

1 DRAFT MINUTES

2
3 **California Connect**
4 **Telecommunications Access for the Deaf and Disabled Administrative**
5 **Committee (TADDAC) Meeting**
6

7 March 27, 2026
8

9 California Connect's Telecommunications Access for the Deaf and Disabled
10 Administrative Committee (TADDAC) held a hybrid public Committee Meeting
11 on WebEx and at the Hyatt Regency LAX, 6225 W Century Blvd, Los Angeles,
12 CA 90045.
13

14 **TADDAC Members Present**

15 Jesse Acosta, At Large Seat - Veterans Community
16 Louie Herrera, Disability Community-Blind/Low Vision Community Seat, Vice Chair
17 Katie Wright, Late-Deafened Community Seat, Chair (WebEx)
18 Robert Sidansky, Deaf Community Seat
19 Darren Blackburn, CPUC Public Advocates Office Representative (WebEx)
20 Kevin Siemens, Disability Community-Speech-to-Speech User Seat (WebEx)
21 Kenneth Rothschild, Deaf Community Seat
22

23 **TADDAC Non-Voting Liaisons Present:**

24 Brent Jolley, Communications Division, CPUC
25

26 **CPUC Staff Present:**

27 Matthew Reinig, Committee Coordinator, Communications Division
28 Tyrone Chin, Communications Division (WebEx)
29 Karen Luong, Communications Division (WebEx)
30 Charles Abeghe, Communications Division (WebEx)
31 Mark Bella, Communications Division (WebEx)
32

33 **Others present in-person:**

34 Arianna Anaya, PM-EPC, Maximus
35

36 **Others Present on WebEx:**

37 Amanda Whyrick, California Connect Division President
38 Kyle Miers, California Connect Division Vice President
39 Chong Vang, Equipment Processing Center Operations Director, CSD
40 Jennifer Minore, Field Operations Program Director, CSD
41 Aida Cerda, Outreach Director, CSD
42 Molly Miller, Marketing Director, CSD

- 1 Josh Josa, Testing & Training Director
- 2 Genelle Sanders, Testing Manager, CSD
- 3 Loulia Miller, Maximus
- 4 Erin Anhouvy, RAID Manager, Maximus
- 5 Abby Magtoto, Relay Account Manager, Hamilton Relay
- 6 Riva Usher, Contract Director, Maximus
- 7 Kevin
- 8 5102****00
- 9 Abby Magtoto - Hamilton Relay
- 10 Amit Chhabra
- 11 AS
- 12 ASL/English Interpreter:Lacey Easton (she/her)
- 13 Captioner-Brenda Perin
- 14 Heidi Tillman
- 15 Janett Serpa
- 16 Jeff C
- 17 Julie Green
- 18 Kerrie D
- 19 Leigh Ann Hubbard
- 20 Melody Lujano
- 21 Riva Davis
- 22 Riva Usher
- 23 Roger Pflieger
- 24 Ryan Gallagher
- 25 Safavi, Gelareh
- 26 sam mcintire
- 27 Sara Starr
- 28 Selznick, Dennis
- 29 Shaunee Cerny
- 30 Steve Longo
- 31 Theresa Emig
- 32 Yazmine McNair-Turner
- 33
- 34 TADDAC Chair Katie Wright called the meeting to order at 10:04 AM.
- 35
- 36 **I. Administrative Business**
- 37 **A. Roll Call of TADDAC Members**
- 38 TADDAC Chair Katie Wright performed a roll call.
- 39
- 40 **B. Agenda Review and Approval**
- 41 Katie Wright proposed to remove the Interview with Megan Schwimmer
- 42 due to Megan being unable to attend. Moved by Jesse Acosta, seconded by

1 Louie Herrera, and with no opposition, the Agenda was approved as
2 amended.

3
4 **C. Approval of Meeting Minutes from February 27, 2026**

5 Kevin Siemens motioned and (inaudible) seconded, and the minutes were
6 approved without opposition.

7
8 **D. EPAC Update/Report**

9
10 Steve Longo provided an update from the EPAC meeting on March 13,
11 2026.

12 Steve Longo began the EPAC meeting by noting that it had taken place
13 two weeks prior and included a farewell for Judy, who resigned from EPAC for
14 health reasons. The committee expressed their best wishes for her.

15 The committee discussed Wave 2 equipment and the need to report on
16 its performance. Janice tested the Echo Show 11, which offers news and
17 weather updates but lacks consistent captioning, making it inaccessible to
18 Deaf users. The committee decided to put further consideration of the Echo
19 Show 11 on hold. Longo noted the existence of a newer Echo device, version
20 15, and plans to compare its accessibility features to the Echo 11 to determine
21 if it is a better option. Longo tested additional devices, including SquareGlow,
22 which is customizable and loud, with options to add lights and adjust tones for
23 various hearing needs. The SquareGlow device can send alerts to a phone,
24 though it does not provide video. The bed alarm was praised for its
25 functionality, particularly its ability to send text alerts and provide vibration,
26 which was found effective after several days of testing. Longo is exploring the
27 integration of the Ring doorbell with SquareGlow to avoid the need for
28 additional devices. Kenneth Rothschild shared his preference for a hard-wired
29 connection for SquareGlow as opposed to continuously replacing the
30 batteries.

