

**BEFORE THE  
DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENTAL SERVICES  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

**In the Matter of:**

**CLAIMANT**

**and**

**INLAND REGIONAL CENTER, Service Agency**

**DDS No. CS0020197**

**OAH No. 2024081063**

**PROPOSED DECISION**

Alan R. Alvord, Administrative Law Judge, Office of Administrative Hearings, State of California, heard this matter on October 1, 2024, by videoconference.

Wendy R. Dumlao, Law Office of Wendy R. Dumlao, represented claimant. Claimant's mother was also present.

Senait Teweldebrhan, Fair Hearings Representative, represented Inland Regional Center.

Oral and documentary evidence was received. The record was closed, and the matter was submitted for decision on October 1, 2024.

## **ISSUE**

Must Inland Regional Center (IRC) approve additional funds in claimant's self-determination program (SDP) budget to fund an educational advocate to assist claimant's mother in advocating for claimant with the school district?

## **SUMMARY**

The evidence showed that claimant's unique needs and unique family situation support adding funds to claimant's SDP budget for an educational advocate. It is the most cost-effective and efficient way to maximize the chance that claimant will have a positive experience in school that will foster and support meeting his individualized program plan (IPP) goals.

## **FACTUAL FINDINGS**

### **Jurisdictional Matters**

1. Claimant, an 11-year-old male, is eligible for and receives regional center services based on a diagnosis of autism spectrum disorder. He also receives special education services from his school district. Claimant presently receives regional center services through the traditional service delivery model. Claimant is in the process of transitioning from the traditional service model to the SDP.

2. In the spring of 2024, as part of the SDP budget development process, claimant's mother asked IRC to approve additions to the SDP budget to fund tutoring and educational advocacy services for claimant. On June 24, 2024, the service agency

issued a Notice of Action denying the request. On August 26, 2024, the service agency issued another Notice of Action stating that funding for certain items in the SDP budget was approved, but denying budget increases for tutoring, educational advocate, transportation, and homemaker services.

3. On August 21, 2024, claimant, through his attorney, submitted a fair hearing request raising multiple issues and requests that the service agency had denied. The parties attended a mediation and resolved all outstanding issues except the issue presented in this hearing: whether the service agency is required to approve adding funds to claimant's SDP budget for an educational advocate. This hearing followed.

### **Current Individualized Program Plan**

4. Claimant lives in his family home with his two parents and two brothers, ages 3 and 12. In addition to autism spectrum disorder, he is diagnosed with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. He is in sixth grade and receives special education services, including a one-to-one Registered Behavior Technician (RBT) as an aide. He receives Applied Behavioral Analysis therapy through his medical insurance. He has elopement and self-harm issues. He has a history of aggressive and destructive behavior at school. At home, the family is concerned about his aggression towards his siblings, especially his younger brother. His speech is difficult to understand; he often uses utterances instead of words to communicate basic needs.

5. Claimant's most recent IPP is dated February 26, 2024. Claimant's mother would like him to become more independent, improve his communication skills, decrease aggressive behaviors, and improve his personal safety awareness and participate in community outings. He requires constant attention for his safety; his IPP

goal is for his providers to give the needed supervision for him to remain safe. Other IPP goals include receiving an appropriate public education and initiating and maintaining appropriate peer interactions.

6. Claimant was authorized to receive 48 hours per month of respite. IRC increased respite temporarily to 89 hours per month through March 2024 and recently approved an extension of the temporary increase through March 2025. IRC also funded claimant's mother to attend a Special Education Law and Advocacy program at the University of San Diego School of Law in March and April 2024.

### **Claimant's Behavior Incidents at School Beginning in 2022**

7. On March 16, 2022, claimant's mother sent claimant's consumer services coordinator, Maggie Forbush, a copy of a note the mother received from a school staff member. The note described an incident at school in which claimant was accused by another student of talking about guns and saying he would shoot a student's dogs. The note said claimant shouted, denying he said that, and when the staff member asked him to return to his seat, he broke a plastic mechanical pencil, charged at the staff member, and knocked over some desks and chairs. In the message to Ms. Forbush, claimant's mother expressed her concerns because claimant "has never got physical or aggressive at school only at home." Mother asked for a list of free educational advocates. Ms. Forbush responded to the email message on March 21, 2022, with a list of free and low-cost services, and attorneys who represent families before school districts.

