

**BEFORE THE
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

In the Matter of:

CLAIMANT

and

GOLDEN GATE REGIONAL CENTER, Service Agency.

DDS No. CS0038207

OAH No. 2026070348

DECISION

Administrative Law Judge Juliet E. Cox, State of California, Office of Administrative Hearings, served as the hearing officer in this matter on August 10, 2026, by videoconference and telephone.

Claimant's conservator appeared for claimant. Claimant was not present.

Appeals and Complaints Specialist Wendy Nauman appeared for service agency Golden Gate Regional Center.

The record was held open for written closing argument, which was timely received. The record closed and the matter was submitted for decision on August 11, 2026.

ISSUE

Has service agency Golden Gate Regional Center (GGRC) provided adequate assistance to claimant in arranging vendors to provide the services authorized for her in her Individual Program Plan (IPP)?

FACTUAL FINDINGS

1. Claimant is a conserved adult who is a GGRC consumer.
2. Claimant's GGRC-funded services include support for independent living services (ILS). Claimant's conservator is claimant's ILS vendor.
3. Claimant's conservator would like GGRC to approve other vendors to provide services for claimant, including ILS, in case claimant's conservator becomes unavailable either to provide these services personally or to oversee employees that claimant's conservator may hire to provide these services to claimant.
4. Claimant's conservator requested this fair hearing because she contends that claimant has not received "the guidance or support" that she needs from GGRC for claimant's father to "complete the vendorization process."
5. Claimant's conservator has asked several GGRC staff members over the last few years for assistance in gaining approval for substitute vendors. Each of these staff members has explained to claimant's conservator that GGRC's community services unit assists service providers in becoming vendors who can serve GGRC consumers. These staff members have referred claimant's conservator to staff members in the community services unit for further information.

6. In late 2020, claimant's adult sister submitted an incomplete application to become an ILS vendor for claimant. GGRC Community Resource Developer Sarki Gyalzen exchanged further correspondence with claimant's conservator about this application, but claimant's sister did not participate personally in these exchanges. Claimant's sister never completed this application.

7. Claimant's case manager, Julie Gin, provided a copy of GGRC's vendor application form to claimant's conservator on November 14, 2025. Gyalzen provided this same form to claimant's conservator again on March 2, 2026, and referred claimant's conservator to GGRC community services unit manager Dania Chawkins for additional information and assistance regarding vendor approval.

8. The Department of Developmental Services offers information for prospective regional center service vendors through its website.¹ The evidence does not establish whether claimant, claimant's conservator, or claimant's father ever have consulted this information.

9. Claimant's conservator, although not claimant's father, has asked Gin and Gyalzen for "assistance" in completing a vendor application for claimant's father. The only specific form of assistance that claimant's conservator has requested, however, is "legal services by an attorney to obtain vendorizations." GGRC has never received a complete vendor application from claimant's father.

¹ <https://www.dds.ca.gov/rc/vendor-provider/vendorization-process/>

10. The evidence does not establish that claimant's father's failure to complete the vendor approval process has deprived claimant of any GGRC-funded service to which her IPP entitles her.

LEGAL CONCLUSIONS

1. The Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Services Act (Lanterman Act, Welf. & Inst. Code, § 4500 et seq.) entitles claimant to an administrative fair hearing to review GGRC's service decisions. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 4710 et seq.) Claimant bears the burden in this matter to prove that the Lanterman Act requires GGRC to provide the services and assistance she requests.

2. The matters summarized above in Findings 2 and 10 do not establish any denial or alteration by GGRC of any service to which claimant's IPP entitles claimant.

3. The matters summarized above in Findings 3 through 9 do not establish any failure by GGRC to assist claimant in procuring the services to which her IPP entitles her. In particular, if either claimant or any service provider that claimant may wish to use needs legal advice regarding how to satisfy regulatory requirements for regional center vendors (see Cal. Code Regs., tit. 17, § 54300 et seq.), providing such advice is not GGRC's responsibility.

ORDER

Claimant's appeal is denied.

DATE:

JULIET E. COX

Administrative Law Judge

Office of Administrative Hearings

NOTICE

This is the final administrative decision. Each party is bound by this decision. Either party may request reconsideration pursuant to subdivision (b) of Welfare and Institutions Code section 4713 within 15 days of receiving the decision, or appeal the decision to a court of competent jurisdiction within 180 days of receiving the final decision.

**BEFORE THE
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

In the Matter of:

S. Z., Claimant

and

GOLDEN GATE REGIONAL CENTER, Service Agency.

