



DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS  
**COURT REPORTERS BOARD**  
OF CALIFORNIA

2535 Capitol Oaks Drive, Suite 230, Sacramento, CA 95833  
Phone (916) 263-3660 / Toll Free: 1-877-327-5272  
Fax (916) 263-3664 / www.courtreportersboard.ca.gov



**COURT REPORTERS BOARD OF CALIFORNIA**  
**MINUTES OF OPEN SESSION**  
**JANUARY 26, 2022**

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Robin Sunkees, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. The public meeting was held via a teleconference platform and a physical meeting location was not provided.

ROLL CALL

Board Members Present: Robin Sunkees, Licensee Member, Chair  
Davina Hurt, Public Member, Vice Chair  
Laura Brewer, Licensee Member  
Denise Tugade, Public Member

Staff Members Present: Yvonne K. Fenner, Executive Officer  
Rebecca Bon, Board Counsel  
Grace Arupo Rodriguez, Legal Affairs Assistant Deputy Director  
Paula Bruning, Executive Analyst

Board staff established the presence of a quorum.

Ms. Sunkees welcomed new Board member Laura Brewer to her first meeting.

1. PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

No comments were offered.

2. REVIEW AND APPROVAL AUGUST 20, 2021 MEETING MINUTES

*Ms. Hurt moved to approve the minutes. Ms. Tugade seconded the motion. Ms. Sunkees called for public comment.*

Ana Fatima Costa clarified her request in the last sentence of the second paragraph on page four of the minutes. She stated that she intended to request an audit of the Board's entire testing process from receipt of application through completion, as well as RealtimeCoach (RTC) and ProctorU.

A vote was conducted by roll call.

For: Ms. Hurt, Ms. Tugade, and Ms. Sunkees  
Opposed: None  
Absent: None  
Abstain: Ms. Brewer  
Recusal: None

### 3. RESOLUTION FOR BOARD MEMBER TONI O'NEILL

Ms. Sunkees read aloud the resolution prepared for Ms. O'Neill found on page 22 of the Board agenda packet.

Ms. Sunkees expressed her appreciation for Ms. O'Neill's years of work with the California Court Reporters Association (CCRA) and National Court Reporters Association (NCRA) to grow and support the profession of court reporting. She stated that the Board and consumers have greatly benefited from her contributions.

Ms. Hurt stated that Ms. O'Neill has been a great advocate for CA consumers. She thanked her for her grace, thoughtfulness, and invaluable input formed from years of service as a certified shorthand reporter. She added that Ms. O'Neill would be very much missed.

Ms. Tugade commented that although their service on the Board together was brief, it was clear how knowledgeable Ms. O'Neill is. She stated that she would leave a lasting imprint on the Board as a leader.

Ms. Brewer shared that Ms. O'Neill has been a star in representing reporters and disseminating information for many years. She expressed her gratefulness for her years of service to the public.

Ms. Fenner shared that she and Ms. O'Neill served as members of the Board together until Ms. Fenner transitioned to executive officer. She stated that Ms. O'Neill has been such an involved board member and has always been available to staff. She thanked her for freely sharing her expertise to enable the Board and staff to do their very best. She expressed that it had been an honor to have served with Ms. O'Neill in protecting the consumers of California and wished her success in the next portion of her life's adventure.

Carolyn Dasher thanked Ms. O'Neill for her service and wished her well in her retirement.

*Ms. Brewer moved to adopt the resolution. Ms. Hurt seconded the motion.* Ms. Sunkees called for public comment. No comments were offered. A vote was conducted by roll call.

For: Ms. Brewer, Ms. Hurt, Ms. Tugade, and Ms. Sunkees  
Opposed: None  
Absent: None  
Abstain: None  
Recusal: None

#### 4. DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS UPDATE

Carrie Holmes, Deputy Director, Department of Consumer Affairs (Department/DCA), provided a Department update

Ms. Holmes welcomed new Board member, Ms. Brewer, and thanked her for her willingness to serve. She also thanked Ms. O'Neill for her dedication to the Board and California consumers.

##### COVID-19

Ms. Holmes thanked staff for continuing to work during the pandemic. She stated that California had implemented enhanced safety measures to combat the spread of COVID-19 including proof of vaccination or weekly testing and mandatory mask requirements for indoor settings.

##### Board Meetings

She shared that on January 5, 2022, Governor Newsom signed an executive order that extends through March 31, 2022, the permission for Board to hold public meetings via WebEx without listing member locations. She added that Sacramento County also issued local order directing public board, committees, and similar public bodies to suspend in-person meetings that might otherwise be held in the county and hold them remotely. After March 31, 2022, it is expected that meetings will resume in person in accordance with all aspects of the Open Meetings Act. Before attending in-person meetings, Board members must verify full vaccination status with the DCA Human Resources Unit or participate in COVID-19 testing. Verification was requested to be completed by January 31, 2022, to allow enough time for testing for those that need it. She expressed her appreciation for continual flexibility of Board and staff as it is unknown what additional changes to the law will be coming.

##### Board Member Requirements

Ms. Holmes reminded the Board about the requirement to file their Form 700 before April 1 to avoid penalties from the Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC). DCA requests members file by March 18. If assistance is needed, members may reach out to the DCA filing officer or legal counsel.

##### Training

Ms. Holmes stated that newly appointed and reappointed Board members must complete the Board Member Orientation Training (BMOT) within one year of appointment. Registration is completed through the Learning Management System (LMS). The live virtual trainings will be held March 9, June 15, and October 12.

#### 5. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER

##### 5.1 CRB Budget Report

Ms. Fenner provided a review of the Board's budget and referred the Board to page 25 of the Board agenda packet for the final numbers for fiscal year 2020/21. She highlighted the end of year surplus of 19 percent, which was reverted back to the Board's main fund.

Ms. Hurt commented that the Board and staff had been very disciplined in spending. She added that moving the exam to the online platform made a huge difference. She asked if more employees were needed to support existing staff. Ms. Fenner responded that the Board had been operating without the half-time receptionist for many of the months since July 2019. Additionally, the half-time analyst who worked on the pro per portion of the Transcript Reimbursement Fund (TRF) vacated the position in December 2020. She thanked staff for picking up the additional duties. She shared that a new receptionist would be onboarded in the near future. Additional staffing needs would then be reevaluated. Ms. Hurt inquired about the status of cross-training staff. Ms. Fenner responded that existing staff are currently cross-trained.

Ms. Fenner referred to the Board's expenditure projections on page 26 of the Board agenda packet, which reflected statistics through fiscal month five. She emphasized the projection of over 14 percent surplus but noted that the filling of the receptionist position was not reflected in the report. She then provided a summary of the overall fund condition on page 27 of the Board agenda packet.

## 5.2 Transcript Reimbursement Fund

Ms. Bruning provided statistics for the end of fiscal year 2020/21, reporting that the TRF paid out more than \$96,000 for pro bono applications and approved more than \$18,000 for pro per applicants. Thus far for fiscal year 2021/22, more than \$46,000 had been authorized for payment for pro bono applicants, and \$26,000 had been approved for pro per applicants.

Ms. Bruning shared that the Legislature allocated an additional one-time \$500,000 for the TRF from the General Fund.

Ms. Hurt thanked the legislators and Governor's Office for the additional allocation for the consumers and pro bono entities.

## 5.3 Enforcement Activities

Ms. Fenner referred to the enforcement statistics starting on page 29 of the Board agenda packet. She indicated that the most common complaints received continue to be for timeliness of production and accuracy of the transcript. There are no new trends as to type of complaint.