8. In the consumer notes at the time, Ms. Forbush noted that claimant's mother reported the school principal told her she will "keep an eye" on claimant and that mother was concerned that claimant will not receive the support he needs to

make progress at school. Ms. Forbush offered to participate with the family in the school district individualized education plan (IEP) meetings. Claimant's mother reported that she was looking to hire an advocate to help her.

9. Claimant's behavior issues continued to escalate in the 2023-2024 school year and the 2024-2025 (current) school year despite having an RBT aide and a behavior plan in place. He destroyed property at school. He hit the principal in April 2023. He hit the assistant principal in January 2024. In February 2024, he wrapped a headphone cord around his neck, began pulling on it, and refused to allow school staff to remove it, resulting in a need to restrain him so staff could cut the cord off. He was suspended from school twice. One of his behavior incidents resulted in evacuation of the school, and the incident was discussed by parents at a public school board meeting in February 2024. After this incident, claimant's mother was concerned about the school's ability to continue supporting him in a way that would foster his education. She removed him from school.

10. Claimant's service coordinator, Ms. Forbush, has attended some IEP meetings with claimant's mother. At one meeting, Ms. Forbush advocated to have the district add autism spectrum disorder as a diagnosis on the IEP document. The school district refused to do so. At other meetings, Ms. Forbush listened but did not advocate.

### **Family's Efforts to Find a Special Education Advocate**

11. In the spring of 2022, when claimant's behavior issues at school escalated, claimant's mother began looking for a special education advocate to help her work with the school district to ensure claimant's educational needs were met. Working from the list Ms. Forbush sent her, she contacted Clients' Rights Advocates in April 2022. It took them two weeks to respond to her message. They requested emails

with the history, which she provided. Then they “stopped replying to me.” She contacted many of the free and low-cost advocates on the list Ms. Forbush had sent her. The free advocates told her they were “swamped” and could not help her. One apparent referral service directed her back to Alan Munoz, who is an IRC employee. When she called Inland Counties Legal Services, she spent four or five hours to get through on the telephone and then they told her she had to be low income to receive their assistance. Disability Rights California told her they are not representing people at IEP meetings. Family Resource Network has classes that mother has attended but, upon speaking with the representatives, they did not know as much as she did about special education.

12. Having exhausted the free and low-cost options, ultimately, the family decided to pay for an advocate. One potential advocate told claimant’s mother that attending an IEP meeting would cost \$900 up front. She paid advocate Araceli Diaz more than \$4,000 and did not receive a resolution of the issues. The family hired attorney Jennifer Chang who helped them through a due process filing against the district that resulted in a settlement. The family had to pay out of pocket for attorney Chang to attend IEP meetings because the school district does not pay for IEP meetings in a special education case even if the district pays for the student’s attorney’s fees in a final resolution.

## **IEP Meetings and Reports**

13. Attorney Jennifer Chang attended the IEP meeting on January 23, 2024. The IEP report noted that claimant was functioning at grade level in writing and math. The IEP report stated, “Since the end of September, [claimant] has only had four incidents where his frustration escalated to a severe level during the school day.” He demonstrated difficulty initiating interactions with peers.

14. The IEP was not completed at the first meeting. Another IEP meeting was held February 9, 2024, also attended by attorney Chang with claimant's mother. In the IEP document dated February 9, 2024, the team noted that claimant was not attending school since the January 23, 2024, IEP meeting. The IEP report noted that claimant's mother explained she did not want claimant returning to the school because he feels embarrassed by a behavioral incident that occurred in the classroom on January 23, 2024. The report stated that the family's attorney and the district's attorney had been in discussions about an alternative school site, but nothing would be decided until the IEP was completed with an offer of services from the district. The amended IEP report included interventions for escape behavior and an RBT aide. Supplementary aids, services, and supports included recasting, providing choices, frontloading class schedule, additional time to respond verbally, breaks for 10 minutes during classroom time and testing, extended time for assignments, positive rewards for completing tasks, and the option to complete tasks in a different area. In addition to specialized instruction and an RBT, he was receiving speech and social work "wrap" program services. The IEP report reflected discussions between claimant's new advocate, Linsey Krauss, and claimant's mother to ensure that she understood and agreed with what the school was offering.

