

DRAFT MINUTES

**California Connect
Telecommunications Access for the Deaf and Disabled Administrative
Committee (TADDAC) Meeting**

June 26, 2026

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

TADDAC Members Present

Jesse Acosta, At Large Seat - Veterans Community
Louie Herrera, Disability Community-Blind/Low Vision Community Seat, Vice Chair
Katie Wright, Late-Deafened Community Seat, Chair
Darren Blackburn, CPUC Public Advocates Office Representative (WebEx)
Kevin Siemens, Disability Community-Speech-to-Speech User Seat (WebEx)
Eve Reiland, Disability Seat IV
Scott Hostetler, Proxy for Kenneth Rothschild

TADDAC Members Absent

Robert Sidansky, Deaf Community Seat
Kenneth Rothschild, Deaf Community Seat

TADDAC Non-Voting Liaisons Present:

Brent Jolley, Communications Division, CPUC

CPUC Staff Present:

Matthew Reinig, Committee Coordinator, Communications Division
Tyrone Chin, Communications Division (WebEx)
Karen Luong, Communications Division (WebEx)
Charles Abeghe, Communications Division (WebEx)
Mark Bella, Communications Division (WebEx)

Others present in-person:

Kerrie Daniels, Maximus

Others Present on WebEx:

Aida Cerda, Outreach Director, CSD
Molly Miller, Marketing Director, CSD

1 Genelle Sanders, Testing Manager, CSD
2 Loulia Miller, Maximus
3 Abby Magtoto, Relay Account Manager, Hamilton Relay
4 Tamara Paul-Reeff, Maximus
5 Kevin
6 5102****00
7 5628****46
8 89012
9 ALI AYALA
10 Ally Park
11 Amit Chhabra
12 Anonymous
13 Antonio Serna
14 Ashley Alvarado
15 ASL interpreter (Aaron Brace)
16 ASL Interpreter Aimee A.
17 ASL Interpreter Kay Feuerborn
18 Bella Lopez
19 Captioner-Brenda Perin
20 CH
21 Cody
22 Colin Krasnoff
23 Daisy Sheard
24 Dan Mabashov
25 Janett Serpa
26 kc
27 Matthew Bitter
28 Melody Lujano
29 RH
30 Rhiannon Kuffler
31 Roger Pflieger
32 Safavi, Gelareh
33 Sara Starr
34 Silvia
35 stephanie shaw
36 Steve Longo
37 Theresa Emig
38 Zdavis
39
40 TADDAC Chair Katie Wright called the meeting to order at 10:05 AM.
41
42 **I. Administrative Business**

1 **A. Roll Call of TADDAC Members**

2 TADDAC Chair Katie Wright performed a roll call. Scott Hostetler is
3 Kenneth Rothschild's proxy. Robert Sidanksy was absent.
4

5 **B. Agenda Review and Approval**

6 Moved by (inaudible), seconded by (inaudible), and with no opposition,
7 the Agenda was approved.
8

9 **C. Approval of Meeting Minutes from April 24, 2026**

10 Scott Hostetler suggested one correction: his last name was misspelled
11 on page 9. Kevin Siemens motioned and (inaudible) seconded, and the
12 minutes were approved without opposition as corrected.
13

14 **D. Approval of Meeting Minutes from May 15, 2026**

15 Kevin Siemens motioned and Jesse Acosta seconded, and the minutes
16 were approved without opposition, with Scott Hostetler abstaining.
17

18 **E. EPAC Update/Report**

19 Steve Longo delivered a brief report on the most recent EPAC meeting
20 held on June 12th. He highlighted that the committee focused on reviewing
21 and updating their charter, addressing outdated references and making
22 necessary revisions. The updated charter was subsequently forwarded to Matt
23 for his review, with the aim of finalizing changes before the November
24 deadline. Steve also drew attention to the need for updating the program
25 name from DDTP to California Connect in both the EPAC and TADDAC
26 charters.

