

**Pam Gregory**Docket No. 06-181

**From:** Jay Keithley  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 04, 2006 2:09 PM  
**To:** Pam Gregory  
**Subject:** FW: Television closed captioning waivers

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 8 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

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

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

**From:** KAOtis@aol.com [mailto:KAOtis@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 04, 2006 12:56 PM  
**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:** Television closed captioning waivers

October 4, 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 we 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

10/4/2006

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 two programmers, specifically Anglers for Christ Ministries and New Beginnings Ministries, 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 us

- 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 us and we can only get it if it is captioned.

Thank you for your consideration,

Sincerely,

Mr. & Mrs. William D. (Kathleen A.) Otis  
PO Box 123  
1400 Winchester Southern Rd.  
(Canal Winchester, OH 43110-0123  
[KAOtis@aol.com](mailto:KAOtis@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

Separate emails sent via webform to:

**Senator Mike Dewine (Ohio)**  
**Senator George Voinovich (Ohio)**  
**Representative David Hobson (R-OH 7th)**

Docket No. 06-181

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 8 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary  
October 4, 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 Wisconsin Telecommunicators and its members (hereafter known as WTCI) 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 hearing-impaired (Deaf, hard of hearing, etc) 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 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,



James Powell

President, on behalf of WTCI Board and Members

[president@wi-deafdir.info](mailto:president@wi-deafdir.info)

Phone: 800-678-7960

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

(continued)

Page 3

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 8 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

cc:

Senator Herb Kohl

Senator Russ Feingold

Congressman Paul Ryan, 1<sup>st</sup> District

Congresswoman Tammy Baldwin, 2<sup>nd</sup> District

Congressman Ron Kind, 3<sup>rd</sup> District

Congresswoman Gwendolynne Moore, 4<sup>th</sup> District

Congressman F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., 5<sup>th</sup> District

Congressman Thomas E Petri, 6<sup>th</sup> District

Congressman David Obey, 7<sup>th</sup> District

Congressman Mark Green, 8<sup>th</sup> District

September 19, 2006

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."

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 8 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

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

DEC - 8 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 12<sup>th</sup>, 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](mailto: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](http://www.norcalcenter.org)

10/4/2006

**Kenneth L. Hill**

Docket No. 06-181

**From:** Wendy House [whill7house@verizon.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, September 25, 2006 11:40 PM  
**To:** 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; rep.cardin@mail.house.gov  
**Subject:** Closed Captioning Waiver

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 8 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.

Being deaf since birth and not knowing sign language, my reading and vocabulary were very low. Until I entered in high school when I was sixteen years old, I entered deaf and hard of hearing resource room and learned about closed captioned from my deaf friends. I am so grateful for the introduction of closed caption because my vocabulary and reading skills have improved significantly. While watching TV, I was able to follow through programs without having to rely or ask my family members to tell me what actors, actresses, reporters, or comedians were saying. If not for closed captioning shows, it could lead frustrations and anger among my family. I truly care a great deal about my family and want to maintain our relationships stronger than resentful towards me.

On Sundays, I would often watch Joel Osteen, The Hourly (father and son's show in California), and many more, including Billy Graham and his son whenever they are in the evenings to spread the gospel. Like I mentioned early above my reading was bad that included understanding and memorizing King James Version which was not my strong suit. Until I learned sign language and at the same time watch religion shows to increase my comprehension and vocabulary. Now, I can give back to the deaf and hard of hearing community to educate them of the need to read to improve their writing, comprehension, and vocabulary.

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

10/4/2006

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 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,

Wendy Hill-House  
2110 Hallmark Drive  
Gambrills, MD 21054  
[whill7house@verizon.net](mailto:whill7house@verizon.net)

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

Barbara A. Mikulski, US Senator (Maryland)  
Paul S. Sarbanes, US Senator (Maryland)  
Benjamin L. Cardin, US Congressman of Maryland

**Kenneth L. Hill**

Docket No. 06-181

**From:** ABBailBonds@aol.com

**Sent:** Tuesday, September 26, 2006 9:27 AM

**To:** Deborah Tate; Robert McDowell; Michael Copps; JonathonAdelstein@fcc.gov; Monica Desai

**Cc:** RushHolt@hrUS.gov

**Subject:** Closed captioning

I am hearing impaired and need closed captioning. Please do not remove it from TV Programming.

