



Follow-up from [REDACTED] (at Stanford Law) re: scope of PRA request & 2 other issues discussed this morning

5 messages

Thu, Mar 22, 2018 at 12:49 PM

To: "Scott, Jason@DDS" <Jason.Scott@dds.ca.gov>

Cc: [REDACTED]

Hi Jason,

I am glad we had a chance to touch base this morning. Going forward, I will keep in mind that you are rarely if ever reachable on your office phone because of the construction, so for the time being it is better to call you on your cell [REDACTED].

Below, I have summarized my understanding of where things stand on the three different "baskets" of issues we just discussed, so I can remind myself of what we discussed later on, and we can make sure we are on the same page.

These three baskets are: (1) clarifying scope of PRA (data) request in answer to questions posed by your staffers in IT department; (2) Clarifying next steps on more qualitative questions that are follow-ups on our meeting with your colleagues on Feb. 16th; and (3) Identifying the best person/people at DDS (in addition to [REDACTED] [REDACTED] to help resolve issues around HIPAA (protecting security of high-risk protected health information) in preparation for submission of research protocol to the State Committee for Protection of Human Subjects. (We have been in dialogue with [REDACTED] about this for months now, but have learned that some portions of this process are outside her areas of expertise, so it might be wise to include others.)

Here are more details:

(1) Clarifying Scope of PRA Request

Below are responses (in black, bold, underlined type) to the questions posed by your staffers:

For Part A of the request, I'd like clarification as to whether the request for the number of consumers classified as status 2 (item 1) apply to all residence types.

For item 1, we need to redirect [REDACTED] to DSS, who has a part in SSI (Supplemental Security Income). See <http://www.cdss.ca.gov/inforesources/SSI-SSP>

RESPONSE: If possible, our preference would be to receive this information broken down by each residence type and status as well as total figures. (For example, one column or row in an Excel spreadsheet could correspond to each residence type and/or status, and a final row/column could provide total figures.)

And whether the request for counts by residential type (items 2-7) are for only status 2 consumers (item 1).

RESPONSE: For items 2-7, we would prefer to get this information separately for Status 2 consumers and other consumers (in two different spreadsheets if that is easier to manage). We realize that for many non-status 2 consumers, many of the "residence" cells will be empty. (For example, consumers who reside in developmental centers will not - by definition - reside at home). But all the same, if possible, it would be ideal to receive the data separately for Status 2 and non-Status 2 consumers.

Part B is as follows: