

April 26, 2025

Supervising Administrative Law Judge
Sacramento Regional Office
Department of Social Services
VIA: ACMS

Claimant: Yang Xiong

Beneficiary: Kaleb Xiong

State Hearing Number: 105121263

Hearing Date: May 15, 2025

Subject: Rebuttal to Sacramento County's Request for Dismissal of State Hearing

Dear Supervising Administrative Law Judge:

I respectfully submit this rebuttal to Sacramento County's request to dismiss my pending State Hearing regarding compliance with State Hearing Decision No. 105072660, adopted on January 2, 2025 (see Exhibit F), from which the Notice of Action dated January 22, 2025 was issued (see Exhibit E).

I. Jurisdictional Argument – Mischaracterization of the Issue

County's Position:

Sacramento County asserts that the hearing should be dismissed because it concerns provider payments, which they claim fall outside the jurisdiction of the State Hearings Division.

Rebuttal:

This case does not involve a private wage dispute. It concerns Sacramento County's failure to fully comply with the ALJ's January 2, 2025 order to make my child whole. The issue is whether Sacramento County properly implemented the hearing decision — including full and accurate payment of all service hours owed, with applicable overtime.

Regulatory Support:

- **MPP §22-054:** Allows a claimant to request a hearing on whether a county has complied with a prior hearing decision.
- **MPP §22-078:** Confirms that enforcement of compliance with hearing decisions falls within the State Hearings Division's jurisdiction.

Conclusion:

This hearing request properly falls within the State Hearings Division's jurisdiction as a compliance matter, not a private provider grievance.

II. Compliance Argument – Incomplete Implementation

County's Position:

Sacramento County contends that it complied with the ALJ's decision by issuing Notices of Action and payments.

Rebuttal:

Compliance requires full and accurate correction of aid as ordered by the ALJ, not merely issuing paperwork or partial payments. Sacramento County authorized additional hours and issued partial payments but failed to account for overtime triggered by those hours, resulting in incomplete compliance (see Exhibit I, Pages 13-15).

Regulatory Support:

- **MPP §22-072.5:** Requires counties to take full corrective action to implement hearing decisions.
- **Welfare and Institutions Code §10962:** Mandates that corrective action following a decision must be completed within 30 days.

Conclusion:

Sacramento County's failure to properly calculate and pay overtime constitutes noncompliance with the ALJ's order.

III. Overtime Payment Argument – Mandatory Once Hours Are Awarded

County's Position:

Sacramento County, supported by CDSS, asserts that overtime is not owed because the ALJ's decision did not explicitly reference overtime, and that post-hearing payments are made to the recipient (see Exhibits A and B).

Rebuttal:

Once service hours are awarded — and those hours exceed 40 per week — overtime compensation becomes mandatory under IHSS regulations. The absence of specific overtime language in the ALJ's decision does not relieve Sacramento County of its obligation to comply with applicable overtime laws.

Regulatory Support:

- **Welfare and Institutions Code §12300.4:** Requires overtime pay for IHSS services that exceed 40 hours per week.
- **MPP §30-757.172:** Mandates that providers working over 40 hours per week must be paid overtime.
- **MPP §§30-769.252(a) and 30-769.734:** Specify how post-hearing payments must be calculated, without exempting overtime obligations.

Conclusion:

Sacramento County must pay overtime resulting from the additional authorized hours awarded by the ALJ's decision.

III.A. CDSS' Additional Arguments and Rebuttals

February 27, 2025 Conversation with CDSS Representative Victoria Cescato (Exhibit J):**Argument 1:**

Payments after a hearing are made to the recipient, not the provider.

Rebuttal:

MPP §30-769.734 governs the method of payment but does not relieve the County's obligation to properly calculate and pay overtime.

Regulatory Support:

- **MPP §30-769.734(c):** Requires counties to authorize and pay services consistent with hearing decisions.
- **California Labor Code §510:** Requires overtime pay for all hours worked over 40 hours per week.
- **Welfare and Institutions Code §12300.1:** Overtime protections apply to IHSS providers.

Conclusion:

Routing payments through the recipient does not excuse Sacramento County from its legal obligation to correctly calculate and pay overtime.

Argument 2:

Overtime is not owed because "services were not technically authorized."

Rebuttal:

Retroactive authorization legally validates that services were necessary, and providers must be fully compensated for all hours worked, including overtime, regardless of when services were formally approved.

Regulatory Support:

- **MPP §30-763.452:** Requires authorization and payment for previously denied necessary services.
- **Labor Code §1194(a):** Provides workers the right to recover unpaid minimum wages and overtime.
- **29 CFR §778.106:** Requires timely payment of overtime even when administrative delays occur.

