

**SandraLyn Bailey**

04-207

**From:** Marietta Coufal [acey19672002@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 01, 2007 1:14 PM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

Marietta Coufal (acey19672002@yahoo.com) writes:

Please don't stop the captioning on TV. I need them to understand the shows and not depend on my friends and family to explain to me what's going on. I am deaf and can't understand what's going on without captions. Please don't approve to excuse the TV captioning requirements. Please reverse the decision soon!

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 192.104.54.5  
Remote IP address: 192.104.54.5

**FILED/ACCEPTED**

**MAR 13 2007**

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**SandraLyn Bailey**

04-20/

**From:** Mark Tessier [Tesshe5@adelphia.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 01, 2007 12:03 PM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

**FILED/ACCEPTED**

Mark Tessier (Tesshe5@adelphia.net) writes:

**MAR 13 2007**

February 1, 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Chairman Kevin Martin:

I am kind surprised to hear news from NAD that FCC made their decision to wavier some TV programming requesting without closed caption. Is it TRUE? If true, you can imagine if you have your own deaf or hard of hearing child to watch TV programming without closed caption, it would hurt more than FCC decides "best" without thinking twice about deaf and hard of hearing community would become angry and protest the FCC's approval to excuse TV captioning requirements. No show should be on TV without captions! Why? Can't watch TV programs that are not captioned. FCC must reverse their decision and support deaf and hard of hearing consumers and support closed captioning on all TV programs!

Closed captioning is KEY for all deaf and hard of deaf community therefore FCC must understand what we can't hear what happens and favor TV programming without closed captioning so it is big impact this part of EDUCATION with closed captioning.

Please don't ever ignore one issue "CLOSED CAPTION" forever and don't become weak FCC's decision to look down deaf and hard of hearing consumers.

Thank you,

Mark Tessier

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 192.104.54.5  
Remote IP address: 192.104.54.5

**SandraLyn Bailey**

04-207

**From:** Martha C Dearman [christine.dearman@marriott.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, February 02, 2007 7:27 AM  
**To:** Jonathan Adelstein  
**Subject:** Help protect my family

Martha C Dearman  
11606 mapleview drive  
silver spring, MD 20902-2327

February 2, 2007

Jonathan Adelstein  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20554

FILED/ACCEPTED

MAR 13 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I am disgusted to learn that I am being forced to help pay for scenes describing bestiality and other depraved behavior on the FX network's Nip/Tuck with my cable subscription. In the episode that aired on September 26, a plastic surgeon treats a female patient who says her nipple was torn off when she tried to break up a dogfight. She is desperate to have the injury repaired and undetectable before her husband returns from Iraq. The husband returns after the surgery and confronts her in the doctor's office, revealing that she used peanut butter to seduce her dog and implying that her nipple was actually torn off when she was having sex with the dog. It is outrageous that this kind of material is airing on television - period. Nip/Tuck is not my choice, and I don't want it coming into my home. But it is inexcusable for the cable industry to force me to pay for this content with my monthly cable subscription.

The solution is so simple - but so far Congress has done nothing but appease the deep-pocketed cable industry. What about consumers' rights?

Give us cable choice. Offering parents the ability to choose the channels they want, and to pay only for those channels, puts power back in the hands of the consumer - of parents - and forces the producers of indecent or violent programming to fund their own raunch. It is the only fair solution. Why should I be forced to pay for programming that insults my intelligence and assaults my values just to gain access to a handful of channels I can watch with my family. The cable industry has been carried on the backs of American consumers long enough. It is time for this extortion to end.

Sincerely,

Martha Dearman  
3019333386

**SandraLyn Bailey**

04-2007

**From:** Megan Mathisen [Pepgal13@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 07, 2007 1:32 PM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

Megan Mathisen (Pepgal13@aol.com) writes:

I want to share with you that I am avid reader. That is when I watch television programs with the assistance of Closed Captioning. In compliance with the american disability act, the deaf and hard of hearing community solely relies on the visual aid of closed captioning.

On Behalf of Illinois Association of the Deaf I am sending this as a petition request to enforce that closed captioning is mandatory on every channel on every program.

1. I am angry and I protest the FCC's approval to excuse TV captioning requirements! No show should be on TV without captions! WHY?
2. I cannot watch TV Programs that are not captioned.
3. FCC must reverse their decision and support deaf and hard of hearing consumers and support closed captioning on all TV programs.