## 5.4 Exam Update

Ms. Fenner indicated that the exam statistics began on page 31 of the Board agenda packet. She stated that the last onsite skills exam was given in March 2020 and the pass rates seem to have stabilized since moving to the remote platform. All tests go through the same development process and are carefully counted by word and syllable, so she was unable to offer a reason for prior fluctuations or the current stabilization of pass rates on the skills exam. She added that there were no alarming trends with respect to the two written portions of the license exam – English and Professional Practice.

Ms. Hurt noted that the overall number applications for the skills exam has continued to diminish causing her great concern over lack of new licensees. She urged the Board and industry to discuss options for recruiting new candidates.

Ms. Fenner commented that the Board has done a good job at exploring options for new licensees such as licensing voice writers and reciprocity agreements. She welcomed additional ideas from the resourceful Board.

Ms. Brewer echoed the concerns shared by Ms. Hurt. She stated that industry-wide practices have been initiated to try to recruit reporters, but there is a huge cohort of reporters nearing age of retirement. There is a need to figure out ways to meet the demand and serve consumers without dropping the quality of the product produced.

Michelle Carter, CSR, stated that more exam applicants are needed. She expressed that licensure of voice writers would be preferred over digital recorders.

Ms. Costa requested the exam accommodation process be made easier for candidates and not require candidates to submit a new request with each new application. She questioned whether the Board shares information regarding accommodations with RTC or ProctorU. Ms. Fenner stated that candidates' circumstances sometimes change, requiring a new request for each examination. She added that the reason for accommodation is not shared with RTC or ProctorU.

Ms. Dasher suggested the Board allow for online qualifiers and out-of-state schools to be recognized. Ms. Fenner stated that the recognized schools may offer online qualifiers.

## 5.5 Business Modernization

Ms. Fenner shared that the Board's databases currently operate on a legacy system with DCA. Although the staff previously participated in the groundwork for the next phase of business modernization, the decision was made to allocate funding to reopen the TRF instead of funding business modernization. With cost savings realized from the past two years plus the \$500,000 transfer from the General Fund to the TRF, the Board is now in a position to be able to restart the business modernization process.

Ms. Fenner stated that the Board is in discussions with the DCA Office of Information Services to explore options for online services in addition to the online renewal payment system. OIS is working to provide high-level options based on recent market research. It is hoped that the short-term workload will lead to long-term efficiencies.

Ms. Tugade commended staff for investing the time and effort in working toward workload efficiencies.

Ms. Hurt inquired if the DCA pro rata payments covered any of the business modernization costs. Ms. Fenner stated that there are some costs absorbed by DCA in providing OIS staff and support, however, each program bears the cost of its individual system. The benefit of having waited is that other boards have paved the way in finding what works, which will streamline the process for the Board.

## 6. LEGISLATION

Ms. Fenner stated that information regarding the bills the Board tracked during the last legislative session could be found beginning on page 37 of the Board agenda packet. She noted that a number of bills are two-year bills for which more details would be available at the next meeting.

6.1 AB 29 (Cooper) – No discussion.

6.2 AB 107 (Salas) – No discussion.

6.3 AB 163 (Committee on Budget) – Ms. Fenner reported that the bill made changes to reimbursement amounts for the TRF. The changes included an increase in the limit for pro per cases from \$1,500 to \$2,500 and eliminated the \$75,000 cap for pro per cases in each fiscal year.

6.4 AB 177 (Committee on Budget) – Ms. Fenner reported that the bill provided for a transcript rate increase for court transcripts.

6.5 AB 225 (Gray, Gallagher, and Patterson) – No discussion.

6.6 AB 305 (Maienschein) – No discussion.

6.7 AB 646 (Low) – No discussion.

6.8 AB 885 (Quirk) – No discussion.

6.9 AB 1386 (Cunningham) – No discussion

6.10 SB 170 (Skinner) – Ms. Fenner reported that the bill allocated \$30 million by the Judicial Council to increase the number of court reporters in family and civil law cases.