Conclusion:

The timing of administrative authorization does not negate the obligation to compensate providers for overtime already earned.

Argument 3:

State Hearing payment structure calculates overtime differently or excludes it.

Rebuttal:

State Hearing awards must still fully comply with IHSS wage protections and California labor laws. Administrative routing of payment through the recipient does not eliminate the County's duty to properly calculate and pay overtime when service hours exceed 40 per week.

Regulatory Support:

- **Welfare and Institutions Code §12300.4:** Requires overtime pay for IHSS services exceeding 40 hours per week.
- **MPP §30-757.172:** Mandates overtime pay for IHSS providers working more than 40 hours weekly.
- **MPP §30-769.734(c):** Requires that services awarded by hearing decisions are paid accurately, including applicable overtime.
- **Labor Code §1194(a):** Protects the right to recover unpaid wages, including overtime.
- **29 CFR §778.106:** Clarifies that overtime must be paid when work is performed, not when payment is administratively processed.

Conclusion:

State Hearing payments must include all overtime earned, even when routed to the recipient, to fully comply with labor and IHSS laws.

IV. Prior Hearing Argument — Misapplication of Res Judicata

County's Position:

The County claims the matter was already decided in State Hearing No. 105019726 and State Hearing No. 105072660 (see Exhibits F and G), and that both were accepted (see Exhibits C and D).

Rebuttal:

This hearing does not seek to re-litigate eligibility. It challenges Sacramento County's incomplete compliance with prior hearing decisions. Compliance hearings are expressly authorized when there are allegations of noncompliance.

Regulatory Support:

- **MPP §22-078:** Authorizes hearings to review compliance with a prior State Hearing decision.

Conclusion:

Prior adjudication does not bar a compliance hearing where full implementation remains disputed.

V. Nature of Appeal Argument — Mischaracterization as Provider Grievance

County's Position:

Sacramento County asserts this is a private provider grievance.

Rebuttal:

I am appearing as the authorized representative of the IHSS recipient — my child — to enforce correction of awarded services. This case concerns recipient rights and the enforcement of aid delivery, not a private employment or wage dispute.

Regulatory Support:

- **MPP §22-054:** Allows a recipient (or authorized representative) to request a hearing to enforce compliance with a hearing decision.
- **MPP §22-078:** Establishes that compliance issues are within the jurisdiction of the State Hearings Division.

Conclusion:

This matter concerns enforcement of the recipient's right to full benefits, not a private provider grievance.

VI. Pattern of Sacramento County and CDSS' Noncompliance

September 3, 2024:

Sacramento County improperly kept my child under IHSS Plus Option, limiting his

services to 190 hours per month instead of transferring him to CFCO for 283 hours per month as ordered (see Exhibit G).

Regulatory Support:

- **ACL 14-60:** Requires transfer to CFCO for eligible recipients.
- **Welfare and Institutions Code §14132.95(b):** Establishes CFCO eligibility and service protections.

Comment:

Sacramento County unlawfully restricted services, violating CFCO requirements.

September 13, 2024:

CDSS improperly certified Sacramento County's compliance without ensuring correction of the unlawful capping of hours (see Exhibit D).

Regulatory Support:

- **MPP §22-085:** Requires CDSS to verify actual county compliance before certifying compliance.

Comment:

CDSS failed its duty to verify corrections.

September 26, 2024:

Sacramento County conceded the service capping error but excluded overtime in retroactive payment calculations (see Exhibit I, Pages 13–15).

Regulatory Support:

- **Labor Code §510:** Requires overtime pay for hours worked over 40 hours in a week.
- **MPP §30-763.441:** Retroactive adjustments must account for full service and payment obligations.

Comment:

Retroactive corrections must include all owed overtime.

January 29, 2025:

Sacramento County refused to issue remaining overtime payments owed (see Exhibit A).

Regulatory Support:

- **Labor Code §1194(a):** Workers are entitled to recover unpaid overtime through administrative or court action.
- **MPP §22-054:** Allows a claimant to request a hearing to enforce correction of benefits ordered.

Comment:

Failure to issue full overtime payment violates both labor laws and hearing enforcement rights.

February 7, 2025:

IHSS Supervisor Suzanne Love improperly ended negotiations regarding the dispute (see Exhibit A, Page 14/14).

Regulatory Support:

- **MPP §22-073.26:** Requires counties to attempt good faith resolution prior to hearing.
- **Welfare and Institutions Code §10950:** Guarantees the right to a fair hearing and pre-hearing efforts to resolve disputes.

Comment:

Ending negotiations without good faith efforts denied procedural protections.

February 27, 2025:

Victoria Cescato (CDSS) cited irrelevant regulations to justify withholding overtime payments (see Exhibit J).

Regulatory Support:

- **Labor Code §510:** Overtime must be paid for hours worked over 40 per week.

- **Labor Code §1194:** Workers have the right to recover unpaid overtime wages.

Comment:

Overtime obligations are based on work performed, not administrative excuses.

April 7 and April 10, 2025:

CDSS inconsistently admitted partial overtime payments but resisted full compliance (see Exhibit B).

Regulatory Support:

- **MPP §22-054:** Compliance requires full, not partial, implementation of the hearing decision.
- **Labor Code §1194(a):** Full overtime recovery is a protected worker right.

Comment:

Only full compliance satisfies the hearing orders.

April 24, 2025:

Hearing Representative Debra Garcia failed to conduct a meaningful pre-hearing conference (see Exhibit H).

Regulatory Support:

- **MPP §22-073.27:** Requires counties to engage in meaningful pre-hearing resolution efforts.
- **Welfare and Institutions Code §10950:** Ensures claimants' access to fair and meaningful pre-hearing processes.

Comment:

Sacramento County failed to meet its pre-hearing obligations.

Conclusion:

The documented pattern of noncompliance by Sacramento County and CDSS reinforces the urgent need for a full compliance hearing to enforce State Hearing orders and applicable law.

Final Conclusion

Because this appeal seeks enforcement of a prior State Hearing decision under **MPP §22-054** and **MPP §22-078**, and because Sacramento County's compliance remains incomplete, I respectfully request that the motion for dismissal be denied and that the matter proceed to a full hearing on the merits.

Respectfully,



Yang Xiong
Father of IHSS Client Kaleb Xiong
IHSS Case No. 1951916

Attachments

- Exhibit A: Sacramento County Email Correspondence (January 5, 2025 through February 7, 2025)
- Exhibit B: CDSS Email Correspondence (February 24, 2025 through April 17, 2025)
- Exhibit C: CDSS Certification of Compliance (January 29, 2025)
- Exhibit D: CDSS Certification of Compliance (September 13, 2024 and December 10, 2024)
- Exhibit E: Notice of Action (January 22, 2025)
- Exhibit F: Hearing No. 105072660 Decision (Adopted January 2, 2025)
- Exhibit G: Hearing No. 105019726 Decision (Adopted September 3, 2024)
- Exhibit H: Sacramento County Hearing Representative Debra Garcia Email Correspondence (February 28, 2024 through April 24, 2025)
- Exhibit I: Sacramento County Email Correspondence (September 12, 2024 through October 1, 2024)
- Exhibit J: Summary of February 27, 2025 Phone Contact with Victoria Cescato, CDSS



Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Automatic reply: 1951916 K.X. IHSS hours & MediCal funding

Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Sun, Jan 5, 2025 at 9:49 AM

To: "Love. Suzanne" <LoveSu@saccounty.gov>, "Choy. Norman" <choyna@saccounty.gov>

Cc: Mary Xiong <maryxiong19@yahoo.com>, "McFarland. Dianne" <MCFARD@saccounty.gov>, "Ishola. Al-Ameen" <isholaal@saccounty.gov>, JohnsonJea@saccounty.gov

Dear Ms. Love and Mr. Choy,

I hope this message finds you well.

On January 2, 2025, the ALJ released the state hearing decision in my favor. Before implementing the ALJ's order, I would like to ensure we are aligned to avoid any further complications.

As per the ALJ's decision, Sacramento County is directed to place my child in the CFCO program effective August 1, 2023, with the appropriate monthly hours of 227:16. Given the circumstances, this adjustment applies to the period from August 1, 2023 through September 30, 2024. Starting October 1, 2024, my child's hours were updated to 243:12, as determined by Mr. Choy's annual assessment on September 24, 2024 (NOA dated September 30, 2024).


Please confirm once the necessary adjustments have been made so that we can proceed with the IHSS Electronic Services Portal (ESP) system to generate and complete the supplemental timesheets. If the County opts to address this through a special transaction instead, I kindly ask that the remaining \$3,872.79 be issued promptly.


Thank you for your attention to this matter. Please let me know if any clarification is needed to move forward efficiently.

Best regards,

Yang Xiong

 Claimant-Position-of-Statement-10.4.2024.pdf

 Decision_105072660_01022025153423076.pdf

 Rebuttal-to-Sacramento-County-Position-Statement-12.16.2024.pdf

[Quoted text hidden]



Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Automatic reply: 1951916 K.X. IHSS hours & MediCal funding

Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Mon, Jan 13, 2025 at 7:26 AM

To: "Love. Suzanne" <LoveSu@saccounty.gov>, "Choy. Norman" <choyna@saccounty.gov>

Cc: Mary Xiong <maryxiong19@yahoo.com>, "McFarland. Dianne" <MCFARD@saccounty.gov>, "Ishola. Al-Ameen" <isholaal@saccounty.gov>, JohnsonJea@saccounty.gov

Good morning, Ms. Love and Mr. Choy,

This email is a friendly follow-up to my January 5, 2025 email. Even if you have not been able to work on carrying out the ALJ's order, please send me a quick update to let me know where things are.