31 Efforts are underway to recruit candidates with technological expertise
32 for the EPAC Chair or an EPAC seat, as well as for TADDAC. Interested
33 parties should contact Matt or Katie for further information and application
34 assistance.

35 Lastly, Longo shared that he made a vlog that is currently four minutes
36 long, providing an overview of TADDAC and EPAC. Molly Miller from
37 Marketing is currently reviewing it.

38
39 **E. TADDAC Action Items from February 27, 2026**

1 **Action Item #68: Committee members to assist CTAP and CRS Vendor**
2 **outreach efforts by emailing information or reporting on community**
3 **events to the DDTP Committee Coordinator.**

4 Katie Wright will share information on the two walks for hearing. This
5 action item remains open.
6

7 **Action Item #99: TADDAC will make an effort to recruit new Members for**
8 **its eight (8) open seats. TADDAC is seeking a Hard-of-Hearing, Disability**
9 **I – Mobility, Disability II – Speech-to-Speech, Disability III – Blind/Low**
10 **Vision, Disability Representative IV, Disability Representative V, Late**
11 **Deafened, and At-Large.**

12 No updates. This action item remains open.

13 **Action Item #114: Test Learning Management System (LMS) Courses**
14 **and Community Platform.**

15 Josh Josa, Testing & Training Director, provided an update on WeCo's
16 Accessibility Audit that addresses the feedback received regarding the LMS
17 and Community Platform. This action item is now closed.
18

19 **Action Item #115: Evaluate and complete surveys for member's selected**
20 **equipment.**

21 Josh Josa, Testing & Training Director, developed a summary report on
22 the member's feedback. This action item is now closed.
23

24 **Action Items #116: Read the book, "Out of My Dreams" featuring a**
25 **character with a speech disability.**

26 Kenneth Rothschild requested a physical copy of the book. Members can
27 request a purchase by contacting Matthew Reinig. This action item remains
28 open.
29

30 **II. CPUC & CA Connect/DDTP Update**

31 Tyrone Chin provided the CPUC update, stating that the proceeding to
32 modernize California Connect has concluded. Commissioner Houck issued a
33 decision establishing revisions and updates to the program. As a result,
34 communication division staff are required to take a number of actions, like
35 consolidating all subprograms and brands under California Connect,
36 collaborate with other programs such as California Lifeline for cross-
37 promotion, and implement a direct procurement and shipping model for
38 equipment distribution. An email outlining the outcome was previously sent to
39 Committee members by Matthew Reinig. Chin also provided an update on the
40 CRS-6 Request for Proposal, noting that it is still in the evaluation phase.
41

42 **III. TADDAC & EPAC Charter Discussion**

1 The committee began its discussion on the TADDAC charter, focusing on
2 the terms of appointment. Katie Wright reviewed the charter and noted that
3 appointments are for four-year terms, with the possibility of serving two
4 consecutive terms for a total of eight years. After serving, individuals must wait
5 two years before rejoining the Committee. The charter also states that
6 members cannot serve as proxies for two consecutive months during the two-
7 year waiting period. Katie questioned whether this proxy limitation is still
8 appropriate, especially since current needs emphasize having proxies who are
9 familiar with ongoing work. Katie acknowledged that absences might
10 occasionally extend beyond two months, making the current proxy rule
11 potentially restrictive. Katie is considering removing the restriction that
12 prevents a person from serving as a proxy for two consecutive months. It was
13 noted that Ken had served as a proxy multiple times in previous years and
14 was required to wait two years before becoming a full member again.

15 Jesse Acosta agreed that the proxy term limit restriction should be
16 eliminated. Katie Wright stated that she and Matt would remove the proxy
17 restriction from their master lists, noting the benefit of having experienced
18 proxies like Ken. Matthew Reinig sought clarification from Brent regarding the
19 removal of the two-month proxy limitation, specifying that only that portion
20 would be eliminated. Katie Wright emphasized that the committee was
21 removing the restriction in section 3.5, number two, which states that a person
22 cannot serve as a proxy for two consecutive months during the two-year
23 period. This change would allow members whose terms expired to serve as
24 proxies without that limitation.

25 Katie Wright asked if there were any other references to proxies in the
26 charter, and inquired whether Brent believed it was necessary to formally
27 require the identification of a proxy in the charter. Brent Jolley clarified that it is
28 not necessary to identify a specific individual as a proxy. He recommended
29 that the committee should discuss the proposed changes (redline) in the
30 bylaws to determine if they are needed. Katie Wright confirmed Brent Jolley's
31 request and asked if further discussion on the redline was desired. Brent
32 Jolley replied affirmatively, indicating the goal was to determine whether the
33 redline change was necessary.

34 Katie Wright invited additional comments or objections regarding the
35 proposal to eliminate the restriction on proxies serving more than two
36 consecutive months. Kevin Siemens reiterated that a limitation on proxy
37 service duration should exist and questioned what that limit should be. It could
38 be six months. But then it begs the question of whether the member wants to
39 be on the committee if they haven't attended the meetings. Katie Wright
40 reflected that if a committee member needs a proxy for an extended period, it
41 could become problematic, depending on the reason for their absence. She
42 referenced section 3.6, which allows for the removal of members who miss

1 three consecutive meetings without just cause or a proxy. Wright used the
2 example of a member being unable to attend due to an accident, noting that in
3 such cases, resignation or removal might be appropriate, and that the proxy
4 would no longer be needed once the member leaves the committee. Louie
5 Herrera agreed, stating that if a member leaves and the proxy was only
6 serving for that individual, the proxy's role would naturally end.

7 Katie Wright noted the absence of a leave of absence policy in the
8 bylaws, and questioned what options exist when a member is unable to attend
9 for an extended period—either removal or resignation. Louie Herrera asked
10 Matt and Brent if there is regulatory guidance addressing absenteeism, and
11 how similar situations have been handled previously. Brent Jolley explained
12 that in past cases, members have failed to attend meetings or provide contact
13 for extended periods. He suggested that the bylaws should retain provisions
14 for removing absent members unless an acceptable reason is given, allowing
15 the committee to decide on a case-by-case basis. Brent Jolley recounted a
16 recent instance where Ken served as a proxy for Richard, who could not
17 participate but remained in communication with the committee. Jolley
18 emphasized that while such situations occur, it is up to the committee to
19 decide whether to amend the bylaws or address exceptions case by case.

20 Louie Herrera expressed agreement with the need for flexibility in
21 handling absences, noting that circumstances sometimes require members to
22 take time off. However, Herrera emphasized that the committee should not be
23 delayed by members who are indecisive or absent without justification. He
24 recalled a situation where a member, Joe Porter, stepped down due to travel
25 issues, and stressed the importance of addressing each situation on a case-
26 by-case basis without allowing unexplained absences to hinder the group's
27 progress. Kevin Siemens shared his personal experience of being absent for
28 two months due to surgery and rehabilitation. He noted that his absence was
29 communicated to the coordinator, and he was not removed from the
30 committee.

31 Katie Wright agreed, stating that if a member is expected to return after a
32 few months of absence, their position should remain open and a proxy should
33 serve during their absence. Wright argued that this approach maintains
34 continuity and supports removing the limitation on proxies serving more than
35 two months.

36 Wright further noted that the current rules allow for the removal of a
37 member who is absent for three consecutive meetings without just cause,
38 using this as an example of a fair process. She suggested that the group
39 reflect on these ideas and return with proposed changes, acknowledging that
40 section 3.5 of the charter will require revision.

41 Kenneth Rothschild raised a procedural question, asking whether the
42 charter under discussion was the most recent, approved version. He

1 referenced finding an older charter from 2004 and questioned whether the
2 2011 document was officially adopted. Matthew Reinig confirmed that the
3 current version is from 2011, and he gave Kenneth the wrong one, the 2004
4 version. Reinig will confirm internally that the 2011 version is the correct
5 one. Rothschild recalled seeing the 2004 charter on the DDTP website,
6 which caused confusion about which document was current. Reinig stated that
7 he had already requested that the website be updated with the 2011 charter to
8 prevent further confusion.

9 Reinig suggested making the charter review an action item. He proposed
10 that each member read the charter and submit suggestions for changes,
11 particularly to section 3.5, so the committee could move forward. He also
12 noted the requirement by the Commissioner to update the charter every five
13 years. Wright agreed to make the charter review an action item, instructing
14 members to review the charter and send their redline suggestions to Reinig.
15

16 **IV. Equipment Evaluation Discussion**

17 Matthew Reinig presented and the presentation is on pages 28 to 37. The
18 study is on pages 38 to 43.

19 Kenneth Rothschild motioned to approve EPAC's recommendation for
20 CPUC to conduct a VRI pilot. Kevin seconded the motion, and unanimously,
21 the motion passed.
22

23 **V. Wave Two Equipment Recommendations**

24
25 Mark Bella greeted the group and indicated that Josh would begin the
26 presentation. He asked whether there was a preference to review the slides
27 one by one.

28 Josh Josa explained that the slides provided an overview of the Wave 2
29 equipment, which had been demonstrated at a previous EPAC meeting. Each
30 slide featured a photo and brief description of a device's purpose. Reinig
31 apologized for not including the binder with the slides and promised to send it
32 to Jesse and others who needed it.

