

TITLE II · WCAG 2.1 AA · PRELIMINARY SURVEY

Website accessibility, *surveyed and explained.*

Preliminary findings for **A New York Town (pop. ~8,500)** · a New York town (name withheld)

78

ACCESSIBILITY DEFECTS FOUND

5

CRITICAL / SERIOUS ISSUE
TYPES

25_{/25}

PAGES WITH AT LEAST ONE
ISSUE

The Department of Justice has adopted a rule under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act requiring the web content and documents of state and local government entities to meet the WCAG 2.1 AA accessibility standard. For A New York Town (pop. ~8,500), the compliance date is **April 26, 2028**. There is no exemption for small entities.

In preparation for that deadline, an automated evaluation of **25 pages** of a New York town (name withheld) was performed on July 20, 2026, using the same class of tools used in formal accessibility audits. This document summarizes what was found. It is a preliminary survey, not a certification; a full assessment includes manual review that automated tools cannot perform.

Severity follows the standard axe-core impact scale. "Defects" counts individual failing elements against WCAG 2.1 A/AA criteria. An accessible HTML version of this document is available on request: hello@civibinder.org.

TITLE II COMPLIANCE
DATES

OVER 50,000 POPULATION –
APRIL 26, 2027

ALL OTHERS –
APRIL 26, 2028

Principal findings

The issues below are ordered by severity and prevalence. Each affects how a resident with a disability — using a screen reader, keyboard navigation, or magnification — experiences official town information and services.

SEVERITY	FINDING	INSTANCES	PAGES
SERIOUS	Text with insufficient color contrast Text is too faint against its background for many readers, including older residents and those with low vision.	53	25
CRITICAL	Menus and controls with broken accessibility structure Navigation menus and interactive controls are announced incorrectly, or not at all, by screen readers.	10	2
SERIOUS	Links with no readable text A screen reader announces "link" with no destination — the resident cannot tell where it goes.	11	4
SERIOUS	Improperly structured lists Screen readers mis-announce how many items a list has, or read it as disconnected text.	2	2
SERIOUS	Scrolling content unreachable by keyboard A resident who cannot use a mouse has no way to scroll this content.	2	1

Examples from your site

Three concrete instances, quoted directly from the site's own pages:

Text with insufficient color contrast — on <https://a-new-york-town.gov>

```
<a href="https://a-new-york-town.gov/town-directory/" class="purple">Town Directory</a>
```

Menus and controls with broken accessibility structure — on <https://a-new-york-town.gov>

```
<a href="#" aria-label="Show slide 1 of 5" role="tab" class="flex-active">1</a>
```

Links with no readable text — on <https://a-new-york-town.gov>

```
<a href="https://a-new-york-town.gov/brush-and-debris-pickup-will-start-on-monday-july-20-2026/" class="_self pt-cv-href-thumbnail pt-cv-thumb-default cvplbd cvp-la
```

Documents (PDF)

22 PDF documents were discovered on the site. Of the 22 examined, **9 lack the internal tagging** required for a screen reader to read them in order — for those documents, an affected resident may receive no usable content at all.

Under the rule, documents made available to the public are covered content. Meeting agendas, minutes, forms, and notices posted as untagged PDFs are among the most common — and most cited — accessibility failures for municipal sites.

What compliance requires

By April 26, 2028, A New York Town (pop. ~8,500) is expected to have:

- ✓ Web content and mobile apps conforming to **WCAG 2.1 AA**
- ✓ Covered **documents** (PDFs, forms) accessible or provided in an accessible alternative
- ✓ A written **accessibility policy** and a public **accessibility statement** with a way for residents to report barriers
- ✓ A documented, dated **remediation plan** showing good-faith progress

Enforcement is by the Department of Justice and by private action. Civil penalties for ADA violations can reach \$75,000 for a first violation. As of the rule's adoption, lawsuits against public entities over inaccessible websites continue during the compliance window.

The practical path

Most small entities do not need a \$5,000 consultancy engagement. They need a documented record: a complete inventory of what is wrong, the policy and statement the rule expects, and a dated plan their web vendor can execute. That is what a CivicBinder Readiness Binder contains.

About this document

This preliminary survey was prepared by CivicBinder, a New York practice preparing small public entities for the Title II web accessibility rule. It covers the 25 pages listed in the appendix of the full report, as scanned on July 20, 2026. It is provided at no cost and carries no obligation.

The Readiness Binder

FLAT FEE · \$1,450

The full engagement produces:

-
- | | |
|----|---|
| 01 | Full accessibility evaluation
A complete WCAG 2.1 AA evaluation of the site — automated plus manual review — with every finding ranked. |
| 02 | Complete PDF inventory
Every document, its accessibility status, ranked by prominence. |
| 03 | Accessibility Policy
Ready for board adoption. |
| 04 | Public Accessibility Statement
With a resident feedback mechanism. |
| 05 | Dated remediation plan
Specific enough to hand directly to your web vendor. |
-

The fee is flat, payable by purchasing card or invoice (W-9 supplied), and sits below common small-purchase thresholds — no bid process required.

Isaiah Kim

CivicBinder · hello@civicbinder.org