Thank you.

Yang Xiong

[Quoted text hidden]



Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Automatic reply: 1951916 K.X. IHSS hours & MediCal funding

Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Fri, Jan 17, 2025 at 9:33 AM

To: "Love. Suzanne" <LoveSu@saccounty.gov>, "Choy. Norman" <choyna@saccounty.gov>

Cc: Mary Xiong <maryxiong19@yahoo.com>, "McFarland. Dianne" <MCFARD@saccounty.gov>, "Ishola. Al-Ameen" <isholaal@saccounty.gov>, JohnsonJea@saccounty.gov

Good morning, Ms. Love and Mr. Choy.

I understand that you are often managing numerous requests and urgent matters; however, the impact of delays cannot be overlooked. The ALJ released the hearing order on January 2, 2025, and I brought this to your attention in my email on January 5, 2025. Please let me know if additional time is required to properly review and implement the ALJ's order. While I do not intend for my tone to come across as overly forceful, I must emphasize the frustration I have been experiencing since August 1, 2023, due to Sacramento County's ongoing failure to fulfill its obligations under the regulations and laws for my son.

I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Thank you.

Yang Xiong

[Quoted text hidden]



Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Automatic reply: 1951916 K.X. IHSS hours & MediCal funding

Love. Suzanne <LoveSu@saccounty.gov>

Fri, Jan 17, 2025 at 3:51 PM

To: Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>, "Choy. Norman" <choyna@saccounty.gov>

Cc: Mary Xiong <maryxiong19@yahoo.com>, "McFarland. Dianne" <MCFARD@saccounty.gov>, "Johnson. Jeannette" <JohnsonJea@saccounty.gov>

Good afternoon Mr. Xiong,

Thank you for your emails inquiring about the result of the hearing outcome issued 1/2/25. Please know that we have received the decision and are working to comply. We will be sure to follow up with you as soon as we are able to address the Administrative Law Judge's order.

Thank you,

Suzanne Love

IHSS Human Services Supervisor

DCFAS, County of Sacramento

Phone: 916-874-2018

Email: lovesu@saccounty.gov

From: Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>**Sent:** Friday, January 17, 2025 9:34 AM**To:** Love. Suzanne <LoveSu@saccounty.gov>; Choy. Norman <choyna@saccounty.gov>**Cc:** Mary Xiong <maryxiong19@yahoo.com>; McFarland. Dianne <MCFARD@saccounty.gov>; Ishola. Al-Ameen <isholaal@saccounty.gov>; Johnson. Jeannette <JohnsonJea@saccounty.gov>**Subject:** Re: Automatic reply: 1951916 K.X. IHSS hours & MediCal funding

⚠ **EXTERNAL EMAIL:** If unknown sender, **do not** click links/attachments. ⚠
If you have concerns about this email, please report it via the Phish Alert button.

Good morning, Ms. Love and Mr. Choy.

I understand that you are often managing numerous requests and urgent matters; however, the impact of delays cannot be overlooked. The ALJ released the hearing order on January 2, 2025, and I brought this to your attention in my email on January 5, 2025. Please let me know if additional time is required to properly review and implement the ALJ's order. While I do not intend for my tone to come across as overly forceful, I must emphasize the frustration I have been experiencing



Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Automatic reply: 1951916 K.X. IHSS hours & MediCal funding

Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Fri, Jan 17, 2025 at 9:55 PM

To: "Love. Suzanne" <LoveSu@saccounty.gov>

Cc: "Choy. Norman" <choyna@saccounty.gov>, Mary Xiong <maryxiong19@yahoo.com>, "McFarland. Dianne" <MCFARD@saccounty.gov>, "Johnson. Jeannette" <JohnsonJea@saccounty.gov>

Thank you for acknowledging receipt of my emails and for providing the status update.

Yang Xiong

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

Your assistance in ensuring these corrections are made would be greatly appreciated. I look forward to hearing from you regarding the next steps that would be taken.