33 Josa introduced the Amazon Echo Dot (5th generation), describing it as a
34 compact smart speaker with Alexa voice controls, smart home integration, and
35 accessible audio feedback. Josa asked whether to provide detailed features of
36 each device or stick to brief descriptions. Jesse Acosta requested detailed
37 features. Josa elaborated on the Amazon Echo's features, highlighting voice
38 controls, touch and gesture activation, adjustable voice output, drop-in call
39 capability, and environmental feedback such as temperature. Josa invited
40 committee members to provide feedback on the Amazon Echo. Mark Bella
41 summarized feedback from the EPAC meeting, noting that the Amazon Echo
42 Show 11 was not recommended due to issues with captioning, lack of

1 specificity, a non-user-friendly interface, and integration challenges, making it
2 unsuitable for users who are hard of hearing. However, the Echo Show was
3 found to be beneficial for individuals with cognitive or mobility needs, as noted
4 by CSD team member Ally.

5 Wright suggested that the presentation proceed without gathering live
6 feedback, as members could submit their input via feedback forms if they had
7 tested the devices. Brent Jolley suggested scheduling a future agenda item for
8 Josh to present results and recommendations for each device at the next
9 TADDAC meeting, and to physically bring the devices. Reinig added that the
10 devices were physically present at the EPAC meeting for hands-on testing.

11 Bella explained that the Q Braille XL was not recommended, as it was
12 overwhelming for new users, especially those who are newly blind.
13 Additionally, the device is no longer being manufactured.

14 Bella stated that the Orbit Reader 20 was also not recommended due to
15 its limitation of only displaying one line at a time, making it slow for reading
16 and writing. However, it might still be suitable for some new users.

17 The Sonic Bomb alarm clock with Super Shaker was not recommended
18 due to its small size, complexity, and difficult-to-read instructions. Alternative
19 devices, such as the Bellman, were considered more suitable.

20 Bella mentioned that three products—Future Call, HIMS (eMotion), and
21 SmartVision—had not yet been published in the EPAC meeting minutes. Bella
22 confirmed that those three products were demonstrated in person at the
23 EPAC meeting. Bella concluded that EPAC recommended all other products
24 except the four previously mentioned and offered to proceed with a detailed
25 slide-by-slide review if desired.

26 Katie Wright expressed her perspective regarding the Committee's
27 structure, noting that the subcommittee (EPAC) is responsible for equipment
28 evaluation, while the main committee serves an administrative role. She
29 emphasized the importance of trusting EPAC's recommendations, as that is
30 their area of expertise. TADDAC members were given opportunities to provide
31 feedback on requested items, and this input was presumably considered by
32 EPAC in their decisions. Wright stated it would be inappropriate, both in terms
33 of time and committee function, to duplicate EPAC's work. Instead, TADDAC's
34 involvement should begin when EPAC forwards recommendations to the
35 CPUC. Wright analogized that the committee had participated in the process
36 in an informal way and should now step back to allow the appropriate
37 procedures to continue.

38 Louie Herrera agreed with the process described by Katie Wright but
39 raised concerns about decisions based on misunderstandings of equipment
40 features. He pointed out that most Braille displays, regardless of model or
41 price, are single-line devices and argued that the Orbit Reader serves a
42 valuable and affordable role, even if not the fastest or most flexible. Herrera

1 stressed that device evaluations should be based on informed reasoning
2 rather than misconceptions. Matthew Reinig clarified that the feedback on the
3 Orbit Reader, provided by Danyelle, did not result in its elimination, but rather
4 its placement on hold for further evaluation. Reinig emphasized that it was not
5 a definitive rejection but a decision to pause and reconsider based on further
6 input.

7 Kenneth Rothschild suggested Steve Longo should have stayed for the
8 discussion. Kenneth was prepared to make a motion to accept EPAC's
9 recommendation unless other members had an objection.

10 Wright asked for clarification on whether EPAC's recommendations were
11 presented for a vote by the committee. Reinig clarified that EPAC had already
12 voted to recommend fifteen out of nineteen products, placing four devices on
13 hold. He stated that the recommendations had been communicated via email.

14 Acosta raised concerns about the reliance on a single blind EPAC
15 member's feedback for evaluating devices intended for blind users. He
16 explained that both he and Louie, as blind users, had first-hand experience
17 with the equipment and sometimes faced challenges that might not be
18 captured by one individual's perspective. Acosta underscored the value of
19 having multiple blind users assess the devices to ensure more comprehensive
20 feedback.

21 Katie Wright stated that feedback from committee members, including
22 Louie, was provided to EPAC and used in their decision-making process
23 regarding equipment evaluation.

24 Acosta asked what EPAC's response was to the feedback provided by the
25 committee. Wright sought clarification from Acosta regarding which item he
26 was referring to. Acosta explained that he was referring to a different item and
27 expressed uncertainty about how EPAC responded to their feedback. Wright
28 suggested that EPAC's response should be documented in the meeting
29 minutes. Matthew Reinig clarified that member feedback was included in the
30 EPAC minutes and that he could provide the full transcript. He noted that only
31 four pieces of equipment were specifically placed on hold based on detailed
32 feedback.

33 Reinig added that on the CSD CPUC side, survey results had not yet
34 been shared before voting. Acosta sought clarification as to whether survey
35 results were shared with EPAC. Reinig said that as of now, those results had
36 not been shared with EPAC and invited Mark or Josh to comment further if
37 desired. Mark Bella confirmed that the results had not been shared with
38 EPAC. Wright asked for clarification as to whether EPAC received the
39 committee's evaluations and feedback. Reinig confirmed that EPAC did not
40 receive the evaluations. Wright acknowledged this clarification with surprise.