27 Steve discussed several ongoing action items. The VRI mobile pilot
28 remains open, with the committee eager to secure CPUC approval to initiate
29 the pilot, emphasizing its potential benefits for communication access in
30 California. Another open action item involves the ongoing review of the
31 Community Platform, a process that involves regular updates and
32 communication with Matt. Additionally, the committee continues its work on
33 reviewing and updating the charter, a task scheduled for completion by
34 November. Steve noted that the action item related to completed surveys had
35 been closed.

36 Further, Steve reported that EPAC had interviewed and approved two
37 candidates for committee membership—one specializing in software and the
38 other in hardware, both with substantial professional experience. Since there
39 were two vacancies, both candidates were approved to join the committee.
40

41 **F. TADDAC Action Items from May 15, 2026**
42

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

No updates.

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

No updates.

Action item #119: Committee members will provide suggestions and recommendations for updating the current TADDAC Charter.

Charter review is ongoing. October TADDAC meeting will be dedicated solely to updating the Charter. This action item remains open.

Action Item #117: Committee members will provide CPUC with a list of CBOs to enter a collaborative partnership serving Deaf and Disabled Californians during emergencies.

Katie Wright opened the discussion by emphasizing the need for emergency shelters to be better equipped for California Connect customers and others with specific needs. She insisted that there should be a clear commitment from CD stating that they must ensure the provision of appropriate equipment and resources at emergency shelters. Wright expressed frustration that she has been advocating for these changes since 2018 and highlighted the urgency by referencing the recent Garden Grove evacuation, where people were displaced for several days, including her own son. She questioned how individuals with disabilities managed during those emergencies, noting that not all have the time or ability to prepare or evacuate with necessary communication devices and support. Wright advocated for practical solutions such as having captioning on screens in shelters for announcements, ensuring those with hearing impairments are not left out. Kevin Siemens and Jesse Acosta joined the conversation, with Siemens raising questions about specific shelter situations in Los Angeles and Garden Grove. Wright admitted not knowing if shelters had the right equipment, explaining her personal circumstances at the time. Acosta pointed out the confusion and lack of coordination between different jurisdictions in LA during emergencies, leading to people being turned away from shelters depending on which city or county they resided in.

Louis Herrera contributed by explaining that CRS did deploy accessible transportation and support during recent emergencies, but he criticized local authorities for lacking proper coordination and prioritization. Herrera

underscored that while third-party groups like CRS are always ready to help, the true responsibility lies with the Office of Emergency Services. He highlighted systemic problems, such as outdated databases and a lack of genuine engagement with the disabled community in planning and drills. Acosta and Herrera both agreed that for real progress, there needs to be better communication, updated systems, media involvement, and inclusive planning. Herrera added that people with disabilities also need to self-identify so they can be accounted for during emergencies, making it a “two-way street.”

In summary, Katie Wright, Kevin Siemens, Jesse Acosta, and Louis Herrera all shared concerns about the current state of emergency preparedness for people with disabilities. They called for clearer responsibilities, improved communication, active involvement of relevant agencies, and more inclusive strategies to ensure that all individuals, especially the most vulnerable, are supported during emergencies.

Action Items #116: Read the book, “Out of My Dreams” featuring a character with a speech disability.

No additional comments. This action item remains open.

II. CPUC & CA Connect/DDTP Update

Tyrone Chin provided an update from the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). He first addressed the Equipment Processing Center Request for Proposal (RFP), stating that the RFP was released on May 26, 2026. The evaluation period is scheduled from July 6 to July 20, 2026, followed by a negotiations phase from July 20 to July 31, 2026. The contract award date is still to be determined. Planning also includes a six-month transition and extension coordination period to maintain continuity until the RFP is awarded.

Chin then discussed the Enterprise Resource Planning Request for Proposal, noting that solicitation development activities are ongoing in collaboration with the California Department of Technology. He concluded with an update on the CRS-6 Request for Proposal, which is still in the evaluation phase.