Yang Xiong

On Tue, Oct 1, 2024 at 12:17 PM Ishola. Al-Ameen <isholaal@saccounty.gov> wrote:

Good Afternoon Mr. Xiong,



Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Automatic reply: 1951916 K.X. IHSS hours & MediCal funding

Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Fri, Jan 24, 2025 at 4:42 PM

To: "Love. Suzanne" <LoveSu@saccounty.gov>

Cc: "Choy. Norman" <choyna@saccounty.gov>, Mary Xiong <maryxiong19@yahoo.com>, "McFarland. Dianne" <MCFARD@saccounty.gov>, "Johnson. Jeannette" <JohnsonJea@saccounty.gov>

Hello,

Per **MPP Section 22-078.1**, "The county shall comply with all state hearing decisions immediately upon receipt, even if a request for a rehearing is made." Additionally, the county is required to submit a compliance report to the State Hearings Division within **30 days** of receiving the decision, detailing the actions taken to comply.

As of today, we are nearing the **30-day compliance deadline**. The decision was issued on **January 2, 2025**, and I provided a copy of the decision to the county on **January 5, 2025**. It is essential that this matter is resolved promptly to avoid further delays.

As previously mentioned, I do not want a repeat of past issues where incorrect actions were taken by the county. Your immediate clarification and confirmation of the county's intended course of action are necessary to ensure that the outstanding balance of **\$3,872.79** is appropriately claimed and issued without further delay.

Please respond with an update on the county's compliance status by **January 31, 2025** to avoid escalation.

Thank you.

Yang Xiong

[Quoted text hidden]



Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Automatic reply: 1951916 K.X. IHSS hours & MediCal funding

Love. Suzanne <LoveSu@saccounty.gov>

Tue, Jan 28, 2025 at 9:55 AM

To: Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Cc: "Choy. Norman" <choyna@saccounty.gov>, Mary Xiong <maryxiong19@yahoo.com>, "McFarland. Dianne" <MCFARD@saccounty.gov>, "Johnson. Jeannette" <JohnsonJea@saccounty.gov>

Good morning Mr. Xiong,

Thank you for your correspondence. A Hearing Compliance Notice of Action has been mailed to you on 1/22/25, in accordance with the ALJ decision. You should be receiving it this week.

Thank you,

Suzanne Love

IHSS Human Services Supervisor

DCFAS, County of Sacramento

Phone: 916-874-2018

Email: lovesu@saccounty.gov

From: Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>**Sent:** Friday, January 24, 2025 4:43 PM**To:** Love. Suzanne <LoveSu@saccounty.gov>**Cc:** Choy. Norman <choyna@saccounty.gov>; Mary Xiong <maryxiong19@yahoo.com>; McFarland. Dianne <MCFARD@saccounty.gov>; Johnson. Jeannette <JohnsonJea@saccounty.gov>**Subject:** Re: Automatic reply: 1951916 K.X. IHSS hours & MediCal funding

⚠ EXTERNAL EMAIL: If unknown sender, **do not** click links/attachments. ⚠
If you have concerns about this email, please report it via the Phish Alert button.

Hello,

Per **MPP Section 22-078.1**, "The county shall comply with all state hearing decisions immediately upon receipt, even if a request for a rehearing is made." Additionally, the county is required to submit a compliance report to the State Hearings Division within **30 days** of receiving the decision, detailing the actions taken to comply.



Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Automatic reply: 1951916 K.X. IHSS hours & MediCal funding

Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Tue, Jan 28, 2025 at 11:51 PM

To: "Love. Suzanne" <LoveSu@saccounty.gov>

Cc: "Choy. Norman" <choyna@saccounty.gov>, Mary Xiong <maryxiong19@yahoo.com>, "McFarland. Dianne" <MCFARD@saccounty.gov>, "Johnson. Jeannette" <JohnsonJea@saccounty.gov>

Dear Ms. Love,

Thank you for your response.

I have received the Notice of Action (NOA) dated January 22, 2025, which replaces the NOAs issued on September 11, 2024 and September 20, 2024, as directed by the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ). According to the NOA, Sacramento County asserts that it has complied with the ALJ's order through the September 26, 2024 payment. However, this payment does not account for the full back pay owed for the period of August 2023 through September 2024. As confirmed during the hearing—and substantiated by Yolanda Lewis and the check stubs submitted as evidence—the outstanding balance remains **\$3,872.79**.

Given that my child has now been correctly enrolled in the IHSS program (effective August 1, 2023) and a partial payment has been issued, I need clarification on how the remaining back pay will be processed. Specifically:

1. Will supplemental timesheets be made available through the IHSS Electronic Services Portal to allow my child's provider/mother to submit them for the remaining balance?
2. If not, will the County issue another special transaction to fulfill the outstanding amount?

I expect a prompt resolution to this matter, as the ALJ's order requires full compliance. Please provide a detailed response outlining the next steps and expected timeline for the remaining payment.

I appreciate your attention to this issue and look forward to your timely response.

