

Date Recd	Complainant's Name	RC Log #	Description of Complaint	Outcome	Statutory Due Date	Date Closed
1/22/2008	Boudoin	08-001 RCEB	1) The Petitioner alleged that the DDS Regional Resource Development Project in Stockton, California (Delta Project) and RCEB did not follow-up with a court order for an assessment of the Complainant for placement in a developmental center/state mental hospital. 2) The Petitioner alleged that the RCEB service coordinator and supervisor did not return the Petitioner's phone calls. 3) The Petitioner alleged that the RCEB supervisor's treatment of her son and herself was motivated by racial discrimination.	1) There is no evidence to substantiate a violation on this issue. 2) There is no evidence to substantiate a violation on this issue. 3) There is no evidence to substantiate any discriminatory actions against the Complainant or the Petitioner by RCEB staff. 4) Additional Issue: RCEB is in noncompliance for failure to include appeal referral information, per section 4731(b).	3/7/2008	3/3/2008
2/8/2008	Austin Berry	08-002 RCOC	2) Failure by RCOC to comply with section 4642 and 4643 (a) 3) Failure by RCOC staff to implement the mandatory DDS training they received, as per WIC section 4643.3. 4) Failure by RCOC to comply with section 4710 (e). Failure by RCOC to comply with WIC sections 4725-4731. 1) Failure by RCOC to comply with another component of WIC section 4643 (a). *Other issues were not in regard to this Complainant, therefore were not addressed in this determination.	2) DDS finds no violation on this issue. 3) DDS finds no violation on this issue. 4) DDS finds no violation on this issue. 10) DDS finds that RCOC was out of compliance with section 4728. 11) DDS finds no evidence is available to substantiate any violation.	3/24/2008	3/19/2008

Date Rec'd	Complainant's Name	RC Log #	Description of Complaint	Outcome	Status Due Date	Date Closed
3/12/2008	Lackey	08-003 IRC	1) The Petitioner alleged that IRC failed to provide her with the Consumer's records in a timely manner. 2) The Petitioner alleged that IRC refused to provide her with a verification letter for Disneyland.	1) IRC is in non-compliance with section 4728 for failure to provide access to the Complainant's records within 3 business days of the Petitioner's request. 2) No violation noted.	4/26/2008	4/22/2008
4/4/2008	Maria de Rosario Garcia	08-004 SDRC	The Petitioner alleged that the SDRC service coordinator did not testify, as she had promised to, that the Petitioner was pressured to sign an IEP for the Complainant.	There is insufficient evidence to support any violations on this issue.	5/19/2008	5/5/2008
4/7/2008	Kimberly Hubbard	08-005 SDRC	The Petitioner alleged that her son's confidential information was breached by his previous SDRC service coordinator.	SDRC is in non-compliance for failure to only disclose information related to the offense, per WIC section 4514.	5/22/2008	5/8/2008
4/18/2008	Louis M. Vasquez Jr.	08-006 CVRC	CVRC held a "behavior services quality review" meeting for the Complainant with CVRC staff, vendor, and consulting psychologist in attendance, without the family. The Petitioner alleges that it's in violation of the Lanterman Act as the Complainant's behavioral services and supports were reduced without the parents input.	CVRC is found in non-compliance with sections 4646 and 4646.5.	6/2/2008	6/3/2008

Date Recd	Complainant's Name	RC Log #	Description of Complaint	Outcome	Statutory Due Date	Date Closed
5/2/2008	Ms. Holly Bins, Acting CRA	08-007 SDC	1) SDC allegedly violated section 4710 (a) (1), when it failed to provide the Conservator with adequate notice when it made a decision without mutual consent of the Conservator to terminate services set forth in an IPP. 2) SDC allegedly violated section 4710 (f) when adequate notice was not provided within 10 days after SDC terminated home visits for the health and safety of the Complainant. 3) SDC allegedly violated section 4502 (j) and 4503 (i) when the Complainant could not make choices in her own life including the way she spent her leisure time.	1) SDC is found in non-compliance with section 4710 (f). 2) No violation substantiated for this issue. 3) No violation substantiated for this issue.	6/16/2008	6/24/2008
5/12/2008	Muell	08-008 TCRC	1) Complainant alleged that TCRC will not change his son's speech therapist to a different vendor. 2) Complainant alleged that TCRC will not relocate his son's speech services so that he can participate in them.	The Complainant filed a Fair Hearing Request on March 28, 2008, citing that "The vendor being provided by Tri-Counties has interfered with my participation in my son's therapy. My ex-wife refuses to agree that a new therapist should be provided to replace the current one." The Complainant's issues were being appropriately addressed within the Fair Hearing process, and his complaint is set aside pending resolution of these proceedings.	6/26/2008	6/3/2008
5/13/2008	Zasslow	08-009 GGRC	Complaint against GGRC, not taken as a 4731	It appeared that GGRC had addressed service issues appropriately, by referral to the fair hearing process and scheduling another Individual Program Plan (IPP) to address the Complainant's dispute issues.	6/27/2008	5/20/2008

Date Rec'd	Complainant's Name	RC Log #	Description of Complaint	Outcome	Statutory Due Date	Date Closed
5/19/2008	Tsang	08-010 RCOC	Review of the Complainant's issues indicated that they were not within the jurisdiction of the W&I section 4731 complaint appeals process, because the issues are either currently filed under the fair hearing appeals procedure and/or haven't not first been submitted to RCOC for investigation.	n/a	7/3/2008	5/27/2008
6/4/2008	Okhamafe	08-011 RCEB	Review of the Complainant's issues indicated that they were not within the jurisdiction of the W&I section 4731 complaint appeals process, because the issues are currently filed against RCEB under the fair hearing appeals procedure.	n/a	7/19/2008	6/24/2008

Date Rec'd	Complainant's Name	RC Log #	Description of Complaint	Outcome	Statutory Due Date	Date Closed
6/25/2008	Ball	08-012 RCOC	<p>1) The Petitioners alleged that RCOC did not honor the Complainant's "last IPP from May 2007 which states [the Complainant] is to receive 180 hours of respite from 7/1/07 – 6/30/08. Her respite was terminated and no notice of action was sent to [the Complainant] ... It should be noted that during the past seven years the only services we have ever received from the Regional Center was respite hours in 2007."</p> <p>2) The Petitioners alleged that the RCOC service coordinator (SC) "did not offer crisis intervention services even when she knew [the Complainant] needed them."</p> <p>3) The Petitioners alleged that RCOC "committed perjury and fraud in a report stating [the Complainant] has mental retardation."</p> <p>4) The Petitioners alleged that RCOC "was responsible for numerous misplacements causing untold suffering to the very client [it] is supposed to serve."</p> <p>5) The Petitioners alleged that RCOC "does not support [the Complainant's] parents as her conservators... Despite the fact ... every IPP report ... state that [the Complainant's] parents are very supportive and understanding of</p>	<p>1) RCOC is found out of compliance with section 4710(f).</p> <p>2) This issue is in regard to the nature, scope, or amount of services and supports included in the Complainant's IPP, and is therefore excluded from the section 4731 complaint process.</p> <p>3) No rights violation is substantiated for this issue.</p> <p>4) The issue regarding the conservatorship status and powers is outside the jurisdiction of the section 4731 complaint process.</p> <p>5) This issue regarding the appointment of a conservator for the Complainant is an issue outside the section 4731 complaint process.</p> <p>6) This issue is in regard to the nature, scope, or amount of services and supports included in the Complainant's IPP, and is therefore excluded from the section 4731 complaint process.</p>	8/9/2008	8/5/2008

Date Recd	Complainant's Name	RC Log #	Description of Complaint	Outcome	Statutory Due Date	Date Closed
6/27/2008	Crumpler	08-013 ACRC	<p>1) The Complainant alleged that ACRC refused to accept full responsibility for its consumer by "refusing to allow Mr. Crumpler's IPP to be person centered," and "refusing adequate funding and services to meet Mr. Crumpler's needs and services."</p> <p>2) The Complainant alleged that ACRC refused to vendorize Derrick Crumpler's Adult Residential Facility so that James Crumpler Jr. "can be admitted and receive his vendored services he is entitled to."</p>	Outside jurisdiction of 4731.	8/11/2008	7/23/2008
7/7/2008	Matsunaga	08-014 HRC	<p>1) The Petitioner is requesting that HRC refund her copy fees, "which they unlawfully collected from me on April 25, 2008."</p> <p>2) The Petitioner is also requesting that DDS order HRC to provide "me with a complete copy of my son's HRC file at no charge to me because I cannot afford to pay for these copies"</p>	<p>1) Complaint not sustained. 2) Complaint not sustained. Additional Issues: 3) HRC is in noncompliance with section 4731(b) for failure to send a written proposed resolution to the complainant within 20 working days of receiving the complaint. 4) HRC is in noncompliance with section 4729 for failing to provide the information required when access to records is requested.</p>	8/21/2008	8/18/2008

Date Recd	Complainant's Name	RC Log #	Description of Complaint	Outcome	Station Date	Date Closed
7/17/2008	Karonis	08-015 ACRC	<p>1) The Petitioner alleged that Southside Art Center (SSAC) was out of compliance in terminating the 1) Complainant's services without notice, and had concerns regarding how ACRC addressed her alleged violation.</p> <p>2) The Petitioner alleged that SSAC endangered her daughter "by not returning her helmet, which was prescribed by her doctor."</p> <p>3) The Petitioner alleged that SSAC kept her "daughters' staff" after the Complainant was terminated from their program.</p>	<p>1) SSAC violated section 56718.</p> <p>2) No violation substantiated other than that addressed in Issue 1.</p> <p>3) No violation substantiated other than that addressed in Issue 1.</p>	8/31/2008	8/22/2008
7/29/2008	Corradi	08-016 SDC	<p>The Petitioner alleged that the Complainant's right to prompt medical care and treatment was violated by SDC.</p>	<p>Pursuant to section 4502 (d) that "the Complainant's right to prompt medical care and treatment was violated," DDS finds no violation. With regard to the clinical issue about the quality of care, DDS suggests this be addressed through a peer review.</p>	9/12/2008	9/5/2008
7/29/2008	Tolbert	08-017 LDC	<p>The Complainant alleged a lack of appropriate medical care and inadequate communication about health status concerns by LDC.</p>	<p>1) LDC is found in non-compliance with section 4646 for failure to implement the Complainant's IPP, by not keeping the Conservator "informed about all health and safety issues" regarding the Complainant.</p> <p>2) LDC is out of compliance of CCR, Title 17 section 50510 (a) (5) for failing to do ongoing nursing assessments of medical treatment and to follow the facility policy and procedures on documentation in regard to the Complainant's IV care from July 9 – 17, 2007.</p>	9/12/2008	9/8/2008

Date Recd	Complainant's Name	RC Log #	Description of Complaint	Outcome	Statutory Due Date	Date Closed
9/8/2008	Moore	08-018	TCRC The Petitioner alleged that her daughter had been "denied the right to an eligibility determination within 120 days" of her initial call to TCRC.	TCRC found out of compliance with WIC sections 4710 (e) and 4643 (a), given 30 days to submit plan of correction.	10/23/2008	10/21/2008
9/11/2008	Lackey	08-019	IRC The Petitioner filed a Fair Hearing Request regarding the Complainant's services and prior case manager, and the fair hearing issues duplicate the issues that were filed in her WIC section 4731 complaint to DDS.	As the Petitioner is addressing her issues within the Fair Hearing process, DDS will not be able to address the complaint within the WIC section 4731 process at this time	N/A	9/15/2008
9/17/2008	Nguyen/Tu	08-020	RCOC 1) Petitioners alleged that RCOC deprived them of their rights to actively participate in the development of their son's programs and goals per W&I Code section 4646. 2) The Petitioner's issues regarding their son's program and services were not within the jurisdiction of the W&I Code section 4731 complaint process, and were referred to the fair hearing appeals procedure described in W&I Code Section 4700 et seq.	RCOC is in violation of section 4646.5 (b).	11/1/2008	10/28/2008
9/23/2008	Mendence	08-021	HRC/NLACRC Petitioner alleged that "both NLACRC and HRC failed to follow the Transfer Guidelines established by DDS under the Lanterman Act."	HRC and NLACRC were found in non-compliance of WIC section 4643.5 c and the implementation of the DDS Regional Center Transfer Guidelines.	11/7/2008	11/3/2008

Date Rec'd	RC Log #	Description of Complaint	Outcome	Due Date	Date Closed
1/22/2008	08-001 RCEB	1) The Petitioner alleged that the DDS Regional Resource Development Project in Stockton, California (Delta Project) and RCEB did not follow up with a court order for an assessment of the Complainant for placement in a developmental center/state mental hospital. 2) The Petitioner alleged that the RCEB service coordinator and supervisor did not return the Petitioner's phone calls. 3) The Petitioner alleged that the RCEB supervisor's treatment of her son and herself was motivated by racial discrimination.	1) There is no evidence to substantiate a violation on this issue. 2) There is no evidence to substantiate a violation on this issue. 3) There is no evidence to substantiate any discriminatory actions against the Complainant or the Petitioner by RCEB staff. 4) Additional Issue: RCEB is in noncompliance for failure to include appeal referral information, per section 4731(b).	3/7/2008	3/3/2008
2/8/2008	08-002 RCOC	2) Failure by RCOC to comply with section 4642 and 4643 (a) 3) Failure by RCOC staff to implement the mandatory DDS training they received, as per WIC section 4643.3. 4) Failure by RCOC to comply with section 4710 (e). 10) Failure by RCOC to comply with WIC sections 4725-4731. 11) Failure by RCOC to comply with another component of WIC section 4643 (a). *Other issues were not in regard to this Complainant, therefore were not addressed in this determination.	2) DDS finds no violation on this issue. 3) DDS finds no violation on this issue. 4) DDS finds no violation on this issue. 10) DDS finds that RCOC was out of compliance with section 4728. 11) DDS finds no evidence is available to substantiate any violation.	3/24/2008	3/19/2008
3/12/2008	08-003 IRC	1) The Petitioner alleged that IRC failed to provide her with the Consumer's records in a timely manner. 2) The Petitioner alleged that IRC refused to provide her with a verification letter for Disneyland.	1) IRC is in noncompliance with section 4728 for failure to provide access to the Complainant's records within 3 business days of the Petitioner's request. 2) No violation noted.	4/26/2008	4/22/2008
4/4/2008	08-004 SDRC	The Petitioner alleged that the SDRC service coordinator did not testify, as she had promised to, that the Petitioner was pressured to sign an IEP for the Complainant.	There is insufficient evidence to support any violations on this issue.	5/19/2008	5/5/2008
4/7/2008	08-005 SDRC	The Petitioner alleged that her son's confidential information was breached by his previous SDRC service coordinator.	SDRC is in noncompliance for failure to only disclose information related to the offense, per WIC section 4514.	5/22/2008	5/8/2008

Date Recd	RC Log #	Description of Complaint	Outcome	Due Date	Date Closed
4/18/2008	08-006 CVRC	CVRC held a "behavior services quality review" meeting for the Complainant with CVRC staff, vendor, and consulting psychologist in attendance, without the family. The Petitioner alleges that it's in violation of the Lanterman Act as the Complainant's behavioral services and supports were reduced without the parents input.	CVRC is found in non-compliance with sections 4646 and 4646.5.	6/2/2008	6/3/2008
5/2/2008	08-007 SDC	1) SDC allegedly violated section 4710 (a) (1), when it failed to provide the Conservator with adequate notice when it made a decision without mutual consent of the Conservator to terminate services set forth in an IPP. 2) SDC allegedly violated section 4710 (f) when adequate notice was not provided within 10 days after SDC terminated home visits for the health and safety of the Complainant. 3) SDC allegedly violated section 4502 (j) and 4503 (i) when the Complainant could not make choices in her own life including the way she spent her leisure time.	1) SDC is found in non-compliance with section 4710 (f). 2) No violation substantiated for this issue. 3) No violation substantiated for this issue.	6/16/2008	6/24/2008
5/12/2008	08-008 TCRC	1) Complainant alleged that TCRC will not change his son's speech therapist to a different vendor. 2) Complainant alleged that TCRC will not relocate his son's speech services so that he can participate in them.	The Complainant filed a Fair Hearing Request on March 28, 2008, citing that "The vendor being provided by Tri-Counties has interfered with my participation in my son's therapy. My ex-wife refuses to agree that a new therapist should be provided to replace the current one." The Complainant's issues were being appropriately addressed within the Fair Hearing process, and his complaint is set aside pending resolution of these proceedings.	6/26/2008	6/3/2008
5/13/2008	08-009 GGRC	Complaint against GGRC, not taken as a 4731	It appeared that GGRC had addressed service issues appropriately, by referral to the fair hearing process and scheduling another Individual Program Plan (IPP) to address the Complainant's dispute issues.	6/27/2008	5/20/2008