Katie Wright asked for clarification about the Enterprise Resource Planning initiative, stating that she had not heard it mentioned before. In response, Chin explained that the initiative, led by Charles Abeghe, aims to create a centralized database for all program information. Currently, information is spread across multiple contractors, such as Hamilton Relay and Communication Services for the Deaf. The centralized system would allow for more comprehensive data analysis, which was previously challenging due to the dispersed nature of the data. The new system would provide access to

1 both contractors and the CPUC, with all data housed in a single location. He
2 highlighted that this setup would enable greater functionality, including the
3 ability to conduct surveys and perform comprehensive data analysis more
4 easily than before.

5 Wright inquired whether individual sections would still be able to analyze
6 their own data, or if all analysis would now be centralized. Chin asked Wright
7 to clarify what she meant by "each section." Wright elaborated, expressing
8 concern that with centralized data, analysis might shift from individual
9 departments to the umbrella organization, whereas currently, individual
10 departments conduct their own data analysis, as reflected in their reports.
11 Chin acknowledged Wright's point, clarifying that contractors will continue to
12 provide reports to committee members, such as those related to field
13 operations, testing, training, and marketing. However, with the new centralized
14 database, data will be more accessible. For example, instead of requesting
15 marketing data from specific contractors like CSD, users will be able to directly
16 access and analyze information from the centralized platform. Contractors will
17 also be able to use the database for their own analysis.

18 19 **III. TADDAC Charter Discussion**

20 The committee began its discussion on the TADDAC charter.

21 **3.3 Selection of Members:** No comments or objections to suggested
22 changes.

23 **3.4 Qualifications of Members:** No comments or objections to
24 suggested changes.

25 **3.5 Terms of Appointment:** Suggested change: A member shall hold
26 office until a successor has been appointed and has assumed office or until
27 the member has been removed in accordance with Paragraph 3.6 or has
28 resigned in accordance with Paragraph 3.7.

29 **3.6 to 3.9:** No changes.

30 **3.10 Expenses and Per Diem:**

31 The per diem shall be \$375 for each day of meetings attended by the
32 eligible non-officer members or \$275 if the meeting lasts for less than
33 approximately two hours.

34 For the Vice Chair, the per diem shall be \$400 for each day of meetings
35 attended or \$300 if the meeting lasts for less than approximately two hours.

36 For the Chair, the per diem shall be \$450 for each day of meetings
37 attended or \$350 if the meeting lasts for less than approximately two hours.

38 Kevin Siemens requested a different way to compensate members who
39 are on government assistance. Matthew Reinig addressed Kevin as another
40 member, Monique, had a similar concern. Members may opt for less per diem
41 but there is no other way to be compensated per state policy. Matthew

1 mentioned [CalABLE](#) Savings account where members can open a savings
2 account without being penalized for earning or saving more money.

3 The Committee stopped at Article 4.

4 All revisions and comments are made on Microsoft Word.

6 **IV. Equipment Assignment Expectations**

7 Genelle Sanders presented and the presentation is on pages 60 to 64.

8 Kevin Siemens expressed concerns about whether someone will help
9 them during the equipment evaluation process. Genelle reassured that a Field
10 Operations Specialist can go to the member's home or you can bring the
11 equipment to the nearest service center. Mark Bella reinforced that Kevin's
12 and others feedback on the testing process was considered and the new cycle
13 of testing will be monitored closely by CPUC to ensure everyone's experience
14 was better than before.

16 **V. Equipment Survey Expectations**

17 Genelle Sanders presented and the presentation is on pages 65 to 70.

18 Kevin Siemens expressed frustrations with completing the survey twice
19 (each time taking them 3 hours) due to the first submission not being received.
20 Genelle reassured that Smart Survey does not have a "time-out" feature and it
21 will save your answers even when you're not finished. They hope that the
22 transition to the new survey platform will truly support different testing and
23 survey needs.