Best Regards,

Yang Xiong

On Tue, Jan 28, 2025 at 9:55 AM Love. Suzanne <LoveSu@saccounty.gov> wrote:

Good morning Mr. Xiong,

Thank you for your correspondence. A Hearing Compliance Notice of Action has been mailed to you on 1/22/25, in accordance with the ALJ decision. You should be receiving it this week.

Thank you,

Suzanne Love

IHSS Human Services Supervisor

DCFAS, County of Sacramento

Phone: 916-874-2018

Email: lovesu@saccounty.gov



Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Automatic reply: 1951916 K.X. IHSS hours & MediCal funding

Love, Suzanne <LoveSu@saccounty.gov>

Wed, Jan 29, 2025 at 3:49 PM

To: Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Cc: "Choy, Norman" <choyna@saccounty.gov>, Mary Xiong <maryxiong19@yahoo.com>, "McFarland, Dianne" <MCFARD@saccounty.gov>, "Johnson, Jeannette" <JohnsonJea@saccounty.gov>

Good afternoon Mr. Xiong,

Thank you for your email of 1/28/25. Below is the order found at the bottom of the decision document. You will note that the ALJ's decision stated the claim is granted **"in part."** The entirety of your claim was not granted. The County was to rescind the notices of 9/11/24 & 9/20/24 which was completed. The County was to authorize 227:16 hours/minutes per month effective 8/1/23 which was completed. The County was to place the child into CFCO effective 8/1/23 which was completed. The County was to "aid the claimant and child as otherwise eligible," which was completed with the Special Payment Transaction dated 9/26/24. Please note that pursuant to **MPP Section 30-769.734**, "the **recipient** shall receive payment for services when the payments are made as a result of a state hearing decision. **Payments made to a recipient per state hearing decision are for the benefits owed to the recipient, not any payment, including overtime, to a provider.** If you have any questions regarding this policy, please contact the California Department of Social Services' Adult Programs Policy and Operations Bureau at (916) 651-5350.

ORDER

The claim is granted in part.

Sacramento County shall rescind the September 11, 2024, and September 20, 2024 Notices of Action; authorize the child 227:16 (hours: minutes) per month, effective August 1, 2023; place the child in the CFCO program effective August 1, 2023; and aid the claimant and child as otherwise eligible.

Thank you,

Suzanne Love

IHSS Human Services Supervisor

DCFAS, County of Sacramento

Phone: 916-874-2018

Email: lovesu@saccounty.gov



Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Automatic reply: 1951916 K.X. IHSS hours & MediCal funding

Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Thu, Jan 30, 2025 at 9:20 AM

To: "Love. Suzanne" <LoveSu@saccounty.gov>

Cc: "Choy. Norman" <choyna@saccounty.gov>, Mary Xiong <maryxiong19@yahoo.com>, "McFarland. Dianne" <MCFARD@saccounty.gov>, "Johnson. Jeannette" <JohnsonJea@saccounty.gov>

Dear Ms. Love,

Thank you for outlining Sacramento County's progress toward complying with the ALJ's January 2, 2025, directive. However, it appears the County remains out of full compliance. Although you indicated that my child was placed in the CFCO program as of August 1, 2023, with increased authorized hours, his provider still cannot claim these hours through the IHSS Electronic Portal. If the County's rationale for withholding e-timesheets is that it has already fulfilled back-payment obligations through the September 24, 2024, special transaction and that MPP Section 30-769.734 prohibits overtime payments, I must reiterate that this interpretation is incorrect.

Your reading of MPP Section 30-769.734 suggests that state hearing payments must be made solely to recipients, excluding overtime for providers. However, that section merely states, "When payment is made as a result of a state hearing decision," and does not bar overtime or require payment only to recipients.

SOCIAL SERVICES STANDARDS		
30-769 (Cont.)	SERVICE PROGRAM NO. 7: IN-HOME SUPPORT SERVICES	Regulations
30-769	PAYROLLING FOR INDIVIDUAL PROVIDERS (Continued)	30-769
.732	In direct payment cases, where a recipient is incapable of handling his/her financial and legal affairs and has a legal guardian or conservator, direct payment shall be made to the recipient's legal guardian or conservator at such person's request.	
.733	Payment may be made to a recipient's guardian, conservator, substitute payee, or person designated by the recipient.	
.734	When payment is made as a result of a state hearing decision.	
.735	If the recipient is severely impaired he/she shall be notified in writing of the right to hire and pay his/her own provider, and to receive his/her monthly cash payment in advance.	
.736	When direct payment is made to a recipient, guardian, conservator, or substitute payee, the provider shall be hired, supervised, and paid by such payee. In such cases, the recipient or the person authorized to act in the recipient's behalf shall insure that the services provider is capable of and is providing the services authorized.	
.737	It shall be the responsibility of the severely impaired recipient, legal guardian or conservator who receives payment in advance to submit their provider's time sheets at the end of each authorized service month to the appropriate county social services office.	

In fact, in September 2024—while attempting to comply with the September 4, 2024, ALJ directive—the County issued supplemental e-timesheets through the IHSS Electronic Portal, enabling my child's provider to claim overtime. This directly contradicts any assertion that overtime must be excluded or that payments can go only to recipients. Furthermore, MPP Section 30-769.73 specifically states, "Payments for authorized

services rendered shall be sent to the recipient's appropriate provider," which conflicts with the County's interpretation.

.7 Recipient Responsibility

- .71 It is the responsibility of the recipient to report to social services staff accurately and completely all information necessary to complete the SOC 311.
- .72 The recipient, within his/her physical, emotional, educational or other limitations, shall:
 - .721 Designate the authorized hours per provider within the total of the recipient's authorized hours.
 - .722 Designate each provider(s) portion of the share of cost.
 - .723 Sign and date the prescribed time sheet to:
 - (a) Verify payment of the share of cost to the appropriate provider(s).
 - (b) Verify that services authorized were rendered by the appropriate provider.
 - .724 Inform social services staff of any changes affecting the payrolling process.
- .73 **Payments for authorized services rendered shall be sent to the recipient's appropriate provider.**
The recipient shall not receive payment for services except as provided in .731 through .734 below.
- .731 Severely impaired recipients as defined under Section 30-753, shall have the option of choosing to directly receive their payment at the beginning of each authorized month. Such payment shall be the net amount exclusive of the appropriate withholdings.

A thorough review of MPP Sections 30-769.7 through 30-769.737 shows that payments “may” (not “shall”) be directed to the recipient under certain circumstances, including state hearing decisions. Consequently, the County's claim that “the recipient shall receive payment for services when the payments are made as a result of a state hearing decision... not any payment, including overtime, to a provider” is not supported by these regulations. **Should another official source support the County's position, please make it available for my review.**

As a parent of an IHSS minor recipient, I have consulted with other families and advocates across California who have received back payments—including overtime—under similar circumstances. I respectfully request that Sacramento County fully comply with the ALJ's directive, consistent with other counties, by issuing all outstanding back payments and overtime, whether via a special transaction or supplemental e-timesheets.

If the County cannot fulfill this request, I may be forced to appeal the Notice of Action for a fourth time. While I remain confident in my position, given the ALJ's previous rulings in my favor, I prefer to avoid additional proceedings that would consume resources and reflect poorly on Sacramento County.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter. I look forward to your response.



Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

RE:1951916 K.X. IHSS hours & MediCal funding

Love. Suzanne <LoveSu@saccounty.gov>

Mon, Feb 3, 2025 at 8:17 AM

To: Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Cc: "Choy. Norman" <choyna@saccounty.gov>, Mary Xiong <maryxiong19@yahoo.com>, "McFarland. Dianne" <MCFARD@saccounty.gov>, "Johnson. Jeannette" <JohnsonJea@saccounty.gov>

Good morning Mr. Xiong,

Thank you for your email of 1/30/25.

Due to your concern about overtime pay, we did confer with the California Department of Social Services (CDSS), and CDSS did confirm the county is citing the policy correctly. If you have further questions about overtime pay, please contact the CDSS Adult Programs Policy and Operations Bureau at (916) 651-5350.

Thank you,

Suzanne Love

IHSS Human Services Supervisor

DCFAS, County of Sacramento

Phone: 916-874-2018

Email: lovesu@saccounty.gov

From: Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>**Sent:** Thursday, January 30, 2025 9:20 AM**To:** Love. Suzanne <LoveSu@saccounty.gov>**Cc:** Choy. Norman <choyna@saccounty.gov>; Mary Xiong <maryxiong19@yahoo.com>; McFarland. Dianne <MCFARD@saccounty.gov>; Johnson. Jeannette <JohnsonJea@saccounty.gov>**Subject:** Re: Automatic reply: 1951916 K.X. IHSS hours & MediCal funding

⚠ **EXTERNAL EMAIL:** If unknown sender, **do not** click links/attachments. ⚠
If you have concerns about this email, please report it via the Phish Alert button.



Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

RE:1951916 K.X. IHSS hours & MediCal funding

Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Wed, Feb 5, 2025 at 9:17 AM

To: "Love. Suzanne" <LoveSu@saccounty.gov>

Cc: "Choy. Norman" <choyna@saccounty.gov>, Mary Xiong <maryxiong19@yahoo.com>, "McFarland. Dianne" <MCFARD@saccounty.gov>, "Johnson. Jeannette" <JohnsonJea@saccounty.gov>

Good morning, Ms. Love,

Thank you for your email of February 3, 2025, in which you confirmed that CDSS has verified the County's interpretation of MPP Section 30-769.734 and advised me to contact the CDSS Adult Programs Policy and Operations Bureau at (916) 651-5350 for further inquiries.