DDS No. CS0038207

OAH No. 2026070348

ORDER DENYING CLAIMANT'S REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

A Decision in this matter was issued on August 18, 2026, by Juliet E. Cox, Administrative Law Judge (ALJ), with the State of California, Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH), who served as an independent hearing officer. Wendy Nauman, Appeals and Complaints Specialist, represented Golden Gate Regional Center (GGRC or Regional Center). Claimant was represented by a conservator.

Within 15 days of the date of the final hearing decision, a party may request reconsideration to correct a mistake of fact or law or a clerical error in the decision, or to address the decision of the original hearing officer not to recuse themselves following a request pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 4712, subdivision (g). (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 4713, subdivision (b).) The party seeking

reconsideration must state the specific grounds on which the application is made; give notice of the application to the other party to the proceeding and the Department of Developmental Services (DDS); and the other party may file a written statement supporting or opposing the application. (*Id.*) Within 15 days of receiving the request, a hearing office responsible for issuing the decision may deny the application for reconsideration, grant the application for reconsideration and modify the decision, or grant the application for reconsideration and set the matter for further proceedings. (*Id.* at subd. (d).)

On August 20, 2026, OAH received claimant's timely request for reconsideration of the Decision under Welfare and Institutions Code section 4713, seeking to correct a mistake of fact or law or the failure of the hearing officer to recuse herself. It appears that claimant's representative served GGRC and DDS with the document as required. The undersigned Presiding Administrative Law Judge (PALJ) Regina Brown did not hear the matter or write the Decision for which reconsideration is requested.

Claimant's Claims

Claimant states the grounds on which the application for reconsideration is made as follows:

1. whether the final Decision was based on a complete administrative record;
2. whether documents submitted by complainant's representative were received and made available to the hearing officer; and,
3. whether the final Decision accurately addressed the remaining issues for hearing after the order denying in part and granting in part GGRC's motion to dismiss.

Additionally, since 2015, claimant has had over 15 prior fair hearing-related matters filed with OAH. ALJ Cox, PALJ Brown and other ALJs with OAH have served as hearing officers in fair hearings with claimant's representative. Claimant contends that due to the prior proceedings, PALJ Brown and ALJ Cox should have voluntarily disqualified themselves under "impartiality or recusal provisions" pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 4712, subdivision (g), and reconsideration is warranted under section 4713, subdivision (b).

GGRC's Opposition

GGRC opposes claimant's request for reconsideration contending that the request after the fact for PALJ Brown and ALJ Cox to recuse themselves lacks legal merit and there is no mistake of fact or law that occurred regarding "missing evidence." GGRC argues that claimant's representative was given an explicit opportunity to enter evidence at the hearing, she refused ALJ Cox's direct assistance to allow claimant's representative to provide evidence at the hearing, and she chose to rely solely on GGRC's evidence packet.

ANALYSIS

The issue at the fair hearing was whether GGRC provided adequate assistance to claimant in arranging vendors to provide the services authorized in her Individual Program Plan (IPP). The issue was clarified at the beginning of the fair hearing with input from claimant's representative and GGRC.

In the Decision, the hearing officer found that claimant's representative asked GGRC employees for assistance in completing a vendor application for claimant's father and for GGRC to provide the legal services of an attorney to obtain

vendorizations for claimant's father and sister. The evidence established that GGRC has never received a complete vendor application from claimant's father and providing legal advice to claimant's representative is not GGRC's responsibility. The hearing officer denied the appeal concluding that the evidence did not establish that claimant was deprived of any GGRC-funded service to which her IPP entitles her.

The hearing officer considered the testimony of three witnesses proffered by GGRC, nine exhibits offered by GGRC and admitted into evidence, and a closing written statement offered by claimant.

It is determined that claimant has not identified a mistake of fact or law that requires correction. Claimant's representative knowingly and voluntarily elected not to offer any documentary evidence at the hearing, and claimant's representative did not offer any testimony at the hearing. The Decision was based on a complete administrative record, the hearing officer reviewed claimant's representative's closing written statement, and the issue defined in the Decision was determined by the parties at the beginning of the hearing.

It is determined that it is not necessary to address any issue of recusal. Claimant did not request the disqualification of ALJ Cox prior to the taking of evidence at hearing, as required under Welfare and Institutions Code section 4712, subdivision (g). Additionally, PALJ Brown was not the hearing officer at hearing; therefore, Welfare and Institutions Code section 4712, subdivision (g), does not apply.

For the reasons stated above, the application for reconsideration must be denied.

ORDER

The application for reconsideration is DENIED. The final decision remains effective as of August 20, 2026.

DATE: September 2, 2026

REGINA BROWN

Presiding Administrative Law Judge

Office of Administrative Hearings