Ms. Hurt inquired who would monitor the system and what would happen if they are not able to find court reporters to fill the positions.

Ms. Sunkees noted that the Judicial Council met on January 21, 2022. It was her understanding that they developed a formula on how to distribute the funding to the individual courts. She did not have information on how the money would be used if there were no court reporters to hire. She shared that the Supreme Court ruling on Jamison vs. Desta required that indigent parties be provided “an official reporter, or other valid means to create an official verbatim record...”, which potentially leaves the door open for electronic recording. She believed the Board was working to increase licensees by exploring voice writers and reciprocity and hoped for a remedy soon.

Ms. Brewer stated that many officials have left the court and now work as freelance pro tem reporters who specialize in covering court. Unfortunately, there are often four or five reporters lined up to cover one courtroom, each for different counsel, instead of one official reporter for that courtroom. She opined that this is not the most efficient way to handle the pool of reporters while there is a shortage. She added that

recruitment of skilled individuals to the profession is crucial. Adding funding is a move in the right direction, but not fruitful without a substantial licensee base.

Ms. Tugade echoed the concerns regarding the long-term sustainability for public access to court reporters. She requested additional information be sought regarding the formula developed by Judicial Council and if there will be any prioritization of those funds in terms of courts with higher needs, backlogs, or serving a population who needs more access.

Ms. Sunkees stated that the courts created a quasi-private system when they laid off officials from civil court. Those court reporters formed firms that are very lucrative and are no longer interested in working as officials.

Ms. Hurt requested the Board also research the Jamison vs. Desta ruling with regard to what “or other valid means” intends and how that affects the allocation.

Ms. Dasher invited the Board to view the Judicial Council’s website to view the report from the January 21, 2022, meeting where decisions were made on how to allocate the funding. She stated that some courts are creating incentives to attract officials. She suggested that the Board and stakeholders work with the Legislature to make modifications to how the money is spent in the future.

Ms. Costa inquired if the Board operated strictly from licensing fees. Ms. Fenner confirmed that it is, with the exception of the additional \$500,000 recently allocated to the TRF. Ms. Hurt added that the Board was formed to protect California consumers and its funding may change in the future based upon the circumstances.

6.11 SB 241 (Umberg) – Ms. Fenner reported that the bill is the Board’s firm registration bill. She stated staff has been working with OIS to update the Board’s legacy database as well as creating an application form for firms. Additionally, proposed regulatory language to set the fee for registration is being brought to the Board under Agenda Item 7. Staff has been working diligently to meet the July 1, 2022, implementation deadline.

Ms. Hurt asked how the Board arrived at the \$500 firm registration fee. Ms. Fenner stated that Board staff worked with fiscal staff to determine how much staff time is required to process applications to determine the costs. She stated that the desk review revealed that the cost to the Board is slightly higher than the statutory cap of \$500.

Ms. Hurt thanked Senator Umberg for carrying the bill. She also thanked DRA and CCRA for working toward the goal of firm registration. Ms. Brewer echoed her sentiments.

Ms. Sunkees highlighted Section 367.75(d)(2)(A) of the bill found on page 53 of the Board agenda packet, wherein it states that if the trial is held by remote technology, “the official reporter or official reporter pro tempore shall be physically present in the courtroom.”

Ms. Dasher congratulated the Board on the passing of the firm registration bill. She added that the remote appearance language, although related to court reporting, was an offshoot and hard road to cross for officials. She shared that Los Angeles County is currently negotiating with courts on how to facilitate remote reporting within the confines within Code of Civil Procedure 367.75, and she is confident other counties would follow suit. She looked forward to working on legislation in future to help improve the environment for court users and reporters.

Cindy Vega, CSR, shared that she often appears as a pro tem for one or two hearings. She stated that it is unfortunate for pro per litigants who cannot afford a pro tem reporter based on the fees that they need to charge to make an appearance. She added that San Diego County is not allowing remote reporting as of January 1, 2022.