41 Wright acknowledged the situation and referenced the motion made by
42 Kenneth Rothschild to approve the equipment list. Kevin made a comment,

1 but the captions did not display it. Rothschild explained that he hesitated to
2 make a motion and was now uncertain due to the ongoing discussion. Jesse
3 Acosta suggested not proceeding with a motion to approve the list. Wright
4 stated that Kenneth made a motion and the committee has two choices: 1)
5 second the motion and vote or 2) no one seconds the motion. If there is no
6 second to his motion, then the motion dies.

7 Wright asked if anyone would second Rothschild's motion to approve the
8 list. With no second, the motion to approve the list was not carried forward.

9 Wright summarized the consensus that Josh and Mark should ensure
10 EPAC receives the committee's feedback before presenting the equipment list
11 again. Matthew Reinig expressed concern about further delays, noting that
12 gathering feedback had already taken considerable time and that not all
13 members had submitted their input. Wright clarified that she was not asking
14 for another delay, but that existing feedback should have been presented to
15 EPAC before their meeting. She asked if Louie had provided feedback before
16 the meeting. Louie Herrera confirmed he had provided feedback before the
17 meeting. Wright asked Jesse Acosta if he had also provided feedback prior to
18 the EPAC meeting. Acosta confirmed that he had submitted feedback a week
19 before the meeting.

20 Brent Jolley stated that TADDAC should request EPAC to present their
21 recommendations along with supporting data at future meetings. He
22 suggested that EPAC remain available to explain their decisions and the data
23 collected to support those recommendations, ensuring transparency and
24 understanding. Katie Wright agreed with Jolley's suggestion but emphasized
25 that it is EPAC's responsibility to review and use the data as they see fit. She
26 stated that her main concern was knowing EPAC had access to all necessary
27 information to make informed decisions.

28 Louie Herrera agreed with Jolley, emphasizing the importance of
29 thorough analysis in evaluating equipment. As a Braille user, Herrera
30 explained that personal preference should not outweigh functional suitability
31 for consumers. He stressed the need for objective evaluation criteria, given
32 the responsibility to use taxpayer funds effectively for community
33 communication resources. Herrera concluded that decisions should be based
34 on understanding the purpose and user needs of each device. Katie Wright
35 inquired whether the discussion was focused on a single controversial item
36 from the equipment list. Herrera explained that the controversy arose from
37 comments about the Orbit Reader being a single-line Braille display. He
38 clarified that most Braille displays are single-line unless significantly more
39 expensive models are purchased, and cautioned against wasting taxpayer
40 money on unnecessary features.

41 Brent Jolley added that both TADDAC and EPAC play important roles in
42 the assessment and recommendation process. He noted that individuals with

1 disabilities contribute valuable perspectives and that both committees are
2 responsible for gathering and evaluating data to represent the community
3 effectively. Jolley elaborated that while EPAC is responsible for evaluating
4 equipment and compiling recommendations, TADDAC also has a role in
5 providing community feedback. He outlined that EPAC presents its
6 recommendations to TADDAC, which then has the opportunity to question and
7 discuss the evaluation process before accepting or rejecting the proposed list.

8 Kevin Siemens explained that he was unable to test his assigned product,
9 the Future Call phone, because it was not functioning. He noted that even
10 though the device could potentially be excellent, he could not provide a
11 complete evaluation. Siemens reiterated that EPAC was not provided with full
12 details about the Future Call phone due to the feedback not being shared with
13 them. Katie Wright asked Siemens whether Mark and Josh were informed
14 about the non-functional device. Siemens confirmed that Mark and Josh were
15 aware of the issue.

16 Matthew Reinig confirmed that Monique also tested the Future Call phone
17 and, although her issue was not identical to Kevin Siemens's, she experienced
18 similar difficulties. Monique was unable to make a call and did not pursue
19 further testing after her initial attempts. Thus, two people encountered
20 problems with the device. Katie Wright asked for confirmation that the device
21 was not included on the final recommended list. Reinig clarified that the device
22 was missing from the original list and was not recommended for inclusion.

23 Robert Sidansky expressed his support for Brent Jolley's recent
24 comments. Brent Jolley reiterated the suggestion that, in the future, EPAC's
25 Chair should present recommendations and supporting data in person to
26 TADDAC. Katie Wright stated that the committee wants Mark and Josh to
27 return the list to EPAC and bring it back with more supporting data for further
28 review.

29 Wright voiced concern about not knowing the complete list of products
30 and questioned whether concerns were limited to the Braille reader or if other
31 items were in question. Mark Bella proposed that he and Josh, after gathering
32 all necessary information, prepare the recommendations with supporting data
33 for the next TADDAC meeting. He suggested involving Steve Longo and
34 providing documentation in advance to allow members ample time for review
35 and comment, which he felt would be more productive than rushing to a vote.
36 Wright agreed, stating that it is the committee's responsibility to be prepared
37 by reviewing all information before the next meeting. Wright acknowledged
38 that members sometimes do not review all materials, but emphasized that it
39 will be important to do so in preparation for the next meeting.