15. Claimant started at a new school on February 16, 2024. The IEP continued to a meeting on March 25, 2024, to discuss claimant's transition to the new school. Ms. Krauss attended the meeting with claimant's mother. She had met educational attorney Krauss during an event for an organization at which claimant's mother volunteers.

16. Claimant's mother testified that, in addition to attending IEP meetings, Ms. Krauss helped her communicate more effectively with the school about claimant's

educational needs. She has also educated claimant's mother on the educational process and what services are available. Through Ms. Krauss's assistance, the school district agreed to additional supports at school. The additional supports included speech to text software to assist claimant with his writing assignments; use of Post-its on assignments to help with organization; reducing demand and distractions by folding (masking) work papers, and a parent communication log. Claimant's mother testified that these additional services have been "100% helpful" to claimant.

17. Ms. Krauss also attended the most recent IEP meeting with claimant's mother on September 10, 2024. The school resource specialist noted claimant has improved in accepting no for an answer and understanding how to step away from a situation or take a moment before reacting, better transitions between activities and classes, has more positive interactions with peers, and he demonstrated "a lot of growth." His general education teacher stated that he does really well in the classroom, observes class norms like raising his hand and speaking respectfully, shows a high level of insight when the class addresses topics of interest, participates in class, and volunteers ideas. His handwriting showed improvement.

18. The team discussed a behavior incident that occurred the day before. The resource specialist noted that claimant said he "needed space," which he was not able to communicate in previous incidents. The incident deescalated in under 30 minutes, which was an improvement from previous incidents. Claimant was able to return to class after the incident and responsibly and respectfully completed his work.

19. Claimant's mother testified that she has tried to advocate for her son with the school district, but she does not understand a lot of the process, the assessments, and the services available. Ms. Krauss has been effective because she is a former special education teacher, a parent of children on the autism spectrum, and an



attorney. She takes the time to explain everything to her during the meeting to be sure she understands before agreeing to what the school district is offering. The family has spent thousands of dollars on advocates who were not very effective, and Ms. Krauss has been very effective for a very reasonable cost. She attended three IEP meetings, advocated very effectively, and has only charged \$1,182.50.

### **Claimant's SDP Budget Request for Special Education Advocate**

20. Claimant's mother is requesting that the SDP budget include eight hours of advocacy at \$150 per hour, \$1,200 per year. Claimant will transition to middle school next year where he will have to adjust to changing classes for seven periods of instruction. His current school only has two class changes. His mother is concerned that this transition will be difficult for him, and she is not confident in her ability to advocate with the school district to ensure he has the right services and supports in place without a knowledgeable advocate assisting her.

21. The educational advocate, Ms. Krauss, submitted a letter in support of claimant's request. She stated that she worked with claimant's mother prior to IEP meetings to gather her parental concerns, counseled her on the educational process and what services are available for claimant to meet his needs, and worked with her after the meetings to make sure required information is included in the IEP document and being implemented by the district. She stated that claimant's mother "often struggled to understand what was being said during meetings" and Ms. Krauss was able to take additional time to explain the process, which helped ensure claimant was receiving appropriate services in the educational setting.

## **Claimant's SDP Budget**

22. Claimant's Person-Centered Plan, which was prepared by the SDP independent facilitator as part of the SDP budgeting process, identified several unmet needs, including social recreation coach, camp and transportation, personal assistant, homemaker, tutoring, nutritional consult, special education advocate/attorney, parent mentor, and service dog training.

23. The draft of claimant's SDP budget includes funds for respite at the temporarily increased amount of 89 hours per month and socialization training. The budget identified unmet needs and changed circumstances, and included additional funds for social recreation, camp, dietary services, and conference. Through the mediation process in this case, IRC agreed to all the identified unmet needs except the educational advocate.

24. Claimant's mother has not agreed to sign the SDP budget until this issue is resolved. She does not want to sign the SDP budget and then later submit a request next year to add funds for an advocate because she is concerned that it will delay the delivery of appropriate educational services to claimant at the crucial beginning of the school year in middle school.