Thank You and Sincerely,  
Megan Mathisen, Tinley Park IL

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 192.104.54.5  
Remote IP address: 192.104.54.5

**FILED/ACCEPTED**

**MAR 13 2007**

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**Sandralyn Bailey**

04-2007

**From:** Melissa DeGraff [melissadegraff@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 13, 2007 4:53 PM  
**To:** Jonathan Adelstein  
**Subject:** Help protect my family

Melissa DeGraff  
527 Wymount Terrace  
Provo, UT 84604-2002

FILED/ACCEPTED

February 13, 2007

MAR 13 2007

Jonathan Adelstein  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20554

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I am disgusted to learn that I am being forced to help pay for scenes describing bestiality and other depraved behavior on the FX network's Nip/Tuck with my cable subscription.

In the episode that aired on September 26, a plastic surgeon treats a female patient who says her nipple was torn off when she tried to break up a dogfight. She is desperate to have the injury repaired and undetectable before her husband returns from Iraq. The husband returns after the surgery and confronts her in the doctor's office, revealing that she used peanut butter to seduce her dog and implying that her nipple was actually torn off when she was having sex with the dog.

It is outrageous that this kind of material is airing on television - period. Nip/Tuck is not my choice, and I don't want it coming into my home. But it is inexcusable for the cable industry to force me to pay for this content with my monthly cable subscription.

The solution is so simple - but so far Congress has done nothing but appease the deep-pocketed cable industry. What about consumers' rights?

Give us cable choice.

Offering parents the ability to choose the channels they want, and to pay only for those channels, puts power back in the hands of the consumer - of parents - and forces the producers of indecent or violent programming to fund their own raunch.

It is the only fair solution. Why should I be forced to pay for programming that insults my intelligence and assaults my values just to gain access to a handful of channels I can watch with my family.

The cable industry has been carried on the backs of American consumers long enough. It is time for this extortion to end.

Sincerely,

Melissa DeGraff

**SandraLyn Bailey**

04-2007

**From:** Melissa Holland [mgbholland1@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 18, 2007 6:15 AM  
**To:** Deborah Tate  
**Subject:** we need cable choice

Melissa Holland  
536 Loma Vista  
Rockwall, TX 75032-2017

FILED/ACCEPTED

MAR 13 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

February 18, 2007

Deborah Tate  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Deborah Tate:

I am disgusted to learn that I am being forced to help pay for scenes describing bestiality and other depraved behavior on the FX network's Nip/Tuck with my cable subscription. In the episode that aired on September 26, a plastic surgeon treats a female patient who says her nipple was torn off when she tried to break up a dogfight. She is desperate to have the injury repaired and undetectable before her husband returns from Iraq. The husband returns after the surgery and confronts her in the doctor's office, revealing that she used peanut butter to seduce her dog and implying that her nipple was actually torn off when she was having sex with the dog. It is outrageous that this kind of material is airing on television - period. Nip/Tuck is not my choice, and I don't want it coming into my home. But it is inexcusable for the cable industry to force me to pay for this content with my monthly cable subscription.

The solution is so simple - but so far Congress has done nothing but appease the deep-pocketed cable industry. What about consumers' rights?

Give us cable choice. Offering parents the ability to choose the channels they want, and to pay only for those channels, puts power back in the hands of the consumer - of parents - and forces the producers of indecent or violent programming to fund their own raunch. It is the only fair solution. Why should I be forced to pay for programming that insults my intelligence and assaults my values just to gain access to a handful of channels I can watch with my family. The cable industry has been carried on the backs of American consumers long enough. It is time for this extortion to end.

Sincerely,

Melissa Holland  
469-338-9899

**SandraLyn Bailey**

64-207

**From:** Michael Berger [mberger641@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 01, 2007 12:06 PM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

FILED/ACCEPTED

MAR 13 2007

Michael Berger (mberger641@aol.com) writes:

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

FCC Chairman, Kevin Martin,

My name is Michael Berger from Illinois. Also I am President of Illinois Association of the Deaf. I want to tell you three important things about Closed Captioning.