40
41
42

1 **VI. Learning Management System (LMS) & Community Platform**
2 **Discussion (CP)**

3 Mark Bella brought up whether the committee should discuss the
4 Community Platform (CP) and Learning Management System (LMS), as
5 EPAC had not yet reviewed these topics due to time constraints. He
6 suggested the committee defer recommendations until EPAC can have a full
7 discussion on the CP and LMS. Katie Wright noted that while the LMS and CP
8 involve equipment, they are also related to program delivery and client
9 services. She expressed interest in hearing feedback collected so far on the
10 LMS and CP.

11 Josh Josa reported that five people submitted feedback on the
12 platforms. Three respondents were confident in the systems' effectiveness,
13 while two expressed concerns about accessibility, particularly with unclear
14 navigation buttons and screen reader compatibility. One respondent had
15 difficulty with the login process. Josa added that those who accessed the
16 content found it easy to understand and navigate, and believed it would
17 support users in independent learning.

18 Mark Bella noted that CSD IT and WeCo conducted an accessibility
19 analysis and provided fifty recommendations for improvements. Bella stated
20 that the team would work on implementing the recommended improvements
21 to enhance user-friendliness and accessibility. Josa explained that WECO's
22 audit covered both the Community Platform and LMS. Of the fifty accessibility
23 recommendations, about fifteen were at WCAG 2.2 or below, with the rest at
24 higher standards. He said the team would address as many issues as
25 possible within platform limitations. Josa clarified that the platforms in question
26 were Microsoft and Talent LMS, both of which have inherent limitations that
27 the team would work to address.

28 Katie Wright reflected on her experience with the evaluation process,
29 stating that she had likely submitted her feedback. She noted that, like others,
30 she encountered minor navigation issues but found the content to be
31 excellent, particularly for users who are hard of hearing. Wright described the
32 navigation as somewhat awkward but praised the overall quality of the
33 content.

34 Louie Herrera clarified that WCAG refers to the Web Content
35 Accessibility Guidelines, with the current approved standard being 2.2 AA and
36 AAA. He explained that while higher versions are in development, they are not
37 yet in use and are still being debated. Herrera cautioned that referencing
38 WCAG standards above 2.2 could be problematic, as they are not yet official.

39 Wright asked Josh Josa if, after making changes based on user feedback,
40 the updated materials would be republished for further testing by the
41 committee. Josh Josa explained that, following WECO's audit, Elevated
42 Resources would address the recommended fixes. The improvements are

1 expected to take five to six weeks, with completion targeted for June 30th. He
2 invited members to test the platforms again after updates are completed. Mark
3 Bella encouraged further testing and feedback, emphasizing that increased
4 input would benefit the community and improve user experience.

5 Louie Herrera inquired about the status of the CAPTCHA barrier affecting
6 system login, asking whether a resolution was underway. He suggested that
7 upgrading to CAPTCHA 3.0 could help address accessibility issues,
8 particularly for users with hearing loss. Josh Josa confirmed that the
9 CAPTCHA issue was identified during WECO's audit and is scheduled to be
10 addressed by June 30th. Herrera offered to assist with testing, emphasizing
11 that the current CAPTCHA creates significant barriers for the Deafblind
12 community, making user validation nearly impossible for some individuals.
13

14 **IX. Interview – Megan Schwimmer**

15 Matthew Reinig read a letter from Megan Schwimmer, who thanked
16 TADDAC and the Committee for the opportunity to connect and expressed her
17 appreciation for their work. Schwimmer explained that she has decided not to
18 pursue involvement at this time due to her commitment to launching a new
19 organization, which demands her full attention. She conveyed her respect for
20 the Committee's mission, expressed interest in staying connected, and left
21 open the possibility of future collaboration. Schwimmer concluded by wishing
22 the Committee ongoing success.
23

24 **X. Program Vendor Reports**

25 **A. Marketing Report**

26 Molly Miller, Marketing Director, presented, and the presentation is on
27 pages 40 to 50.
28

29 **B. Testing and Training Report**

30 Josh Josha, Testing and Training Director, presented and the
31 presentation is on page 51 to 58.

32 Joshua Josa indicated that the next two slides contained substantial
33 content and information about Wave 3 devices under consideration. He asked
34 whether he should read through all of them and list the names, or if there was
35 another preferred approach. Matthew Reinig asked Louie and Jesse if they
36 had reviewed the Wave 3 list and inquired if they wanted the names of each
37 item read aloud, noting that sighted individuals could easily glance at the list.
38 Jesse Acosta appreciated Matt's consideration and emphasized that failing to
39 describe the content excluded non-sighted participants from engaging fully.