Steven Gershenoff  
2 Lynn Rd  
Marlboro, NJ 07746-1315  
732 536-6925

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 8 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

10/4/2006

**Kenneth L. Hill**

Docket No. 06-181

**From:** Marguerite and Wally Laskowski [marwal79@verizon.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, September 25, 2006 10:00 PM  
**To:** Monica Desai  
**Subject:** closed captioning

*We are protesting the decision re: closed captioning. Our daughter and son-in-law are hearing impaired. Please do not take away a much needed service to people with hearing loss.  
Thank you.*

*Marguerite and Walter Laskowski  
2381 Ecuadorian Way #21  
Clearwater, FL 33763*

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 8 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**Kenneth L. Hill**

Docket No. 06-181

**From:** Martha Jean [mjbratton@bellsouth.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, September 25, 2006 7:30 PM  
**To:** Monica Desai  
**Subject:** Closed captioning

*I have a cochlear implant and work in a public school as a principal. I am totally dependent upon closed captioning for television and strongly oppose any exemptions.  
Dr. M. J. Bratton*

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 8 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**Kenneth L. Hill**

Docket No. 06-181

**From:** captnorm@comcast.net  
**Sent:** Sunday, September 24, 2006 9:05 AM  
**To:** Kevin Martin; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; Deborah Tate; Robert McDowell  
**Cc:** Monica Desai  
**Subject:** Closed Captioning

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 8 2006

*Dear Chairman and Commissioners,*

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

*It has been ten years now since the closed captioning rules were put in place. More than enough time for programmers to find funding and set up to caption their programs. The decision to grant a large number of captioning exemptions 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. These decisions to offer exemptions should not stand. They should be reversed immediately.*

*Without Closed Captioning, I'm unable to watch television or movies and understand what is being said. I will be unable to be enriched by the many programming choices offered today because government is beholden to corporations requesting exemption and not the individuals the government should be watching out for in the first place!*

*Jeff Petterson*

**Kenneth L. Hill**

Docket No. 06-181

**From:** rsc@cableone.net  
**Sent:** Saturday, September 23, 2006 8:09 PM  
**To:** Monica Desai  
**Subject:** Closed captioned situation

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 8 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

To: Monica DeSai

I'm angry and I protest the FCC approval of almost 300 requests for new programs to be shown without closed captioned  
I can't watch TV programs that are NOT captioned.  
FCC must reverse their decision, support deaf and hard of hearing consumers and support closed captioning!

Thank you for your time & effort.

Sincerely,  
Louise Casias

10/4/2006

**Kenneth L. Hill**

Docket No. 06-181

**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

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 8 2006

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

10/4/2006

DEC - 8 2005

**Kenneth L. Hill**Docket No. 06-181  
Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary**From:** amullins2@netzero.net**Sent:** Wednesday, September 20, 2006 3:26 PM**To:** Kevin Martin; Deborah Tate; Robert McDowell; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; Monica Desai**Subject:** Closed Captioning Services

Dear Mr. Chairman Martin, Ms. Commissioner Tate, Mr. Commissioner McDowell, Mr. Commissioner Copps, Mr. Commissioner Adelstein, Ms. Chief DeSai:

I am infuriated that as an oral deaf individual that certain decisions have been made by your governmental system regarding closed captioning.

It is my understanding that you have decided to allow certain organizations to be exempt from having to provide closed captioning. What is so hard and expensive about providing closed captioning? Especially with all the technology that is available?

How would you feel if you were trying to watch the news or your favorite nature show with your child and you found out that closed captioning was no longer available and because of that, you could not explain certain things in simpler terms to your child who is asking for clarification? That would be very frustrating, right?

Before you make certain decisions, think about how they would adversely affect other people's lives. Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing people deserve access to the same information that Hearing people have access to.

Sincerely,  
Alysha Mullins-Pantoja

10/4/2006

**Kenneth L. Hill**

Docket No. 06-181  
~~FILED/ACCEPTED~~

**From:** Jegwin@aol.com

**Sent:** Wednesday, September 20, 2006 12:13 PM

**To:** Monica Desai

**Subject:** Closed captioning

DEC - 8 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

It is ridiculous to allow religious outfits to evade closed captioning, particularly since it is unchristian to limit one's audience. The number of hearing impaired people are increasing, due to old age and loud music. The use of closed captioning must be increased, not decreased.

Jim Goodwin Grove OR 97424  
1575 Fairview Place,  
Cottage Grove OR 97424  
jegwin@aol.com

10/4/2006

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 8 2006

Docket No. 06-181

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary**Kenneth L. Hill**

**From:** DougEllis2@aol.com  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 20, 2006 10:38 AM  
**To:** Kevin Martin; Deborah Tate; Robert McDowell; Michael Capps; Jonathan Adelstein; Monica Desai  
**Cc:** DougEllis2@aol.com  
**Subject:** Closed Captions

To Honorable People who serve our Country,

This is Doug Ellis who was born deaf and holds two masters degrees. I am quite a successful educator currently working with students with hearing loss who are mainstreamed into their regular schools. I also teach American Sign Language at California State University, Los Angeles.