## **The Parties' Arguments**

### **IRC ARGUMENT**

25. IRC Program Manager Felicia Valencia testified at the hearing. She was responsible for making the decision to deny claimant's request to add funds for an educational advocate to the SDP budget. She testified that she considered claimant's unique needs, whether IRC was given an opportunity to attempt to resolve the issue

with the school district, whether generic resources were available to meet the need, and whether the services could be funded in the traditional model. She testified that “they can move funds around in SDP” but it would not be approved in the traditional service model. She noted that the September IEP report shows that there are no current unaddressed issues with the school district; claimant’s educational needs appear to be met. There is no current request that the school district has denied, so there is no current need for educational advocacy. Claimant’s mother appears to want an advocate so she can maintain services with the school.

26. Ms. Valencia testified that, only after the service coordinator attempts to resolve the issue with the school district, and it appears that the school is not providing a free appropriate public education, would IRC consider funding an educational advocate. IRC must always look at cost-effectiveness, and it would not be cost-effective to fund an advocate where there is no present issue with the school. She also must look at parent responsibilities to advocate for their children at school.

27. The regional center argued that an education rights attorney advocate is not a service and support authorized under the Lanterman Act, legal services are typically the family’s responsibility, and many generic resources are available for free or low-cost services. In addition, the service coordinator is available and has attended IEP meetings with claimant’s mother. While special education advocate services sometimes are approved on a case-by-case basis, the latest IEP shows claimant is doing well at school and there are no pending issues. To approve an advocate, the family must first exhaust generic resources and then show a need for the advocate is an unmet need to include it in the SDP budget. There is currently no unmet need because claimant’s educational needs are being met. If a new need arises in the new

school year, claimant may request an addition to the SDP budget for advocacy services if they become necessary, and IRC will consider that request.

### **CLAIMANT'S ARGUMENT**

28. Claimant's mother testified that she has tried to be an effective advocate but does not understand the special education process and the available services well enough to maximize the advocacy for her son. She struggles to understand what the school personnel are saying at the IEP meetings. While Ms. Forbush has attended IEPs and tried to advocate, the school district would not accept her suggestions. She has tried to access generic resources such as free and low-cost advocacy, but the family is not low income, so they do not qualify, and those agencies are overwhelmed with requests. Ms. Krauss's advocacy at the IEP meetings was instrumental in getting claimant the support he needs at school and is part of why claimant is doing so well in school. It is fundamentally unfair that IRC forces the family to pay to meet a need, then denies funding because there is no longer a need. Although IRC does not have a service code in SDP for educational consulting, there is a service code (code 107) in the traditional model, which shows that regional centers are able to fund educational advocacy in a traditional program.

### **LEGAL CONCLUSIONS**

#### **Fair Hearing Process Burden and Standard of Proof**

1. The Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Act (Lanterman Act) governs this case. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 4500 et seq.) An administrative "fair hearing" to determine the rights and obligations of the parties, if any, is available under the Lanterman Act. (Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 4700–4716.) In a proceeding to determine

whether a regional center should fund certain services, the burden of proof is on the claimant to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that the regional center should fund the requested service. (Evid. Code, §§ 115, 500; *McCoy v. Bd. of Retirement* (1986) 183 Cal.App.3d 1044, 1051-1052.)

## **Regional Center Requirements**

2. Welfare and Institutions Code section 4501 outlines the state's responsibility for persons with developmental disabilities and the regional center's responsibility for providing services and supports for eligible persons with developmental disabilities to enable them to "approximate the pattern of everyday living available to people without disabilities of the same age." An "array of services and supports should be established . . . to meet the needs and choices of each person with developmental disabilities . . . to support their integration into the mainstream life of the community . . . [and to] prevent dislocation of persons with developmental disabilities from their home communities." Additionally, " [i]t is the intent of the Legislature that agencies serving persons with developmental disabilities shall produce evidence that their services have resulted in consumer or family empowerment and in more independent, productive, and normal lives for the persons served." The purpose of the statutory scheme is twofold: To prevent or minimize the institutionalization of developmentally disabled persons and their dislocation from family and community, and to enable them to approximate the pattern of everyday living of nondisabled persons of the same age and to lead more independent and productive lives in the community. (*Assn. for Retarded Citizens v. Dept. of Developmental Services* (1985) 38 Cal.3d 384, 388.)