1. I am angry and I protest the FCC's approval to excuse TV Captioning Requirements. No Show should be on TV without captions. Why?
2. I cannot watch TV programs that are not captioned.
3. FCC must reverse their decision and support deaf and hard of hearing consumers and support closed captioning on all TV programs.

Respectfully,  
Michael K. Berger, President  
Illinois Association of the Deaf

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 192.104.54.5  
Remote IP address: 192.104.54.5

**Sandralyn Bailey**

04-201

**From:** monica sanchez [monica.sanchez@aurora.org]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 06, 2007 4:39 PM  
**To:** Deborah Tate  
**Subject:** Nip/Tuck proves the need for Cable Choice

monica sanchez  
2630 s 31st  
milwaukee, WI 53215-2835

**FILED/ACCEPTED**

February 6, 2007

**MAR 13 2007**

Deborah Tate  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20554

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dear Deborah Tate:

I am disgusted to learn that I am being forced to help pay for scenes describing bestiality and other depraved behavior on the FX network's Nip/Tuck with my cable subscription. In the episode that aired on September 26, a plastic surgeon treats a female patient who says her nipple was torn off when she tried to break up a dogfight. She is desperate to have the injury repaired and undetectable before her husband returns from Iraq. The husband returns after the surgery and confronts her in the doctor's office, revealing that she used peanut butter to seduce her dog and implying that her nipple was actually torn off when she was having sex with the dog. It is outrageous that this kind of material is airing on television - period. Nip/Tuck is not my choice, and I don't want it coming into my home. But it is inexcusable for the cable industry to force me to pay for this content with my monthly cable subscription.

The solution is so simple - but so far Congress has done nothing but appease the deep-pocketed cable industry. What about consumers' rights?

Give us cable choice. Offering parents the ability to choose the channels they want, and to pay only for those channels, puts power back in the hands of the consumer - of parents - and forces the producers of indecent or violent programming to fund their own raunch. It is the only fair solution. Why should I be forced to pay for programming that insults my intelligence and assaults my values just to gain access to a handful of channels I can watch with my family. The cable industry has been carried on the backs of American consumers long enough. It is time for this extortion to end.

Sincerely,

monica sanchez  
414-389-0504

**SandraLyn Bailey**

04-201

**From:** Rachel Anderson [rander475@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 04, 2007 11:36 AM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

Rachel Anderson (rander475@yahoo.com) writes:

Mr. Martin, I am quite concerned with the recent actions of the FCC in regards to closed captioned programming. I believe it would be a step backward to allow a category of programs to be exempt from the captioning requirement. It opens a door, which I'm afraid will be quite difficult for you to close. If a select segment is allowed to be exempt, for whatever reason, it will just be a matter of time before you're overwhelmed with a slew of other "excuses". It isn't right for captioning to be discontinued because it is "inconvenient" to the producers. I sincerely urge the FCC to reconsider its' position, and reverse the decision to exempt certain programming from required closed captioning, and to maintain the current standards and requirements that the Deaf community has fought so hard to obtain. Thank you for your time and consideration on this matter.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 192.104.54.5  
Remote IP address: 192.104.54.5

**FILED/ACCEPTED**

**MAR 13 2007**

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**SandraLyn Bailey**

04-207

**From:** Randy Byrne [rbyrne@rtmtv.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 08, 2007 4:21 PM  
**To:** Jonathan Adelstein  
**Subject:** Nip/Tuck proves the need for Cable Choice

FILED/ACCEPTED

MAR 13 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Randy Byrne  
555 Beech Grove Way  
Burns, TN 37029-9055

February 8, 2007

Jonathan Adelstein  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I am disgusted to learn that I am being forced to help pay for scenes describing bestiality and other depraved behavior on the FX network's Nip/Tuck with my cable subscription. In the episode that aired on September 26, a plastic surgeon treats a female patient who says her nipple was torn off when she tried to break up a dogfight. She is desperate to have the injury repaired and undetectable before her husband returns from Iraq. The husband returns after the surgery and confronts her in the doctor's office, revealing that she used peanut butter to seduce her dog and implying that her nipple was actually torn off when she was having sex with the dog. It is outrageous that this kind of material is airing on television - period. Nip/Tuck is not my choice, and I don't want it coming into my home. But it is inexcusable for the cable industry to force me to pay for this content with my monthly cable subscription.