6.12 SB 731 (Durazo and Bradford) – No discussion

6.13 SB 772 (Ochoa Bogh) – No discussion

***The Board took a break at 10:40 a.m. and returned to open session at 10:55 a.m.***

## 7. REGULATIONS

7.1 Minimum Transcript Format Standards (MTFS): Public hearing regarding petition to amend regulations. (Gov. Code, § 11340.6.) – Discussion and Possible Action to Initiate a Rulemaking to Amend Title 16, California Code of Regulations section 2473

Ms. Fenner reported that draft language was presented at the August 20, 2021, Board meeting and input was received from the public. She referred to the updated proposed language found on pages 43 and 44 of the Board agenda packet. She highlighted the addition of subsection 12, which will require that transcripts be made available in electronic format if requested.

*Ms. Hurt moved to approve the proposed regulatory text for section 2473; direct staff to submit the text to the Director of the Department of Consumer Affairs and the Business, Consumer Services, and Housing Agency for review; and, if no adverse comments are received, authorize the executive officer to take all steps necessary to initiate the rulemaking process, make any non-substantive changes to the package, and set the matter for a hearing if requested. If no adverse comments are received during the 45-day comment period and no hearing is requested, authorize the executive officer to take all steps necessary to complete the rulemaking and adopt the proposed regulations at section 2473 as noticed. Ms. Brewer seconded the motion. Ms. Sunkees called for public comment. No comments were offered. A vote was conducted by roll call.*

For: Ms. Brewer, Ms. Hurt, Ms. Tugade, and Ms. Sunkees  
Opposed: None  
Absent: None  
Abstain: None  
Recusal: None



7.2 SB 241 Implementation – Firm Registration: Discussion and Possible Action to Initiate a Rulemaking and Possibly Amend Section 2450, Repeal Section 2464, and Adopt Section 2468.1 of Title 116 of the California Code of Regulations, to Implement Firm Registration per Business and Professions Code section 8050.

Ms. Fenner explained that the proposed regulatory package was required to set the fee for the firm registration initial and renewal applications. Additionally, it was found that two sections were no longer needed since Business and Profession Code 8041 was repealed in 1992. Therefore, sections 2463 and 2464 should be repealed. She referred to the proposed language found on pages 45 and 46 of the Board agenda packet.

In response to Ms. Tugade, Ms. Fenner explained that the firm registration law does not set the fee at \$500, but caps it as the maximum fee allowed to be set. The regulatory package is needed to actually set the fee at that amount. She reiterated that Board staff worked with fiscal staff to determine how much staff time is required to process applications to determine the costs.

Kim Kuziora, CSR, requested the Board make it clear how licensed shorthand reporter corporations or licensed shorthand reporter sole proprietor agencies will be able to register with the Board and will be put on the Board's website directory of registered entities that the Board is required to create for SB 241, section 8051(k). She emphasized the importance of this because section 8051(j) specifically states that the certificate holder cannot work for an entity or person unless the entity is registered with the Board.

Ms. Arupo Rodriquez, on behalf of the DCA Legal Affairs, stated that modifications to the language of the BPC enacted by SB 241 were being worked out to include all business types and entities. The amendments to the regulation before the Board specifically focuses solely on the fees.

*Ms. Tugade moved to approve the proposed regulatory text for amendment to section 2450 and repeal of sections 2463 and 2464; direct staff to submit the text to the Director of the Department of Consumer Affairs and the Business, Consumer Services, and Housing Agency for review; and, if no adverse comments are received, authorize the executive officer to take all steps necessary to initiate the rulemaking process, make any non-substantive changes to the package, and set the matter for a hearing if requested. If no adverse comments are received during the 45-day comment period and no hearing is requested, authorize the executive officer to take all steps necessary to complete the rulemaking and adopt the proposed regulations at section 2450 and the proposed repeal of 2463 and 2464 as noticed. Ms. Brewer seconded the motion. Ms. Sunkees called for public comment. No comments were offered. A vote was conducted by roll call.*