40 Jesse Acosta asked if there have been any changes or upgrades to the
41 Community Platform this week. Josh Josa responded that no accessibility
42 fixes from the audit had been implemented yet. He mentioned that there had

1 been some updates, such as blog posts and comments, but no backend fixes
2 had occurred. Jesse Acosta questioned how to proceed if accessibility issues
3 on the Community Platform remained unresolved. He referenced a recent
4 request for feedback, describing the platforms as a "disaster" based on his
5 experiences, and recounted an incident where a California Connect employee
6 witnessed accessibility challenges firsthand. Josh Josa clarified that feedback
7 and experiences had been shared with Elevated Resources, the company
8 responsible for remediating the Community Platform based on audit findings
9 from WeCo. He committed to informing the group once remediations were
10 complete so they could retest the platform.

11 Jesse Acosta pressed for clarification on whether the proposed fixes
12 would actually resolve the accessibility issues. He questioned who would be
13 responsible for testing the corrections—especially regarding accessibility for
14 blind users—and referenced previous discussions about hiring Elevated
15 Resources and the audit conducted by WeCo. Josh Josa confirmed that
16 WeCo had audited the Community Platform and LMS for WCAG compliance
17 and identified issues. Elevated Resources would address these problems,
18 after which WeCo would verify the remediations. He invited additional
19 individuals to participate in testing and auditing to ensure the fixes were
20 effective.

21 Jesse Acosta emphasized the importance of joint responsibility and
22 suggested that a comprehensive assessment should take place during the
23 upcoming May meeting, where all key participants can contribute. Josh Josa
24 supported the need for cross-collaboration to ensure the best public
25 experience, acknowledging the valuable input from both companies, users,
26 and experienced members, especially those who are blind.

27 Kevin Siemens raised concerns about the exclusion of low vision
28 individuals from the conversation, prompting a clarifying response from Josh
29 Josa and further discussion among the group. Louie Herrera addressed this
30 by stating that the process is a learning experience and agreed that the needs
31 of the low vision community should be prioritized, as they represent a larger
32 segment than those who are totally blind. Herrera also highlighted the
33 importance of considering the Deafblind community, which is often
34 underserved, and stressed the need to explore all possible solutions for
35 consumers with varying disabilities.

36 Louie Herrera offered to facilitate testing with qualified users of assistive
37 technology, ensuring that any accessibility improvements are thoroughly
38 evaluated. Kevin Siemens encouraged innovative thinking and reinforced the
39 value of considering diverse perspectives. The conversation concluded with a
40 shared commitment to collaboration and inclusive decision-making to address
41 the needs of all users, especially those with low vision and other disabilities.

1 Louie Herrera inquired about the availability of packaged literature that
2 could be distributed to partner organizations serving people with disabilities.
3 He explained that, due to limited manpower at his company, they rely on
4 community-based organizations (CBOs) to reach individuals in need. Herrera
5 indicated that, if provided with concise and clear information about the
6 purpose and process of a test trial, he could disseminate this to CBOs to
7 gauge interest and potentially recruit testers. He emphasized the importance
8 of brevity and clarity to avoid overwhelming recipients and increase
9 engagement.

10 Brent Jolley responded affirmatively, stating that his team has a
11 significant amount of informational material and asked Herrera for more
12 specifics regarding what should be included. Herrera clarified that the material
13 should clearly explain the objectives of the test trial, the type and amount of
14 testing involved, and the kind of feedback sought. He stressed the need for
15 concise communication outlining what is being tested, why, and how partners
16 can contribute feedback. Jolley agreed with the suggestion and committed to
17 preparing the requested information.

18 Rothschild inquired if Josa, representing CSD, collaborates with other
19 states or if other states use similar independent approaches. Josa responded
20 that CSD reviews product lists from other states' programs to monitor the
21 equipment they offer. He noted that while much of this process has already
22 been completed for earlier program waves, for more recent waves, California
23 is essentially on par with other states. He clarified that there are no formal
24 relationships with other states, but CSD does examine their product lists for
25 reference.

26 Rothschild asked whether CSD had reviewed other states' approaches
27 and found any to be particularly effective or ineffective. Josa replied that he
28 had only been with CSD for four months and had been focused on immediate
29 tasks, but suggested he could provide a more informed answer in six months.
30 Jolley explained that most states have individualized processes for equipment
31 procurement, often using on-demand surveys and data collection to determine
32 consumer needs. While California currently uses an inventory-based model—
33 ordering equipment in bulk and distributing from stock—the state is
34 transitioning toward a more consumer-driven, customized approach. Jolley
35 emphasized the importance of vetting and testing equipment and noted that
36 most other states do not use an inventory-based model but instead make
37 individual purchases based on consumer requests. Mark Bella expanded on
38 Jolley's comments, stating that California is currently learning from feedback
39 and working on improving its strategy and processes. He expressed the goal
40 for California to become a model for other states, although he acknowledged
41 that the state is currently behind and is working to catch up with technological
42 and program advancements.

1 Robert Sidansky inquired whether California works closely with any
2 specific states. Josh Josa responded that California does not currently have
3 active relationships with other states. The state has been reviewing other
4 states' equipment lists and collecting ideas, but aims to establish more direct
5 collaborations once its own processes are streamlined. Josa reiterated that
6 California is currently behind and focused on catching up. Mark Bella added
7 that California is engaged in informal information sharing with other states
8 through the Telecommunications Equipment Distribution Program Agency
9 (TEDPA) and is involved in friendly dialogue and networking to observe and
10 learn from other programs. Mark Bella explained that TEDPA brings together
11 states with similar equipment distribution programs, each using different
12 methodologies and approaches.

13 14 **C. Field Operations Report**

15 Jennifer Minore, Field Operations Director, presented and the
16 presentation is on page 59 to 67.

17 Robert Sidansky asked about high points on two bar graphs. Jennifer
18 Minore explained that such fluctuations are expected and typically result from
19 factors like weather or other events affecting city traffic, noting that only
20 significant changes would be unusual. Kenneth Rothschild suggested
21 reporting data over thirteen months instead of twelve to enable year-over-year
22 comparisons for the same month, and Minore agreed to adopt this approach.
23 Kevin Siemens requested adding the specific date when a spike in traffic
24 began. Minore responded that a day-by-day breakdown might better address
25 this need and suggested further discussion to clarify the request. Brent Jolley
26 clarified that at the biannual joint meetings, there are presentations that
27 elaborate a month-to-month comparison over the last six-months, which
28 addresses Kevin's request.

29 30 **D. Outreach Report**

31 Ryan Gallagher, Outreach for Northern California, presented, and the
32 report is on page 68 to 75.

33 34 **E. CRS-5 Report**

35 Abby Magtoto, Relay Account Manager, presented, and the presentation
36 is on pages 76 to 79.

37 Kenneth Rothschild asked for clarification about what constitutes an
38 inappropriate call. Abby Magtoto explained that certain parameters define
39 inappropriate calls, describing these as instances where Relay services are
40 used for unintended purposes. Rothschild noted that Communication
41 Assistants (CAs) are not supposed to assist scam callers, emphasizing that
42 their role is to transmit information without input.

1 Magtoto added that established parameters for inappropriate calls have
2 been communicated to the state, and callers who meet these criteria are
3 flagged to preserve service use for legitimate users. She apologized if her
4 explanation was unclear. Rothschild asked whether scam calls specifically are
5 considered inappropriate calls. Magtoto responded that scam calls are
6 technically considered inappropriate, but she would provide a more detailed
7 explanation later.

8 Rothschild shared a personal experience in which a Communication
9 Assistant subtly acknowledged a scam call without providing direct assistance,
10 and requested further clarification on the matter. Magtoto confirmed that
11 Communication Assistants are expected to relay calls verbatim and are not
12 supposed to infer or make comments about the content of the call. Robert
13 Sidansky stated that, as a deaf individual, he prefers to independently decide
14 how to handle scam calls and opposes Communication Assistants providing
15 warnings about scams. Sidansky added that hearing individuals do not receive
16 warnings about scam calls, asserting that equal access should apply to all
17 users.

18 Matthew Reinig requested that Abby Magtoto provide the committee with
19 additional information on inappropriate calls and protocols for handling scam
20 calls. Magtoto agreed to investigate further and to provide detailed guidance
21 to the committee on inappropriate calls and the handling of scam calls.
22

23 **F. Equipment Processing Center (EPC) Report**

24 Chong Vang, EPC Operations Director, presented and the presentation
25 is on page 80 to 89.
26

27 **XI. Public Input – PM Session**

28 There was no public input at this time.
29

30 **XII. New Business**

31 **A. Nomination and Voting of Successors or New Members**

32

33 **B. Future Meetings and Agendas**

34 Committee members confirmed that the new proposed date for the joint
35 meeting on September 18, 2026 works, in addition to two new joint meetings
36 in 2027. The 2027 joint meetings will be on the third Friday of the respective
37 month (March, May, September, and November).

38 Louie Herrera solicited additional comments regarding the schedule, and
39 Matthew Reinig clarified that while EPAC members are required to attend in
40 person due to equipment handling, TADDAC members are only strongly
41 encouraged to do so, with virtual attendance allowed as needed. Kenneth

1 Rothschild's preference for in-person meetings was acknowledged, with
2 agreement that face-to-face collaboration is often more effective.

3 Kevin Siemens inquired about follow-up actions on previously discussed
4 topics, specifically regarding 9-1-1 call procedures for speech-to-speech
5 operators. Reinig noted ongoing discussions with Tyrone and confirmed there
6 were no updates on 9-1-1 issues, asking Siemens for clarification on his
7 request. Siemens confirmed his interest in the process, and Reinig committed
8 to following up with Abby Magtoto, who in turn agreed to gather more
9 information and connect after the meeting. Siemens expressed a desire for a
10 prompt resolution.

11

12 **C. Report from the Chair**

13 No report.

14

15 **D. Member Reports**

16 No report.

17

18 **XIII. Meeting Wrap up and Adjournment**

19 The meeting was adjourned at 2:57 PM.

20

21 Matthew Reinig prepared the minutes.