The solution is so simple - but so far Congress has done nothing but appease the deep-pocketed cable industry. What about consumers' rights?

Give us cable choice. Offering parents the ability to choose the channels they want, and to pay only for those channels, puts power back in the hands of the consumer - of parents - and forces the producers of indecent or violent programming to fund their own raunch. It is the only fair solution. Why should I be forced to pay for programming that insults my intelligence and assaults my values just to gain access to a handful of channels I can watch with my family. The cable industry has been carried on the backs of American consumers long enough. It is time for this extortion to end.

Sincerely,

Randy Byrne  
615-446-6744

**SandraLyn Bailey**

04-207

**From:** Richard P. Ivey [nivey5@earthlink.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 20, 2007 7:07 PM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

FILED/ACCEPTED

MAR 13 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Richard P. Ivey (nivey5@earthlink.net) writes:

Dear Chairman Martin:

I have not kept up with the cable tv programming issues of several months ago, but at that time there was discussion about requiring cable companies to offer some kind of family friendly tier programming.

My feelings are that consumers would be better served with the a la carte option of letting consumers purchase programming by the channel.

This would be a better option because it would truly allow the marketplace to determine the quality of programming a majority of families want. For instance, if a program did not contain acceptable values, and I didn't purchase the local channel that aired it, local affiliates would have to make a business decision as to whether or not a particular program turned too many viewers away from that channel.

And, the a la carte options could force unfit programming to be dropped all together. Local affiliates telling producers they won't carry unfit programming is much more effective than an occasional letter to the producer by a single family unit.

Thanks for taking my comments.

R. Ivey  
Shelby, NC  
704-482-7587

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 192.104.54.5  
Remote IP address: 192.104.54.5

04-207

**Sandralyn Bailey**

**From:** Richard Swanson [richard\_swanson@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 17, 2007 11:26 PM  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Subject:** America demands Cable Choice

Richard Swanson  
109 North 54th Street  
Omana, NE 68132-2810

FILED/ACCEPTED

MAR 13 2007

February 17, 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Michael Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Michael Copps:

I am disgusted to learn that I am being forced to help pay for scenes describing bestiality and other depraved behavior on the FX network's Nip/Tuck with my cable subscription. In the episode that aired on September 26, a plastic surgeon treats a female patient who says her nipple was torn off when she tried to break up a dogfight. She is desperate to have the injury repaired and undetectable before her husband returns from Iraq. The husband returns after the surgery and confronts her in the doctor's office, revealing that she used peanut butter to seduce her dog and implying that her nipple was actually torn off when she was having sex with the dog. It is outrageous that this kind of material is airing on television - period. Nip/Tuck is not my choice, and I don't want it coming into my home. But it is inexcusable for the cable industry to force me to pay for this content with my monthly cable subscription.

The solution is so simple - but so far Congress has done nothing but appease the deep-pocketed cable industry. What about consumers' rights?

Give us cable choice. Offering parents the ability to choose the channels they want, and to pay only for those channels, puts power back in the hands of the consumer - of parents - and forces the producers of indecent or violent programming to fund their own raunch. It is the only fair solution. Why should I be forced to pay for programming that insults my intelligence and assaults my values just to gain access to a handful of channels I can watch with my family. The cable industry has been carried on the backs of American consumers long enough. It is time for this extortion to end.

Sincerely,

Richard Swanson  
402-561-026

**SandraLyn Bailey**

04-207

**From:** Rob Ansuini [hissword@verizon.net]  
**Sent:** Friday, February 09, 2007 7:45 PM  
**To:** Deborah Tate  
**Subject:** America demands Cable Choice NOW!

Rob Ansuini  
622 Maple Court  
Santa Maria, CA 93454-7649

FILED/ACCEPTED

MAR 13 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

February 9, 2007

Deborah Tate  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Deborah Tate:

All American's MUST protect our children! Why aren't you with the "power" eliminating this SMUTT? Change the way cable works. Our minds are being polluted with the perversion on television and cable.