Date Rec'd	RC Log #	Description of Complaint	Outcome	Due Date	Date Closed
5/19/2008	08-010 RCOC	Review of the Complainant's issues indicated that they were not within the jurisdiction of the W&I section 4731 complaint appeals process, because the issues are either currently filed under the fair hearing appeals procedure and/or haven't not first been submitted to RCOC for investigation.	n/a	7/3/2008	5/27/2008
6/4/2008	08-011 RCEB	Review of the Complainant's issues indicated that they were not within the jurisdiction of the W&I section 4731 complaint appeals process, because the issues are currently filed against RCEB under the fair hearing appeals procedure.	n/a	7/19/2008	6/24/2008

Date Recd	RC Log #	Description of Complaint	Outcome	Due Date	Date Closed
6/25/2008	08-012 RCOC	<p>1) The Petitioners alleged that RCOC did not honor the Complainant's "last IPP from May 2007 which states [the Complainant] is to receive 180 hours of respite from 7/1/07 – 6/30/08. Her respite was terminated and no notice of action was sent to [the Complainant] ... It should be noted that during the past seven years the only services we have ever received from the Regional Center was respite hours in 2007."</p> <p>2) The Petitioners alleged that the RCOC service coordinator (SC) "did not offer crisis intervention services even when she knew [the Complainant] needed them."</p> <p>3) The Petitioners alleged that RCOC "committed perjury and fraud in a report stating [the Complainant] has mental retardation."</p> <p>4) The Petitioners alleged that RCOC "was responsible for numerous misplacements causing untold suffering to the very client [it] is supposed to serve."</p> <p>5) The Petitioners alleged that RCOC "does not support [the Complainant's] parents as her conservators... Despite the fact ... every IPP report ... state that [the Complainant's] parents are very supportive and understanding of [the Complainant's] needs"</p> <p>6) The Petitioners alleged that RCOC was responsible for its "attempt to send [the Complainant] to the Florida Institute for Neurological Disorders, (as far away from her family as possible and obviously another misplacement ...)."</p>	<p>1) RCOC is found out of compliance with section 4710(f).</p> <p>2) This issue is in regard to the nature, scope, or amount of services and supports included in the Complainant's IPP, and is therefore excluded from the section 4731 complaint process.</p> <p>3) No rights violation is substantiated for this issue.</p> <p>4) The issue regarding the conservatorship status and powers is outside the jurisdiction of the section 4731 complaint process.</p> <p>5) This issue regarding the appointment of a conservator for the Complainant is an issue outside the section 4731 complaint process.</p> <p>6) This issue is in regard to the nature, scope, or amount of services and supports included in the Complainant's IPP, and is therefore excluded from the section 4731 complaint process.</p>	8/9/2008	8/5/2008

Date Recd	RCI Log #	Description of Complaint	Outcome	Due Date	Date Closed
6/27/2008	08-013	ACRC 1) The Complainant alleged that ACRC refused to accept full responsibility for its consumer by "refusing to allow Mr. Crumpler's IPP to be person centered," and "refusing adequate funding and services to meet Mr. Crumpler's needs and services." 2) The Complainant alleged that ACRC refused to vendorize Derrick Crumpler's Adult Residential Facility so that James Crumpler Jr. "can be admitted and receive his vendored services he is entitled to."	Outside jurisdiction of 4731.	8/11/2008	7/23/2008
7/7/2008	08-014	HRC 1) The Petitioner is requesting that HRC refund her copy fees, "which they unlawfully collected from me on April 25, 2008." 2) The Petitioner is also requesting that DDS order HRC to provide "me with a complete copy of my son's HRC file at no charge to me because I cannot afford to pay for these copies...."	1) Complaint not sustained. 2) Complaint not sustained. Additional Issues: 3) HRC is in noncompliance with section 4731(b) for failure to send a written proposed resolution to the complainant within 20 working days of receiving the complaint. 4) HRC is in noncompliance with section 4729 for failing to provide the information required when access to records is requested.	8/21/2008	8/18/2008
7/17/2008	08-015	ACRC 1) The Petitioner alleged that Southside Art Center (SSAC) was out of compliance in terminating the 1) Complainant's services without notice, and had concerns regarding how ACRC addressed her alleged violation. 2) The Petitioner alleged that SSAC endangered her daughter "by not returning her helmet, which was prescribed by her doctor." 3) The Petitioner alleged that SSAC kept her "daughters' staff" after the Complainant was terminated from their program.	1) SSAC violated section 56718. 2) No violation substantiated other than that addressed in Issue 1. 3) No violation substantiated other than that addressed in Issue 1.	8/31/2008	8/22/2008
7/29/2008	08-016	SDC The Petitioner alleged that the Complainant's right to prompt medical care and treatment was violated by SDC.	Pursuant to section 4502 (d) that "the Complainant's right to prompt medical care and treatment was violated," DDS finds no violation. With regard to the clinical issue about the quality of care, DDS suggests this be addressed through a peer review.	9/12/2008	9/5/2008

Date Recd	RC Log #	Description of Complaint	Outcome	Due Date	Date Closed
7/29/2008	08-017 LDC	The Complainant alleged a lack of appropriate medical care and inadequate communication about health status concerns by LDC.	1) LDC is found in non-compliance with section 4646 for failure to implement the Complainant's IPP, by not keeping the Conservator "informed about all health and safety issues" regarding the Complainant. 2) LDC is out of compliance of CCR, Title 17 section 50510 (a) (5) for failing to do ongoing nursing assessments of medical treatment and to follow the facility policy and procedures on documentation in regard to the Complainant's IV care from July 9 - 17, 2007.	9/12/2008	9/8/2008
9/8/2008	08-018 TCRC	The Petitioner alleged that her daughter had been "denied the right to an eligibility determination within 120 days" of her initial call to TCRC.	TCRC found out of compliance with WIC sections 4710 (e) and 4643 (a), given 30 days to submit plan of correction.	10/23/2008	10/21/2008
9/11/2008	08-019 IRC	The Petitioner filed a Fair Hearing Request regarding the Complainant's services and prior case manager, and the fair hearing issues duplicate the issues that were filed in her WIC section 4731 complaint to DDS.	As the Petitioner is addressing her issues within the Fair Hearing process, DDS will not be able to address the complaint within the WIC section 4731 process at this time	N/A	9/15/2008
9/17/2008	08-020 RCOC	1) Petitioners alleged that RCOC deprived them of their rights to actively participate in the development of their son's programs and goals per W&I Code section 4646. 2) The Petitioner's issues regarding their son's program and services were not within the jurisdiction of the W&I Code section 4731 complaint process, and were referred to the fair hearing appeals procedure described in W&I Code Section 4700 et seq.	RCOC is in violation of section 4646.5 (b).	11/1/2008	10/28/2008
9/23/2008	08-021 HRC/NLACRC	Petitioner alleged that "both NLACRC and HRC failed to follow the Transfer Guidelines established by DDS under the Lanterman Act."	HRC and NLACRC were found in non-compliance of WIC section 4643.5 c and the implementation of the DDS Regional Center Transfer Guidelines.	11/7/2008	11/3/2008