My wife is also deaf so are our two children who are leading into very active lives. We also have two beautiful deaf grandchildren attending California School for the Deaf at Fremont. Three generations of deafness in our family do not cease our ability to lead into our lives as normal as anyone. Thanks to our current technology that we now have access to all forms of communication such as closed captions on TV's, phone calls (TTY, relay services, and video relay services), pagers, emails, open captions at movie theatres, sign language interpreters, etc.

I understand that there is an indication of discontinuation on closed captions on TV's. When I come home from work, I have my dinner then retire into my family room and watch TV for a couple of hours before I go to bed.

If you wish to discontinue using closed captions for the deaf and hard of hearing people throughout America, then make sure that the sounds for televisions are eliminated for the hearing people.

Thank you for your attention on this matter.

Sincerely,  
Douglas L. Ellis  
4538 Kraft Avenue  
Studio City, CA 91602

10/4/2006

**Kenneth L. Hill**

Docket No. 06-181

**From:** Margreta von Pein [mvp9@verizon.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 19, 2006 3:32 PM  
**To:** Monica Desai  
**Subject:** closer captioning waiver of rule

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 8 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dear Commissioner Desai,

I protest the recent waiver granted to religious organizations for now and forever providing closed captioning.

This waiver granting is in violation of long standing FCC rules granting public input on changes in rules.

This waiver responds to the organizations making the request, while the public who is affected by the rule is not consulted. This is not providing a public service which is the FCCs reason for being.

Thirdly, the waiver of closed captioning without a hearing disenfranchises deaf and hard of hearing people. Which group is next?

Please take a stand against this rule and rescind the waiver and publish invitations for comment.

Margreta von Pein  
Claverack, NY 12513

10/4/2006

FILED/ACCEPTED

Kenneth L. Hill

Docket No. 06-181 DEC 8 2006

**From:** Lennard Davis [lendavis@uic.edu]**Sent:** Tuesday, October 03, 2006 12:17 PMFederal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary**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-Katrinass 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](http://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

10/4/2006

**Kenneth L. Hill**

Docket No. 06-181

**From:** james w or jackie stover [jimjackie64@yahoo.com]

**Sent:** Tuesday, October 03, 2006 11:54 AM

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

**Subject:** SAVE CLOSED CAPTIONING

DEAR FCC Chairman, Kevin Martin: 202-418-1000 (Voice)

Chairman Martin and Commissioners:

[Kevin.Martin@fcc.gov](mailto:Kevin.Martin@fcc.gov)

[Michael.Copps@fcc.gov](mailto:Michael.Copps@fcc.gov)

[Jonathan.Adelstein@fcc.gov](mailto:Jonathan.Adelstein@fcc.gov)

[Deborah.Tate@fcc.gov](mailto:Deborah.Tate@fcc.gov)

[Robert.McDowell@fcc.gov](mailto:Robert.McDowell@fcc.gov)

Head of the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau:

[Monica.Desai@fcc.gov](mailto:Monica.Desai@fcc.gov)

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 8 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 8 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

I am hoping that you will reconsider as I want to see more closed captioning in every tv screen programs.

I grew up without understanding the religious tv programs which did not use closed captioning except few in the past ten years, did have cc, which was helpful to understand religious aspects.

I hope the tv programs will try to use write off in their business tax purposes for using the closed captioning - as there are millions of us who have hearing loss at various degrees, so we rely to read closed captioning is 100% effective, than to lipread which is 50% or less to read lips ( too small or to far to try to lip read) if you can try to turn off the volume sound and see if you can understand what is being said on any of the tv programs.

Please share what is being shown to the public to all of us Deaf or Hard of Hearing viewers as equal access.

I am trying to keep up to know what is happening on any tv programs with the news, emergency announcements, live weather reports, religious, war news, for emergency, business or social purposes with the help of having closed captioning on.

I oppose granting exemptions.

Thank you for your services,

Jackie Stover of Arkansas

 Jackie Stover

 James Stover 

10/4/2006

**Kenneth L. Hill**

**From:** acey.ossman@cms.k12.nc.us  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 03, 2006 10:36 AM  
**To:** Kevin Martin; Deborah Tate; Robert McDowell; Michael Copps; jonathan.adelsten@fcc.gov; Monica Desai  
**Subject:** Re DA 06-1802, CGB-CC-0005 and CGB-CC-0007

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 8 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

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! Closed Captioning is crucial to the social and educational success of children and adults with hearing loss

Acey Ossman

Educational Specialist for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing

Charlotte, NC

~~~~~"Research shows that by the time a child with hearing loss graduates from high school, more than \$400,000 per child can be saved in special education costs if the child is identified early and given appropriate educational, medical, and audiological services."

Source: White, K. R., & Maxon, A. B. (1995). Universal screening for infant hearing impairment: Simple, beneficial, and presently justified. *International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology*, 32, 201-211.

"If hearing loss remains undetected, even mild hearing loss or hearing loss in only one ear has substantial detrimental consequences. For example, research shows that children with hearing loss in one ear are ten times as likely to be held back at least one grade compared to a matched group of children with normal hearing."

Source: Bess, F. H., & Tharpe, A. M. (1986). Case history data on unilaterally hearing-impaired children. *Ear and Hearing*, 7(1), 14-19.~~~~~

10/4/2006

**Kenneth L. Hill**

*Docket No. 06-181*

**From:** Joel Nielsen [nhrafreak22@windstream.net]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 04, 2006 12:12 PM  
**To:** Monica Desai  
**Subject:** Re: DA 06-1802, CGB-CC-0005 and CGB-CC-0007

FILED/ACCEPTED

*October 4, 2006  
FCC Chief, Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau Monica Desai*

DEC - 8 2006

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.*

*I cannot watch television programs that are not captioned.*

*Please reconsider these FCC decisions and support closed captioning.*

*Sincerely,*

*Joel Nielsen  
129 Ivygreen Chase  
Canton, GA 30114-6610*

**Kenneth L. Hill**

Docket No. 06-181

**From:** Stephen Renault Jr [sjbeanstalk@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 04, 2006 10:02 AM  
**To:** Monica Desai  
**Subject:** Re: DA 06-1802, CGB-CC-0005 and CGB-CC-0007

FILED/ACCEPTED

October 4, 2006  
FCC Chief, Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau Monica Desai

DEC - 8 2006  
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.*

*I cannot watch television programs that are not captioned.*

*Please reconsider these FCC decisions and support closed captioning.*

*Sincerely,*

*Stephen Renault Jr  
11 Hickory Ct Apt A  
Maple Shade, NJ 08052-1951*

**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

DEC - 8 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

**Kenneth L. Hill**

Docket No. 06-181

**From:** Andrew Cohen [dfman18@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 03, 2006 8:52 PM  
**To:** Monica Desai  
**Subject:** Re: DA 06-1802, CGB-CC-0005 and CGB-CC-0007

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 8 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Chief 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,*

*Andrew Cohen  
1341 Foxwood Dr  
Monroeville, PA 15146-4436*

Kenneth L. Hill

Docket No. 06-181

**From:** Sean Gerlis [president@njadeaf.org]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 03, 2006 4:15 PM  
**To:** Kevin Martin; Deborah Tate; Robert McDowell; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; Monica Desai  
**Cc:** president@njadeaf.org  
**Subject:** DA 06-1802, CGB-CC-0005 and CGB-CC-0007: Closed Captioning

Dear FCC Officials:

*In Re DA 06-1802, CGB-CC-0005 and CGB-CC-0007, 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 represent approximately 740,000 Deaf & Hard of Hearing residents of state in New Jersey and we are very concerned about this situation which has been lenient with closed caption in granting exemption for CGB and/or any other non-for-profit organizations to host a television shows.*

*Also, we are very concerned about this recent ruling made by FCC,*

*FCC states 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.*

*We find this ruling very threatening to our community where we really depend on the accessibility of closed captions in our television shows by understanding the verbatim. Without the closed captioned, we are left off from the community interactions made by television shows.*

*We urge you to reconsider and revise this ruling at the earliest convenient.*

*Thank you.*

*Respectfully submitted,*

*-Sean Gerlis; President  
New Jersey Association of the Deaf  
E-mail: President@NJADeaf.org  
Website: www.NJADeaf.org*

*Mailing address:*

*Sean Gerlis; President  
New Jersey Association of the Deaf  
27 Mohawk Avenue*

*Lincoln Park, NJ*

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 8 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**Kenneth L. Hill**

*Docket No. 06-181*

**From:** Michele Lamb [lambm@earthlink.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 02, 2006 8:25 PM  
**To:** Monica Desai  
**Subject:** In Re DA 06-1802, CGB-CC-0005 and CGB-CC-0007  
**Importance:** High

**FILED/ACCEPTED**

**DEC - 8 2006**

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

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

Dear FCC Chairman and Commissioners,

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!

Michele Lamb

10/4/2006

**Kenneth L. Hill**

*Docket No. 06-181*

**From:** Meg Smither [msmither@nc.rr.com]

**Sent:** Monday, October 02, 2006 4:36 PM

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

**Cc:** Lee D Smither

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

**FILED/ACCEPTED**

October 2, 2006

**DEC - 8 2006**

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dear Ladies & Gentlemen,

I protest the recent Orders granting exemptions from closed captioning issued by CGB. I have a hearing impaired daughter who uses Closed Captioning everyday of her life when she is watching television as well as at school when she is watching videos – that the instructors use for education purposes.

These Orders appear to create a new regulation, carving out a new exemption basis, not in keeping with current regulations. My husband and I 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!

Meg & Lee Smither

Raleigh, NC