I am disgusted to learn that I am being forced to help pay for scenes describing bestiality and other depraved behavior on the FX network's Nip/Tuck with my cable subscription. In the episode that aired on September 26, a plastic surgeon treats a female patient who says her nipple was torn off when she tried to break up a dogfight. She is desperate to have the injury repaired and undetectable before her husband returns from Iraq. The husband returns after the surgery and confronts her in the doctor's office, revealing that she used peanut butter to seduce her dog and implying that her nipple was actually torn off when she was having sex with the dog. It is outrageous that this kind of material is airing on television - period. Nip/Tuck is not my choice, and I don't want it coming into my home. But it is inexcusable for the cable industry to force me to pay for this content with my monthly cable subscription.

The solution is so simple - but so far Congress has done nothing but appease the deep-pocketed cable industry. What about consumers' rights?

Give us cable choice. Offering parents the ability to choose the channels they want, and to pay only for those channels, puts power back in the hands of the consumer - of parents - and forces the producers of indecent or violent programming to fund their own raunch. It is the only fair solution. Why should I be forced to pay for programming that insults my intelligence and assaults my values just to gain access to a handful of channels I can watch with my family. The cable industry has been carried on the backs of American consumers long enough. It is time for this extortion to end.

Sincerely,

Rob Ansuini  
805-928-2145

**SandraLyn Bailey**

04-201

**From:** sean keith davis [skidhillbilly@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, February 02, 2007 10:59 PM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

sean keith davis (skidhillbilly@aol.com) writes:

1. I am angry and I protest the FCC's approve to excuse TV captioning requirements! No show should be on TV without captions! Why?
2. I cannot watch TV program that are no captioned.
3. FCC must reverse their decision and support deaf and hard-of-hearing consumers and support closed captioning on all TV programs!  
or you may email them.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 192.104.54.5  
Remote IP address: 192.104.54.5

**FILED/ACCEPTED**

**MAR 13 2007**

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**Sandralyn Bailey**

04-201

**From:** Shon Comparin [meekmusicproductions@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, February 09, 2007 2:54 PM  
**To:** Jonathan Adelstein  
**Subject:** Please support Cable Choice

Shon Comparin  
1001 E. Fern Ave. Apt. E-501  
McAllen, TX 78501-1490

**FILED/ACCEPTED**

**MAR 13 2007**

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

February 9, 2007

Jonathan Adelstein  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I am disgusted to learn that I am being forced to help pay for scenes describing bestiality and other depraved behavior on the FX network's Nip/Tuck with my cable subscription. In the episode that aired on September 26, a plastic surgeon treats a female patient who says her nipple was torn off when she tried to break up a dogfight. She is desperate to have the injury repaired and undetectable before her husband returns from Iraq. The husband returns after the surgery and confronts her in the doctor's office, revealing that she used peanut butter to seduce her dog and implying that her nipple was actually torn off when she was having sex with the dog. It is outrageous that this kind of material is airing on television - period. Nip/Tuck is not my choice, and I don't want it coming into my home. But it is inexcusable for the cable industry to force me to pay for this content with my monthly cable subscription.

The solution is so simple - but so far Congress has done nothing but appease the deep-pocketed cable industry. What about consumers' rights?

Give us cable choice. Offering parents the ability to choose the channels they want, and to pay only for those channels, puts power back in the hands of the consumer - of parents - and forces the producers of indecent or violent programming to fund their own raunch. It is the only fair solution. Why should I be forced to pay for programming that insults my intelligence and assaults my values just to gain access to a handful of channels I can watch with my family. The cable industry has been carried on the backs of American consumers long enough. It is time for this extortion to end.

Sincerely,

Shon Comparin  
956-655-8289

**SandraLyn Bailey**

04-201

**From:** Stacy Tuttle [tuttle7077@bellsouth.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 06, 2007 2:28 PM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

**FILED/ACCEPTED**

**MAR 13 2007**

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Stacy Tuttle (tuttle7077@bellsouth.net) writes:

Dear Chairman Martin,

I am a nationally certified interpreter for the deaf who works primarily in public school settings. I recently learned of decisions made by the FCC that relieved certain parties of their responsibility to caption their programming. Such decisions are detrimental to deaf and hard of hearing consumers in many ways. Working in education, I have seen how difficult it can be for educators to find captioned materials to use with their deaf/hard of hearing students. This often means that deaf/hard of hearing students are denied equal access to educational DVDs and videos to which their hearing peers have access. To further relax captioning requirements would be a travesty.