For: Ms. Brewer, Ms. Hurt, Ms. Tugade, and Ms. Sunkees

Opposed: None

Absent: None

Abstain: None

Recusal: None

## 8. LICENSURE OF VOICE WRITERS

Ms. Fenner reported that, at the direction of the Board, she met with staff from the Senate Business Professions and Economic Development Committee and the Assembly Business and Professions Committee to advance the licensure of voice writers. She added that she and Ms. Sunkees met with representatives of SEIU to answer questions pertaining to voice writers. Staff is awaiting direction from the Legislature for the next step.

Ms. Brewer inquired as to the timeline for hearing back from the Legislature. Ms. Fenner responded that she usually reaches out every couple of weeks just to see if they have any additional information they can offer or to see if there is anything she can do to help, such as set up stakeholder meetings. Currently, she is just waiting for the Board's turn in the Legislature's busy agenda.

Ms. Hurt requested information related to any questions or concerns she heard from the Legislature or SEIU. Ms. Fenner shared that most commonly people wanted to know why this was coming to the forefront now. She stated her response was that the declining number of students and the potential shortage in the field are driving the Board's interest in making sure there is a robust workforce going forward. She educated them on the difference in training methods and times for voice writers and machine writers. She was also asked about whether the Board anticipated a separate license for voice writers and machine writers. She responded that the other states who license both do not differentiate between the two. She added that the Board did not differentiate between pen writers and machine writers when licensure began in 1951. Ms. Fenner shared that the Legislature contended that individuals should be tested in whichever method they will use to practice.

Athena Ponce, CSR, president of the Sacramento Official Court Reporters Association (SOCRA), asserted that there is not a shortage of court reporters, but that many officials have left the court in pursuit of higher wages in the freelance arena. She added that newer reporters are not interested in committing to a fulltime officialship position. She questioned how licensing voice writers would address the shortage of official reporters. She shared her belief that if more courts offered part time pro tem positions or allow retired annuitant to cover court hearings, the shortage of reporters that some courts are experiencing may be alleviated. She stated that SOCRA recently formed a task force to recruit new hires and form a student outreach committee. The task force is working to collect data from California court reporting schools with regard to enrollment. One school shared that their enrollment is up 100 students wherein they only had 75 students three years ago. SOCRA is formulating a plan to reach out to high school career centers to market the profession. Lastly, she stated that many California students attend court reporting school online from various states and qualify for the California license exam by obtaining the RPR certificate. She noted that there was a 67 percent pass rate for those who qualified via RPR certificate for the November 2021 dictation exam.

Michelle Carter, CSR, opined that there is currently a reporter shortage. She stated that there needs to be 300 new court reporters each year to address the shortage. She agreed that there should only be one license type for both voice writers and machine writers, and anyone who can pass the Board's exam should be eligible for licensure. She shared her opposition to digital recorders.

Ms. Dasher shared that she recently learned that students of Mark Kislingbury graduate in 18 months, which is why she suggested the Board allow out-of-state schools to qualify exam candidates. She recommended the Board form a public relations piece directed to current licensees to combat any misinformation regarding voice writers. She stated that there is not a court reporter shortage today but she realizes the number of licensees is declining and there is a need to backfill those retiring.

Stephanie Whitehead, CSR, indicated that she is an official reporter for San Diego County Superior Court and an instructor for a school who teaches Kislingbury's theory. She shared that from a class of 24 students who started in September 2020, only three are now in high speed. She disputed the idea that there are enough students graduating to address the shortage. She believed a differentiation between voice writers and steno writers would cause a salary hierarchy for different license types.

Ms. Costa stated that many court reporters erroneously believe that voice writers are the same as digital recording personnel. She said that some reporters who were previously machine writers transferred to voice writing. She shared that voice writers start school at approximately 140 words per minute compared to machine writers who start at zero words per minute, making the training process much faster for voice writers. She agreed that more education about voice writers was needed for current licensees.