24 CSUN Assistive Technology Conference: Mark Bella explained that the testing
25 and training team has been discussing ways to increase the visibility of the
26 California Connect program at the CSUN Assistive Technology Conference.
27 The team is considering presenting information about their equipment and
28 outlining the program's goals. Another idea is to bring various pieces of
29 equipment to the event, allowing attendees to interact with them and provide
30 feedback. Bella emphasized the importance of raising awareness about
31 California Connect, particularly among California residents. He mentioned that
32 the team plans to submit a presentation proposal by September and is
33 seeking additional suggestions. EPAC members have already expressed
34 support for these ideas. Bella believes that showcasing equipment at the
35 conference could attract more participants and referrals for the program, and
36 he welcomes further input on their plans.

37 Louis Herrera expressed support for the idea of presenting at the CSUN
38 conference and bringing sample equipment for attendees to examine. He
39 stressed the importance of making it clear that the equipment is only available
40 to those who qualify for the program. Herrera also recommended that any
41 printed materials distributed at the conference should be accessible to
42 individuals with low vision, following guidelines for font and color contrast. He

1 noted that accessible literature would ensure that seniors and others with low
2 vision are able to connect with the program and understand the available
3 resources. Herrera emphasized that California Connect should demonstrate
4 care by providing opportunities for individuals to discover potentially life-
5 changing solutions.

6 Katie Wright shared enthusiasm for both the presentation and the
7 display of equipment at the conference. They recalled the effectiveness of
8 distributing application cards in the past, which attendees could fill out, have
9 signed by a medical professional, and mail in. While recognizing the program's
10 preference for online applications, they raised concerns about how applicants
11 would obtain the necessary medical approval online. Katie suggested
12 providing paper application cards at the conference to help streamline the
13 process for potential applicants, especially if on-site medical approval is not
14 feasible.

15 Brent Jolley explained that the issued decision allows the program and
16 the CPUC to consider alternative types of documentation for verifying an
17 applicant's disability. He noted that efforts are underway to identify which
18 forms of documentation could be adopted, referencing previous discussions
19 about leveraging existing entities that already provide such documentation.
20 Jolley assured that the CPUC staff are working diligently to implement these
21 changes before the next CSUN conference, with a goal to have the system in
22 place within six months. Jolley further shared that, in the near future, the
23 application process would no longer require only a medical professional's
24 signature for verification. He acknowledged that this requirement has been a
25 major challenge for both the program and its applicants. The team is
26 progressing toward accepting alternative forms of disability verification and
27 expressed excitement for this upcoming change.

28 Katie Wright inquired whether individuals present at a booth, such as
29 herself, Matt, or Kevin, could be certified by a professional who may not
30 personally know them, for example, by demonstrating their hearing aids or
31 signing abilities. Jolley responded that self-certification is not yet possible and
32 visual observation alone cannot be used to verify disability. However, he
33 mentioned the possibility of future partnerships with other organizations. For
34 instance, at the CSUN conference, a state disability pass could potentially be
35 photographed and attached to an application as verification. Wright envisioned
36 an ideal scenario in which individuals could be certified for disability
37 verification on the spot at a booth. Jolley agreed that immediate certification
38 could be possible if reliable documentation from a trustworthy entity is
39 available. He suggested that a photograph or scan of certain IDs or
40 documents, such as SSI or SSDI eligibility, might be sufficient. These are
41 among the options being considered as potential forms of disability
42 verification.

1 Wright also commented that CSUN offers limited resources for
2 individuals who are Deaf or hard of hearing compared to those available for
3 people who are blind or have physical handicaps (Kevin Siemens corrected
4 Katie to say disability, not handicap).

5 6 **VI. Program Vendor Reports**

7 **A. Marketing Report**

8 Molly Miller, Marketing Director, presented, and the presentation is on
9 pages 71 to 80.

10 Louis Herrera inquired whether the website banner could be stopped to
11 allow Screen Reader users sufficient time to read it. He expressed concern
12 that the banner might disappear too quickly, making it difficult for users to
13 access its content.

14 Molly Miller responded that it had been a long time since the issue was
15 last tested, recalling that Louis previously assisted in the process. She stated
16 that, during her current review, the banner remained static unless she
17 interacted with it using her mouse or keyboard. Louis acknowledged his prior
18 involvement with the banner but wanted to confirm whether any changes had
19 been made since then. He emphasized that, for WCAG compliance, the
20 banner must permit Screen Reader users to pause, review, and release the
21 information. Molly assured Louis that she would verify the banner's behavior
22 again. She noted that the banner does eventually rotate if left alone and
23 promised to have the accessibility specialist review its compliance.

24 25 **B. Testing and Training Report**

26 Ally Park, Training Manager, presented and the presentation is on page
27 81 to 88.

28 29 **C. Field Operations Report**

30 Melody, Interim Field Operations Director, presented and the
31 presentation is on page 89 to 99.

32 33 **D. Outreach Report**

34 Aida Cerda, Outreach Director, presented, and the report is on page 100
35 to 109.

36 Scott Hostetler commended Aida for her thorough presentation of the
37 various data points, emphasizing that these details were essential for the
38 Committee. Scott observed that, although Aida had listed several
39 organizational partnerships, there were no deaf service agencies included. He
40 pointed out that there are eight sister agencies across California and
41 questioned why they were absent from the partnership list.

1 Aida Cerda responded by clarifying that the list she presented was not
2 comprehensive, explaining that there are currently over five hundred accounts
3 in the system. She assured the Committee that partnerships with deaf and
4 hard of hearing agencies do exist and can be found in the full list she
5 previously shared with Matthew.. Aida invited Committee members to
6 introduce additional organizations they believe should be included,
7 emphasizing her openness to expanding partnerships in this priority area.

8 Matthew clarified that he had not yet distributed the comprehensive list
9 of accounts but would do so after the meeting. He stated that everyone,
10 including Scott, should expect an email from him that afternoon containing the
11 list. Matthew encouraged recipients to review the list and provide feedback
12 about any missing organizations.

13 14 **E. CRS-5 Report**

15 Abby Magtoto, Relay Account Manager, presented, and the presentation
16 is on pages 110 to 123.

17 Katie Wright asked for clarification on what VCO and HCO means. Abby
18 shared that VCO means Voice Carryover and HCO means Hearing Carryover.
19 She will provide a brief overview of each service at the next meeting.

20 21 **F. Equipment Processing Center (EPC) Report**

22 Dan Mabashov, Project Manager, presented and the presentation is on
23 page 124 to 135.

24 Katie Wright requested information about devices distributed by
25 certification. She specifically wanted to know whether the numbers, both for
26 new and existing devices, were increasing each month or remaining static.
27 Wright also asked for a historical perspective on the distribution figures by
28 certification.

29 30 **VII. Public Input – PM Session**

31 There was no public input at this time.

32 33 **VIII. New Business**

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

35 No discussion.

36 37 **B. Future Meetings and Agendas**

38 Scott Hostetler informed the group that April 23, 2027, coincides with
39 Passover. At Kenneth Rothschild's request, he proposed moving the meeting
40 to April 16 instead. Katie Wright inquired about previous conflicts with
41 Passover, asking whether the committee had ever encountered this issue
42 before.

1 Matthew Reinig replied that he did not know if there had been such a
2 conflict in the past. Kevin Siemens commented that there had been no such
3 conflict in the past and added that he had served on the Committee for over
4 twenty years. He reiterated that during his twenty years on the Committee, a
5 Passover conflict had never previously occurred.

6 Katie Wright acknowledged that this was the first time such a conflict
7 had occurred. She outlined the potential scheduling impact, noting that if the
8 meeting were moved to April 15, there would be just a week between the
9 EPAC and TADDAC meetings, but expressed confidence in the committee's
10 ability to handle the change.