Thank you for your time and attention to this crucial matter.

Stacy Tuttle, CT

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.0  
Remote host: 192.104.54.5  
Remote IP address: 192.104.54.5

04-207

**Sandra Lyn Bailey**

---

**From:** Thomas A. Galey [tom.galey@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 05, 2007 2:44 PM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

Thomas A. Galey (tom.galey@gmail.com) writes:

I understand that the FCC has granted to waive the closed captioning requirements to about 300 applicants. This is inexcusable. There is an estimate of 35,927,818 individuals with hearing losses in the USA. A large percentage of them benefit from closed captioning. Regulations for closed captioning must be enforced to ensure equal access to t.v media for all Americans. This decision to waive 300 from closed captioning their programs weakens this regulation and defeats the purpose for having this law. Please consider reversing this decision.

Thank you!

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 192.104.54.5  
Remote IP address: 192.104.54.5

**FILED/ACCEPTED**

**MAR 13 2007**

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**Sandralyn Bailey**

04-201

**From:** TONY GOMEZ [mrusa28@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 05, 2007 11:37 AM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

TONY GOMEZ (mrusa28@aol.com) writes:

1. I am angry and I protest the FCC's approval to excuse TV captioning requirements! No show should be on TV without captions! WHY?
2. I cannot watch TV Programs that are not captioned.
3. FCC must reverse their decision and support deaf and hard of hearing consumers and support closed captioning on all TV programs.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 192.104.54.5  
Remote IP address: 192.104.54.5

**FILED/ACCEPTED**

**MAR 13 2007**

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

04-207

**Sandralyn Bailey**

**From:** VIRGINIA GOMEZ [virginia758@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 01, 2007 12:04 PM  
**To:** Jonathan Adelstein  
**Subject:** Help protect my family

VIRGINIA GOMEZ  
1864 Fox Run Dr. B  
Elk Grove Village, IL 60007-7032

FILED/ACCEPTED

March 1, 2007

MAR 13 2007

Jonathan Adelstein  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20554

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I am disgusted to learn that I am being forced to help pay for scenes describing bestiality and other depraved behavior on the FX network's Nip/Tuck with my cable subscription. In the episode that aired on September 26, a plastic surgeon treats a female patient who says her nipple was torn off when she tried to break up a dogfight. She is desperate to have the injury repaired and undetectable before her husband returns from Iraq. The husband returns after the surgery and confronts her in the doctor's office, revealing that she used peanut butter to seduce her dog and implying that her nipple was actually torn off when she was having sex with the dog. It is outrageous that this kind of material is airing on television - period. Nip/Tuck is not my choice, and I don't want it coming into my home. But it is inexcusable for the cable industry to force me to pay for this content with my monthly cable subscription.

The solution is so simple - but so far Congress has done nothing but appease the deep-pocketed cable industry. What about consumers' rights?

Give us cable choice. Offering parents the ability to choose the channels they want, and to pay only for those channels, puts power back in the hands of the consumer - of parents - and forces the producers of indecent or violent programming to fund their own raunch. It is the only fair solution. Why should I be forced to pay for programming that insults my intelligence and assaults my values just to gain access to a handful of channels I can watch with my family. The cable industry has been carried on the backs of American consumers long enough. It is time for this extortion to end.

Sincerely,

Virginia Gomez

**Sandralyn Bailey**

04-201

**From:** Wiladean & James Davis [jimdavism@hotmai.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 04, 2007 6:48 PM  
**To:** Jonathan Adelstein  
**Subject:** Please protect America's families

Wiladean & James Davis  
7861 Morgan Co. Hwy.  
Sunbright, TN 37872-2849

**FILED/ACCEPTED**

**MAR 13 2007**

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

March 4, 2007

Jonathan Adelstein  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I am disgusted to learn that I am being forced to help pay for scenes describing bestiality and other depraved behavior on the FX network's Nip/Tuck with my cable subscription. In the episode that aired on September 26, a plastic surgeon treats a female patient who says her nipple was torn off when she tried to break up a dogfight. She is desperate to have the injury repaired and undetectable before her husband returns from Iraq. The husband returns after the surgery and confronts her in the doctor's office, revealing that she used peanut butter to seduce her dog and implying that her nipple was actually torn off when she was having sex with the dog. It is outrageous that this kind of material is airing on television - period. Nip/Tuck is not my choice, and I don't want it coming into my home. But it is inexcusable for the cable industry to force me to pay for this content with my monthly cable subscription.