Linda Lawson, court reporting teacher with 40 years of experience, asserted that most new court reporting students drop out and statistically only 2 out of the 20 new students starting theory in the fall will make it to high speed classes. She shared that she began investigating voice writing 12 years earlier and has seen an incredible increase in computer processing power and speech recognition technology. She has been teaching a voice writing class for a year and has seen a few students pass qualifiers in less than a year. She believed voice writing would help meet the need for court reporters including realtime services.

Ms. Carter noted that the examination statistics reveal that many of those taking the California license exam are out of state. She questioned how an out-of-state licensee base would be helpful to the California shortage. She added that voice writers and machine writers receive equal pay in other states.

Ms. Whitehead stated that she is in favor of voice writers and believes they should receive equal pay for reporting. A common objection to voice writers among machine writers is that voice writers might charge less and take away jobs from machine writers.

Ms. O'Neill shared her perspective of having worked as a pro tem in court alongside pen writers. Some of the pen writers did not believe that machine writers would be as good. Later, machine writers started using computers to prepare their transcripts, which was again questioned as to accuracy. She stated that there was never a designation on the license as to which way the reporter took the record. She offered her support in licensing voice writers.

Ms. Hurt acknowledged that technology would play a part in the future of court reporting, and licensing voice writers is another evolution in getting an accurate and unbiased record.

Ms. Tugade suggested the Board work to avoid potential unintended consequences if choosing two license types, such as causing a stratification in pay. There is a need to retain public access and long-term sustainability of licensees. Ms. Brewer agreed, adding that pay to the licensee is not the primary concern of the Board but is a consideration in how it affects the consumer and meeting their needs by providing enough qualified reporters.

#### 9. SUNSET REVIEW

Ms. Fenner stated that the Board is scheduled to sunset in January 2024 and, therefore, would be entering the sunset review process later in the current year. The statistical and narrative reports will be due in 2022 and a bill to extend the Board's sunset date would be needed in 2023. She indicated that the sunset review process provides an opportunity for the Board to ask the Legislature for statutory changes required to move its strategic plan forward. Noncontroversial changes are typically included within the legislation proposed to extend the sunset date for the Board.

Although the questions have not yet been received from the Legislature to begin the report, staff wanted to ensure there was plenty of time to develop a robust report including what the Board has accomplished since the last sunset review as well as identifying new areas of concern for the Board or the industry. She recommended the Board create a Sunset Review Task Force to work on the draft of the report for review and approval by the full Board before it is presented to the Legislature. She added that stakeholder meetings are typically held to glean input from the industry and public.

Ms. Hurt and Ms. Tugade volunteered to chair the Sunset Review Committee. Ms. Sunkees appointed these two members to co-chair the committee.

#### 10. STRATEGIC PLAN

Ms. Fenner pointed to the update action plan for the Board's strategic goals on page 64 of the Board agenda packet. She invited input on new prioritization of the goals.

Ms. Brewer requested that staff concentrate on the goal of investigating real-time captioning standards and assess industry practices for consumer protection. She shared that it had been a long-term goal of hers to accomplish this accessibility issue.

#### 11. FUTURE MEETING DATES

Ms. Sunkees estimated the next Board meeting would be needed around March or April and again in the fall. She stated staff would poll the Board members on calendar availability as we get nearer the time.


***The Board convened into closed session from 12:03 p.m. to 12:31 p.m.***

12. CLOSED SESSION

Pursuant to Government Code Sections 11126(a)(1), the Board met in closed session to conduct the annual evaluation of its executive officer.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Sunkees adjourned the meeting at 12:31 p.m.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
ROBIN SUNKEES, Board Chair

7/15/2022  
DATE

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
YVONNE K. FENNER, Executive Officer

7/15/2022  
DATE