11 Matthew Reinig pointed out that the dates and venue had already been
12 arranged, making changes more complicated. He suggested that having a
13 proxy, as Ken had in Scott, was an effective solution for members facing
14 scheduling conflicts. However, he emphasized that the final decision rested
15 with the Committee.

16 Katie Wright initiated the discussion by proposing a schedule adjustment:
17 moving the March joint meeting to April 15th, and making March and May
18 regular meetings. She emphasized that there was still time to decide and
19 sought feedback from the group, particularly from Eve and Jesse, about
20 shifting the 2027 April meeting from the 23rd to the 15th to avoid Passover.
21 She then checked with Louie and Kevin to see if they were comfortable with
22 moving the meeting from April 23rd to April 15th. Kevin Siemens expressed
23 agreement with the proposed change.

24 Brent Jolley recommended keeping the current meeting date as
25 scheduled. He stressed the importance of proxies for members unable to
26 attend and pointed out that changing the date would complicate other
27 arrangements, including the venue, which Matt must book months in advance.
28 Katie Wright agreed, noting that altering the meeting date affects many
29 logistical aspects, such as hotel rooms and flights. Brent concurred,
30 acknowledging that every detail is impacted by a date change. Katie reiterated
31 the complexity, agreed that proxies exist for such situations, and concluded
32 that the group would leave the meeting on its originally scheduled date, April
33 23rd.

34 Katie Wright acknowledged that the group reached a decision after a
35 lengthy discussion. Matthew Reinig then asked whether the current venue
36 would be satisfactory for the 2027 meeting. Katie asked the group if everyone
37 was comfortable with the hotel, especially considering travel distances for
38 members like Eve. The group indicated agreement, with Kevin Siemens
39 confirming his approval of the location. Katie Wright concluded by confirming
40 the group's decision to proceed with the current date and venue.

41 42 **C. Report from the Chair**

1 No report.

3 **D. Member Reports**

4 Louie Herrera reminded the group about the importance of keeping their
5 mobile devices updated, emphasizing the recent increase in hacking
6 incidents. He encouraged those without passwords on their devices to
7 reconsider, noting that even a basic password offers essential protection.
8 Herrera explained that service providers and manufacturers have a vested
9 interest in customer security, so regular updates are crucial for safety and
10 convenience. Additionally, he addressed Screen Reader users—including
11 Jesse, Danyelle, and himself—highlighting recent improvements and updates
12 for both MDA and JAWS, and encouraged everyone to keep their Screen
13 Readers up to date to benefit from these advancements.

14 Kevin Siemens reminded everyone not to forget about their homework,
15 and Katie Wright reiterated this, clarifying that the assignment involved
16 reading the designated book. She also asked Matthew Reinig to send out
17 reminders about the reading, joking about making them daily reminders.
18 Matthew Reinig agreed to send out the requested reminders.

19 Katie Wright welcomed Eve to the meeting in person, expressing
20 happiness at Eve's presence on the committee. Wright acknowledged her own
21 tendency to speak over others and hoped Eve would feel more comfortable
22 over time.

23 Kevin Siemens explained that in his day program, participants would
24 speak one at a time, especially when meetings included both in-person and
25 online attendees using Zoom. Katie Wright acknowledged the challenges of
26 managing hybrid meetings, particularly ensuring that everyone has a chance
27 to speak one at a time. She mentioned difficulties in hearing online
28 participants and questioned whether there was a 'raised hand' feature
29 available, noting that Kevin Siemens could not access this feature but
30 assuring the group that a solution would be found. Kevin Siemens pointed out
31 that there is a hand icon, specifying its location as the second icon from the
32 exit button on the right.

34 **IX. Meeting Wrap up and Adjournment**

35 The meeting was adjourned at 2:42 PM.

36
37 Matthew Reinig prepared the minutes.