3. The Department of Developmental Services (department) is the public agency in California responsible for carrying out the laws related to the care, custody

and treatment of individuals with developmental disabilities under the Lanterman Act. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 4416.) To comply with its statutory mandate, the department contracts with private non-profit community agencies, known as "regional centers," to provide the developmentally disabled with "access to the services and supports best suited to them throughout their lifetime." (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 4620.)

4. Welfare and Institutions Code section 4512, subdivision (b), defines "services and supports for persons with developmental disabilities" as:

[S]pecialized services and supports or special adaptations of generic services and supports directed toward the alleviation of a developmental disability or toward the social, personal, physical, or economic habilitation or rehabilitation of an individual with a developmental disability, or toward the achievement and maintenance of independent, productive, normal lives. The determination of which services and supports are necessary for each consumer shall be made through the individual program plan process. The determination shall be made on the basis of the needs and preferences of the consumer or, when appropriate, the consumer's family, and shall include consideration of a range of service options proposed by individual program plan participants, the effectiveness of each option in meeting the goals stated in the individual program plan, and the cost-effectiveness of each option . . . Nothing in this subdivision is intended to expand or authorize a new or different service or support for any

consumer unless that service or support is contained in his or her individual program plan.

5. Welfare and Institutions Code section 4646.4, subdivision (a), requires regional centers to establish an internal process that ensures adherence with federal and state law and regulations, and when purchasing services and supports, ensures conformance with the regional center's purchase of service policies.

6. Welfare and Institutions Code section 4648 requires regional centers to ensure that services and supports assist individuals with developmental disabilities in achieving the greatest self-sufficiency possible and to secure services and supports that meet the needs of the consumer, as determined by the IPP. This section also requires regional centers to be fiscally responsible.

7. Regional centers are required to identify and pursue all possible sources of funding for consumers receiving regional center services, including governmental entities. (Welf. and Inst. Code, § 4659, subd. (a).) Regional centers are required to consider generic resources and the family's responsibility for providing services and supports when considering the purchase of regional center supports and services for its consumers. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 4646.4.) Regional center funds cannot be used to supplant the budget of an agency that has a legal responsibility to serve all members of the general public and is receiving public funds for providing those services. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 4648, subd. (a)(8).)

## **Self-Determination Program**

8. Welfare and Institutions Code section 4685.8, subdivision (a), provides:

The department shall implement a statewide Self-Determination Program. The Self-Determination Program shall be available in every regional center catchment area to provide participants and their families, within an individual budget, increased flexibility and choice, and greater control over decisions, resources, and needed and desired services and supports to implement their IPP. . .

9. Welfare and Institutions Code section 4685.8 provides:

(m) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (4), the IPP team shall determine the initial and any revised individual budget for the participant using the following methodology:

(A) (i) Except as specified in clause (ii), for a participant who is a current consumer of the regional center, their individual budget shall be the total amount of the most recently available 12 months of purchase of service expenditures for the participant.

(ii) An adjustment may be made to the amount specified in clause (i) if both of the following occur:

(I) The IPP team determines that an adjustment to this amount is necessary due to a change in the participant's circumstances, needs, or resources that would result in an increase or decrease in purchase of service expenditures, or the IPP team identifies prior needs or resources that were unaddressed in the IPP, which would have resulted in an



increase or decrease in purchase of service expenditures.

When adjusting the budget, the IPP team shall document the specific reason for the adjustment in the IPP.

(II) The regional center certifies on the individual budget document that regional center expenditures for the individual budget, including any adjustment, would have occurred regardless of the individual's participation in the Self-Determination Program.

10. In 2009, in response to a budget crisis, the legislature suspended authority of regional centers to fund, among other things, educational services for children ages three to 17. (Welf. & Inst. Code § 4648.5.) Effective July 1, 2021, section 4648.5 was repealed, and the suspension of these services was lifted. The department issued a written directive dated October 7, 2021, in which it notified regional centers that authority to fund educational and other services was restored and advising regional centers to take proactive steps to inform their community of the changes and revise its purchase of service policies as necessary to reflect the restored funding.

## **Analysis**

11. A preponderance of the evidence showed that claimant's mother has attempted to use generic resources and IRC service coordinator support to help her advocate at IEP meetings. Generic resources of free and low-cost advocacy are out of reach for claimant's family because of their income and in any event are so overwhelmed as to be unavailable. Ms. Forbush made heroic efforts to advocate for claimant, but these efforts did not persuade the school district.

12. A preponderance of the evidence also showed that, despite her best efforts and intentions, claimant's mother does not have the ability, by herself, to confidently and effectively advocate for her developmentally disabled child in a way that will lead to an efficient collaborative relationship with the school district and maximally benefit claimant. Her testimony that she struggles with understanding the meaning of the services the school district is offering during IEP meetings was credible and supported by other corroborating evidence including notes in the IEP reports and Ms. Krauss's written statement. IRC is correct that a typical parent of a typical special education student without the overlay of developmental disabilities such as claimant's, can be expected, as part of their normal parenting responsibilities, to advocate for their child at school. Claimant's unique needs and unique family situation present challenges in working with the school district that rise above what can typically be expected of parents. Additional support from IRC is necessary to help claimant benefit from his school experience to meet the goals of his IPP.

13. A preponderance of the evidence showed that, due to his developmental disabilities, claimant has a history of negative, sometimes violent, reactions to new demands in the school setting. Claimant's impending transition to middle school in the next school year will present new and increased demands on him. These new demands create a significant risk that, without effective intervention in advance, he may have a negative reaction that could take months and many additional resources to resolve.

14. A preponderance of the evidence showed that a negative reaction in school threatens claimant's ability to meet the goals in his IPP, including receiving an appropriate education, decreasing his aggressive reactions, improving his communication, community engagement, personal safety, and appropriate peer

interactions. Claimant's difficulty in school also impacts his family and his ability to achieve his IPP goals at home.

15. A preponderance of the evidence showed that, with appropriate supports in place, claimant has proved he can have a positive school experience that offers him the chance to get maximal benefit from his education and maximal progress toward his IPP goals. With his mother's and Ms. Krauss's help, and with additional supports at school from this advocacy, claimant effectively turned what was a negative school experience into a positive one.

16. A preponderance of the evidence showed that the risk to claimant of a negative reaction to the new school setting can be minimized, and his chances for early success at school can be maximized, if claimant's mother has the support of an effective special education advocate at the upcoming IEP meetings the remainder of the current school year and next.

17. A preponderance of the evidence showed that IRC's proposed solution—waiting until a problem develops at school, then having claimant's mother submit a request to increase the SDP budget—would be less effective and more detrimental to claimant's IPP goals. In the time it takes after a problem develops to go through the IRC approval process, claimant risks escalation of his behaviors and damage to his school and IPP progress that will take much more time, more resources, and more expensive interventions to reverse, which may drive up the cost to his SDP budget.

18. A preponderance of the evidence showed that claimant's request of eight hours of advocate time at \$150 per hour for an annual amount of \$1,200 is reasonable when compared to the rates that other professional advocates charge for similar services. In addition, having these funds in the SDP budget now will result in the most

cost-effective solution since the cost of delaying effective advocacy increases the risk of further harm to claimant at school and the potential need for expensive more intensive interventions. Based on claimant's disability and the history in this record, the evidence showed that the old adage "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure" applies to this case.

## **ORDER**

Claimant's appeal is granted. IRC shall approve adding \$1,200 for a special education advocate at eight hours times \$150 per hour per year to claimant's SDP budget and shall certify the SDP budget with this addition assuming the budget meets all other requirements.

DATE: October 9, 2024

ALAN R. ALVORD

Administrative Law Judge

Office of Administrative Hearings

BEFORE THE  
DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENTAL SERVICES  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of:

Claimant

OAH Case No. 2024081063

Vs.

**DECISION BY THE DIRECTOR**

Inland Regional Center,

Respondent.

ORDER OF DECISION

On October 9, 2024, an Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) at the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) issued a Proposed Decision in this matter.

The Department of Developmental Services (DDS) takes the following action on the attached Proposed Decision of the ALJ:

The Proposed Decision is adopted by DDS as its Decision in this matter. The Order of Decision, together with the Proposed Decision, constitute the Decision in this matter.

This is the final administrative Decision. Each party is bound by this Decision. Either party may request a reconsideration pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 4713, subdivision (b), 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.

Attached is a fact sheet with information about what to do and expect after you receive this decision, and where to get help.

IT IS SO ORDERED on this day October 30, 2024

*Original signed by:*

Pete Cervinka, Acting Director