The solution is so simple - but so far Congress has done nothing but appease the deep-pocketed cable industry. What about consumers' rights?

Give us cable choice. Offering parents the ability to choose the channels they want, and to pay only for those channels, puts power back in the hands of the consumer - of parents - and forces the producers of indecent or violent programming to fund their own raunch. It is the only fair solution. Why should I be forced to pay for programming that insults my intelligence and assaults my values just to gain access to a handful of channels I can watch with my family. The cable industry has been carried on the backs of American consumers long enough. It is time for this extortion to end.

Sincerely,

Wiladean & James Davis

**SandraLyn Bailey**

04-2007

**From:** Clyde Byrne [cnabyrne@roadrunner.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 20, 2007 4:22 PM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** A La Carte Programming

FILED/ACCEPTED

MAR 13 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Mr. Martin,

Thank you for the information at <http://www.fcc.gov/cgb/consumerfacts/cablechannels.html> explaining that cable providers are free to offer a la carte programming. I doubt I shall live long enough to see my local Time Warner provider offer a la carte programming above the basic tier. As it is, I pay over \$100 per month for Internet access and three tiers of cable programming just to have access to the very few channels I ever watch.

Please, advise me on any efforts I can make to force the cable industry to offer a la carte choices. The cost of cable is not my #1 issue. I simply want to communicate to the entertainment industry via my entertainment budget which of their products are worth my time and money and which are not.

Thank you,

Clyde D. Byrne  
147 County Road 163  
New Brockton, AL 36351

**SandraLyn Bailey**

FILED/ACCEPTED

04-2007

MAR 13 2007

**From:** Alan Hale [alanco@starband.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 20, 2007 11:44 AM  
**To:** dtaylor@tateweb  
**Subject:** A La Carte, ESPN Lite.....

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

FILED/ACCEPTED

MAR 13 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

February 17, 2007

FILED/ACCEPTED

MAR 13 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20554

Gentlemen:

I am writing to you to demand your support for an a la carte law for cable/satellite television. Why?

Because the large media companies: Disney, Viacom, NBC/Universal, Turner, Scripps are causing bills for cable/satellite to rise more than retired folks can possibly pay. ESPN alone costs the cable company \$7.50 a month.

If ESPN costs this much, and the Disney company demands carriage of several other channels and ESPN in the basic tier, how can anyone afford cable TV?

When your commission says to Congress, that an a la carte bill is not needed then you are either deluded, or bought.

Sorry to be so blunt, however I and my wife are about to completely give up "cable". The evil Disney Company decided to quit selling to C-band this January, and now we do not have any way to receive it. This may be a blessing in disguise, as the cost of ESPN/ESPN2 is something we will not be paying. So on one hand, all we want out of ESPN is auto racing, tennis, and rodeo. We do not want NFL football, NBA basketball, or Major League Baseball. We therefore think that ESPN should be broken up and an ESPN Lite created for a cheaper price.

When you live in a rural area as we do, only satellite reception is possible, and we know ESPN is a very high cost option, but no longer available to us. We therefore opt out. We implore you to:

1. Break up ESPN into a "Light Version" and an all inclusive version.
2. Demand an A La Carte Bill from congress.
3. Require ESPN to sell to NPS/C-Band.

Without these requirements, the cost of "cable" will go away from retired people. Why?

Because most of us only want 15-20 selections other than perhaps a movies service. These are selections such as HGTV, ALTV, History, Military, Speed, VS, Outdoor, Travel, ESPN (if it were a light version) ESPN2 (ditto), Lifetime, TCM, FMC, IFC, GAC, Discovery, NGC, USA, TNT. Selections of these only would, without the bundling enforced by media companies, cost far less than the present three tiered systems employed by cable and satellite companies. When my prescription co-pays by the VA cost \$40 a month, my wife's Medicare supplement payments cost \$150 a month, there is no budget for expensive 200 channel "cable". I hope some of you have to try to live in retirement. See what happens to you.

Sincerely,

Alan Hale

HC65 Boz 187

Austin, Nevada 89310

775-964-1242