EMAILED PUBLIC COMMENTS UNABLE TO BE READ ALOUD

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

DDS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

FEBRUARY 12, 2026

OAH received the following emailed public comments shortly before the Advisory Committee meeting ended and after written public comments had been read aloud. As a courtesy, OAH is providing these comments with the transcription of the meeting.

THE FOLLOWING WRITTEN COMMENT WAS PROVIDED:

(Subject) NOA

My name is Lucero López, and I am the mother of three children who are clients of the Regional Center redwood coast (RCRC).

Currently, they are attempting to remove eligibility from one of my children, despite the fact that there was a prior resolution and we had already reached agreements through mediation. After that, I was sent two case numbers with a Notice of Action (NOA), even though the matter had already been resolved.

Before sending me the NOA, I received phone calls informing me that I supposedly was not even entitled to receive such notification. Mr. Tito Ross was involved in this process.

I attended an informal meeting where I presented evidence from more than one professional evaluation that contradicts the center's position, as they claim that my child is not autistic. Mr. Tito Ross stated that he would take the evidence "to the table,"

but that he would not resolve anything for me. Later, he sent emails indicating that the evaluations were not relevant. During mediation, he again stated that he would not resolve anything and that he was only “the messenger.”

Additionally, I am not the only family experiencing this type of situation. Other families and clients have gone through similar processes, where they feel that prior resolutions are not being respected, professional evidence is not being considered, and clear information and adequate support are not being provided.

I am currently in a hearing process that I consider unjust, as the evidence presented has not been properly evaluated and the prior resolution has not been respected.

As a resolution, I request:

That the previously issued resolution be respected.

That all professional evaluations presented be taken into consideration.

That there be greater transparency and clear communication in the processes.

That mediators and representatives assume active responsibility in resolving cases.

That current practices be reviewed to prevent other families from going through the same situation.

Thank you

Atte: Lucero López

THE FOLLOWING WRITTEN COMMENT WAS PROVIDED:

(Subject) Formal Concerns Regarding Hearing Processes and Notices of Action (NOA)

Dear Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) Committee,

My name is Maribel Oliver, and I am the mother of a client at the Redwood Coast Regional Center. I am writing to respectfully submit a formal concern regarding the experiences my family and other families in our community have faced during the hearing process.

Our experience with the hearings has been extremely stressful. We have perceived inappropriate treatment and, in some cases, retaliation from Regional Center staff when we express disagreements or request necessary services for our children. This creates fear and insecurity for families who are simply exercising their legal right to appeal decisions.

One particularly serious concern is the lack of qualified interpreters during meetings and hearings. On multiple occasions, professional interpretation has not been properly provided, making effective communication very difficult. As a result, our concerns and our children's needs are not always fully or accurately conveyed during the formal process.

Additionally, there have been cases in which services were denied without the timely issuance of a Notice of Action (NOA), preventing families from exercising their right to appeal within the legal timelines. We have also observed significant delays in receiving NOAs after requesting them, which directly affects due process rights.

We respectfully request that the Committee review these matters and consider measures to ensure:

Access to qualified and certified interpreters at all hearings.

Timely and proper issuance of Notices of Action (NOA) in accordance with the law.

Fair processes free from retaliation against families who exercise their right to appeal.

Greater oversight to ensure compliance with clients' rights and due process protections.

Our goal is not to create conflict, but to ensure that our children receive the services they need and that families are treated with respect, fairness, and in accordance with the law.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I am available to provide additional information if needed.

Sincerely,

Maribel Oliver

THE FOLLOWING WRITTEN COMMENT WAS PROVIDED:

(Subject) 2 issues from a parent of two children with TCRC

Below are two issues I wanted to share. One is regarding NOA language used by RC staff when they provide "general denials", without what feels to be valid reasons. The second is regarding the 4731 complaint process, needing clarification regarding what such complaint handles. In my experience, the complaint filed was a complaint fitting for 4731, and not a fair hearing issue. It regarded TCRC staff giving contradicting statements in its NOA, when denying something (SDP). It was NOT about the item itself being denied, but simply about the staff lying and the record showing this.

1- NOA Language by Regional Centers

Each Notice of Action should clearly state the specific and relevant reason for the particular service or support being denied. Generic or standardized denial language that is broadly applied to many cases, without directly addressing the actual request, does not provide meaningful notice and often fails to logically explain the decision. When the stated reason does not match the facts or the item at issue, families cannot understand the basis for the denial or prepare an effective appeal. Due process requires individualized, accurate explanations tied to the specific decision, not template responses. It is perceived as a regional center that is simply "denying just to be denying."

2- 4731 Complaint Process is Dissapointing

The Section 4731 complaint process should address concerns about staff conduct, accuracy, and transparency, not only "missed timelines" (which is how it's been relayed to me that it exists for). When a complaint involves factual inaccuracies or misleading statements in a Notice of Action or representations made by Regional Center staff, which is statements that will be considered by the OAH judge during the hearing, the issue is not simply a disagreement about a denied service. It is a matter of record integrity and administrative accountability. Requiring these concerns to be handled only through a fair hearing conflates two separate issues and leaves potential misconduct unreviewed. Complaints involving accuracy or truthfulness should be independently investigated and resolved to ensure the hearing process is based on reliable and complete information.

Thank you!

THE FOLLOWING WRITTEN COMMENT WAS PROVIDED:

(Subject) Public Comment

On September 9 at 1:30 I presented my case on behalf of my son Palmer Hanscomb against DDS & SDRC to members of San Diego Regional Center and Judge Matyszewski. My evidence documents had been loaded to the Mycase portal. Judge Matyszewki promised to read all of my evidence which contained roughly 100 documents of emails, diagnostic and assessment reports, HCBS-DD Waiver, Employee Contracts, Employee W2s, etc… My written argument against DDS/SDRC for their refusal to fund my 093 vendorization was created in standard pdf format with attached comments. The judge said she could not read the comments from the MyCase portal so I offered the ones I had printed out but she refused to accept them. I assumed she would download the pdfs and read my arguments. I had received no funding whatsoever for three months after I filed an appeal with OAH. By law I was supposed to receive aid paid pending during my appeal so I could continue paying for my son's services. I proved the HCBS-DD Waiver was allowed to expire and was only re-certified months later. I proved SDRC was denying the funding of a statewide Parent Vendor code that I had had for over 20 years before transferring to San Diego. I proved my son's IPP document had not been drafted correctly according to statute for months and it was at the time of hearing still not correct. In evidence was prior noncompliant IPP drafts which omitted critical information on the needs of my son. The judge disregarded that evidence. I had my son brought into the hearing room at the beginning of the hearing to allow the members and judge to see what severe autism looks like. He was there for 5 minutes and displayed his inability to speak while he stared out the window. DDS had claimed I did not pursue "generic alternative services" such as SDRC's vendored agencies. I had explained that I had over 20 years experience

seeking service providers and agencies have liability limitations with the staff they provide. They cannot transport a client in their car, they cannot shave, trim nails, administer medication, etc…This was all disregarded by the judge. The judge's comments in her decision to rule on the side of DDS/included that my son "looked fine and doesn't need extra support". She is not a doctor and for her to say that is completely egregious and disrespectful. She disregarded all evidence to the contrary. I had photos of my son's damage to himself and property. He has severe autism with IDD, epilepsy, he cannot talk, cannot read or write. The judge said she would need 2 weeks to post her decision. She took 2 days and I was not notified by OAH she had made her decision until it was almost too late for my request for reconsideration. My reconsideration had my comments on the document uploads but she claimed I had not given proper details. I had resubmitted my pdf argument comments as separate files. She disregarded that again. Judge Matyszewski's ruling was so obviously biased, unjust and cruel. My experience validates Stanford's report on the unfair hearing process for the disabled. https://law.stanford.edu/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/Unfair-Hearing-Report.pdf Nea Hanscomb
Conservator/Parent of Palmer Hanscomb

THE FOLLOWING WRITTEN COMMENT WAS PROVIDED:

(Subject)

Good afternoon, I believe that every family should be able to obtain services and it shouldn't be such a struggle. Know that each person requesting services is doing so because they need them to move forward in their daily lives. Because then comes the struggle of going to a hearing, which often puts families through stress, knowing they could have saved this time. If it feels like a family is putting up a fight, it's for their children and their future.

THE FOLLOWING WRITTEN COMMENT WAS PROVIDED:

(Subject) Public Comment from Jeanette Picasso-Arguello

Dear committee members and public.

I apologize for not attending in person. I have attended since the commencement of the meeting. Due to unforeseen circumstances and my responsibilities to ensure care for my 4 disabled children. I just want to share publicly my frustration with consumer rights. I will be there virtually to make motions and issue votes for the next scheduled meetings.

Thank you again for allowing me to be a part of this.

Sincerely,

Jeanette Picasso-Arguello

from Coachella Valley and Jurupa Valley within Inland Regional Center (Riverside and San Bernardino Office).

THE FOLLOWING WRITTEN COMMENT WAS PROVIDED:

(Subject)

My name is Cesilia Ortiz, Director of Padres Unidos Por el Autismo (Parents United by Autism), an organization that represents and supports many families in our community.

My public statement reflects the voice and experience of the families we serve. We respectfully request that the Regional Center not have a department specializing in

Fair Hearings, and that only the team working directly with the individual and their family participate in these hearings.

Currently, many families do not know how to navigate the hearing process and also face complex technological barriers that hinder them from exercising their rights.

This situation generates unnecessary stress, inequality in participation, and an inefficient use of state resources.

It is also concerning that, in some cases, there is a lack of clear understanding of the rights established in the Lanterman Act or the criteria of the Self-Determination Program, which directly impacts decisions affecting the lives of the individuals we serve.

Therefore, we request:

- No to specialized Fair Hearings departments within the Regional Centers.
- The exclusive participation of the team directly involved with the individual being served.
- Clear, accessible, and understandable processes for families, including technological support and guidance on their rights.
- Guarantee of decisions aligned with the Lanterman Act and the principles of Self-Determination.

This will not only reduce stress for families but will also allow for a more responsible and efficient use of public funds, prioritizing real support for people with developmental disabilities.

Thank you for listening to the voice of our community.