 AM
To: Monica Desai
Subject: Re: DA 06-1802, CGB-CC-0005 and CGB-CC-0007

FILED/ACCEPTED

OCT 19 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

October 3, 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,

Mark Kusnetz
4801 Redbluff Cir
Irvine, CA 92604-2475

Pam Gregory

Docket No. 06-181

FILED/ACCEPTED

From: kathy kellogg [archygirl2000@hotmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 30, 2006 10:32 AM
To: Monica Desai
Subject: Re: DA 06-1802, CGB-CC-0005 and CGB-CC-0007

OCT 19 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

September 30, 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,

kathy kellogg
34350 dequindre road apt. 204
sterling heights, MI 48310-5205

FILED/ACCEPTED

Pam Gregory

Docket No. 06-181

OCT 19 2006

From: Michael Kaplan [michael@kaplantc.com]Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary**Sent:** Friday, September 15, 2006 9:37 AM**To:** Kevin Martin; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; Deborah Tate; Robert McDowell; Monica Desai**Subject:** FCC decision to provide exemptions for Closed Captioning

It has come to my attention that the FCC has granted over 500 recent exemptions (long term) for closed captioning.

I realize that there is a considerable expense in captioning but for many Americans, this is the only way for them to understand what the rest of us take for granted, including yourselves. Please resend these exemptions and follow the rules that have been in place for over 10 years.

Best regards,

Michael Kaplan
4536 Tuscan Dr.
Plano, TX 75093

9/20/2006

Kenneth L. Hill

Docket No. 06-181

FILED/ACCEPTED

From: Lauren Kmetz [xxPlaidSkirbx@optonline.net]
Sent: Saturday, September 23, 2006 5:42 PM
To: Monica Desai
Subject: Re: DA 06-1802, CGB-CC-0005 and CGB-CC-0007

OCT 19 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

September 23, 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.

Please reconsider these FCC decisions and support closed captioning.

I am a hearing ASL student who believes that all Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing people should have the same opportunity's as hearing people.

Sincerely,

Lauren Kmetz
1670 Hiram Ave.
Holbrook, NY 11741-2512

FILED/ACCEPTED

OCT 19 2006

Kenneth L. Hill

Docket No. 06-181

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary**From:** AlexisKras@aol.com**Sent:** Monday, September 25, 2006 8:26 PM**To:** Kevin Martin; Deborah Tate; Robert McDowell; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; Monica Desai**Cc:** AlexisKras@aol.com; Robert.Sidanksy@csun.edu**Subject:** HELP!!! Give us our closed captioning!!!

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

Dear Kevin Martin, Commissioner Tate, Commissioner McDowell, Commissioner Copps, Commissioner Adelstein, and CGB Chief DeSai,

As a hard-of-hearing filmmaker and as a professor of writing for film and television, I strongly 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!

Sincerely,

Alexis Krasilovsky, Professor, Dept. of Cinema and Television Arts
California State University, Northridge
18111 Nordhoff Street
Northridge, CA 91330-8317

cc: Robert Sidansky, Administrator of Student Services, National Center on Deafness, California State University, Northridge

9/26/2006

Kenneth L. Hill

Docket No. 06-181

FILED/ACCEPTED

From: Hope O. Kiah [hope@webdesignbyhope.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 26, 2006 11:49 AM
To: Monica Desai
Subject: Closed Captioning needs to be Supported

OCT 19 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

re: DA 06-1802, CGB-CC-0005 and CGB-CC-0007
To: CGB Chief Monica DeSai
Dear Ms DeSai,

I am the step-mom of a woman who I care about deeply and who has a hearing disability.

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.

-Hope Kiah
57 Verano Loop
Santa Fe, NM 87508

9/26/2006

Pam Gregory

Docket No. 06-181

From: Bobby Kittersong [bobbyness1@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 14, 2006 2:23 PM
To: Monica Desai
Subject: waiver of closed captioning for religious services on TV

FILED/ACCEPTED

OCT 19 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Monica: could you please send this forward to the following commissioners: <http://www.fcc.gov/commissioners/martin/mail.html>, <http://www.fcc.gov/commissioners/copps/mail.html>, <http://www.fcc.gov/commissioners/adelstein/mail.html>, <http://www.fcc.gov/commissioners/tate/mail.html>, <http://www.fcc.gov/commissioners/mcdowell/mail.html>,
Thank you. Barbara Kitterman

Dear Commisioners: This week the FCC has granted exemptions to religious organizations from captioning their programs. In the past when such organizations have requested exemptions from the captioning rules the requests for waivers have been put out for public comment and have not been granted as they have never demonstrated that it was truly an undue burden to caption their programs. All of a sudden the FCC is taking a completely different approach by granting exemptions without consulting consumers on the impact.

On Monday, the FCC sent out 250 letters granting captioning exemptions directly to those petitioners. Another several hundred letters approving exemptions are expected to go out this or next week - for a total of around 550 exemptions! The FCC has not put these on the Daily Digest to notify the public. Rather, they are simply making these available in their Public Reference room. Even worse still, the exemptions granted are PERMANENT ones, even though several of the petitioners ONLY REQUESTED TEMPORARY EXEMPTIONS - until Sept or Jan.

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.

My parents were deaf and are now deceased. As an elderly hearing person who is slowly loosing my hearing I highly object to this action. Equal access means equal access. Please reconsider your actions in this matter. Sincerely yours Barbara Kitterman