To the extent that the Court considers Target Corporation's Objections to, and Motion to Strike, Evidence, Plaintiffs offer the following general comments:

## 1. Dr. James W. Thatcher

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

It is undisputed that Plaintiffs' expert, Dr. James W. Thatcher, has extensive experience testing and evaluating websites to determine the extent to which they are accessible to blind users. See Thatcher Dep. at 32:15-35:8; 47:3-49:6; 83:4-85:19 and Thatcher Decl. at ¶4. His experience also includes developing accessibility guidelines and actually working with blind internet users to develop assistive technology. See Thatcher Dep. at 22:8-24:24; 27:5-28:22 and Thatcher Decl. at ¶7-10. Moreover, unlike Target's expert, Dr. Thatcher spent extensive time and effort specifically evaluating the extent to which target.com is accessible to blind users. See Thatcher Dep at 101:9-104:25; 106:13-109:11; 117:23-119:25; 126:1-128:16; 129:2-134:19; 136:12-26; Thatcher Decl. at ¶¶20-61 and Thatcher Decl. Ex. A. Thus, there is more than sufficient foundation for his opinions and conclusions in this matter. Additionally, as is evident from the issues and testimony discussed in the briefs, Dr. Thatcher's opinions are specific and directly relevant to this matter.

Target continues to mischaracterize Dr. Thatcher's testimony by incorrectly claiming that he made no analysis of the actual usability of the website. Target's contention is directly contrary to what Dr. Thatcher states in his report, declarations and deposition. See Pl's. Reply Br. at 3-4. In fact, Dr. Thatcher specifically evaluated which types of non-compliance issues pose difficulty for blind users and which do not. See Thatcher Decl. Ex. A ¶ 6.1. As an extra level of usability testing, Dr. Thatcher even tested Target.com with JAWS to simulate what the experience of a blind user would be. See Thatcher Dep. at 62:11-64:2; 66:3-68:5.

Target simply refuses to acknowledge the content of Dr. Thatcher's assessment report. Instead, Defendant attempts to take one quote from his deposition out of context, while refusing to acknowledge Dr. Thatcher's remaining deposition testimony, which specifically discusses the impact of various types of barriers on the usability of target.com. Finally, Target's contention that the assessment does not apply to the website in its current state is belied by Dr. Thatcher's

testimony explaining that he checked target.com the day before his deposition and found that it was still inaccessible. See Thatcher Dep. at 62:11-64:2; 64:25-65:11; 66:3-68:5; 95:3-97:21.

## 2. Dr. Charles Letourneau

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Defendant's objections to the foundation for the opinion testimony of its own expert witness, Dr. Charles Letourneau, only serve to underscore the fact that Target has failed to rebut Plaintiffs' showing that target.com is generally inaccessible to the blind. Given Dr. Letourneau's experience as the co-chair of the World Wide Web's Web Accessibility Initiative (the committee that developed the WCAG 1.0 Standards) he is certainly qualified to render the opinions he testified to in his deposition. Those opinions concerned which features are required for compliance with web accessibility standards and which are required for websites to be readily usable by the blind. These opinions are relevant in that, among other things, they confirm most of the opinions rendered by Dr. Thatcher concerning the features needed for a website to be accessible to and usable by the blind.

## Defendant's Declarants

With respect to Defendant's objections to the testimony of their own declarants, the attempts by these individuals to use target.com provide the foundation for their admission that the site lacks alternative text and other access features. In fact, there is no real dispute that target.com generally lacks alt tags and other basic access features. Whether this absence of access features results in the denial of "full and equal" access is one of the issues in this case.

Should the Court have any further questions or concerns regarding the admissibility of evidence, Plaintiffs' counsel will be prepared to address them during the hearing on July 24, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

DISABILITY RIGHTS ADVOCATES

LAURENCE W. PARADIS MAZEN M. BASRAWI

SCHNEIDER & WALLACE TODD M. SCHNEIDER JOSHUA KONECKY

Laurence W. Paradis Attorneys for Plaintiffs

DISABILITY RIGHTS ADVOCATES
2001 CENTER STREET, THIRD FLOOR
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94704-1204
510.665.8644

BROWN, GOLDSTEIN & LEVY, LLP DANIEL F. GOLDSTEIN (pro hac vice) DATED: July 20, 2006