I attempted to contact them but was only able to reach voicemail, which is often the case. Given the likelihood of receiving no response or engaging in an extended phone tag, I do not believe I will be able to obtain the necessary clarification directly from CDSS. As an alternative, I would appreciate it if the County could provide me with the written regulation supporting its interpretation, as I have previously done in my correspondence.

I have conducted extensive research, and every MPP document I have found on the CDSS website aligns with my interpretation, not with the explanation provided by Ms. Lewis and yourself. This discrepancy is deeply concerning. Based on my understanding of regulations, the County is required to provide the specific regulation upon which its decision is based. To date, this has not been done. Instead, I have only received statements that appear to be interpretations rather than direct citations from official regulations.

I respectfully request that you provide the official source supporting your quotation of the regulation.

I appreciate your time and assistance and look forward to your response.

Thank you.

Yang Xiong

[Quoted text hidden]



Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

RE:1951916 K.X. IHSS hours & MediCal funding

Love. Suzanne <LoveSu@saccounty.gov>

Fri, Feb 7, 2025 at 2:52 PM

To: Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Cc: "Choy. Norman" <choyna@saccounty.gov>, Mary Xiong <maryxiong19@yahoo.com>, "McFarland. Dianne" <MCFARD@saccounty.gov>, "Johnson. Jeannette" <JohnsonJea@saccounty.gov>

Good afternoon Mr. Xiong,

As mentioned in prior correspondence, we respectfully request that you contact CDSS Adult Programs Policy and Operations Bureau for any further questions you may have about this matter. You may reach them at (916) 651-5350.

All further inquiries will be redirected to CDSS.

Thank you,

Suzanne Love

IHSS Human Services Supervisor

DCFAS, County of Sacramento

Phone: 916-874-2018

Email: lovesu@saccounty.gov

From: Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, February 5, 2025 9:18 AM

To: Love. Suzanne <LoveSu@saccounty.gov>

Cc: Choy. Norman <choyna@saccounty.gov>; Mary Xiong <maryxiong19@yahoo.com>; McFarland. Dianne <MCFARD@saccounty.gov>; Johnson. Jeannette <JohnsonJea@saccounty.gov>

Subject: Re: 1951916 K.X. IHSS hours & MediCal funding

⚠ EXTERNAL EMAIL: If unknown sender, **do not** click links/attachments. ⚠
If you have concerns about this email, please report it via the Phish Alert button.

Good morning, Ms. Love,

[Quoted text hidden]



Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Retroactive State Hearing Payment

17 messages

Cescato, Victoria A.@DSS <Victoria.Cescato@dss.ca.gov>
To: "yangcounty@gmail.com" <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Mon, Feb 24, 2025 at 2:57 PM

Hello Mr. Xiong,

I wanted to reach out to you and ask if we could set up a phone call for this Wednesday to discuss the retroactive payment from a State Hearing information. I have been directed by management to verbally walk through the guidance prior to sending written correspondence. Could you please let me know your availability this Wednesday?

Thank you

Vicki Cescato, Manager

IHSS Program Eligibility and Protective Supervision Unit

Adult Programs Division | California Department of Social Services

☎ (916) 653-1868 ✉ victoria.cescato@dss.ca.gov

Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>
To: Victoria.Cescato@dss.ca.gov

Mon, Feb 24, 2025 at 9:19 PM

Dear Ms. Cescato,

Thank you for your email.

I am available for a discussion on the following dates and times:

Tuesday, February 25, 2025:

- 8:00 AM – 11:00 AM
- 12:00 PM – 5:00 PM

Thursday, February 27, 2025:

- Available throughout the day

As we discussed on February 7, 2024, I would appreciate clarification regarding MPP Section 30.769.734—the regulation cited by the County as the authority for withholding overtime pay. The County has indicated that CDSS supports their interpretation. To help clarify my concerns, please review the attached communication that I emailed Ms. Janette Johnson, Division Manager for Sacramento County, which summarizes the issue, outlines my position, and proposes potential solutions.

I appreciate your prompt attention to this matter. I look forward to confirming a meeting on either Tuesday or Thursday to discuss this issue further.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Yang Xiong

[Quoted text hidden]

 **2.21.2025 Email to Ms. Johnson.pdf**
136K

Cescato, Victoria A.@DSS <Victoria.Cescato@dss.ca.gov>
To: Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Tue, Feb 25, 2025 at 10:56 AM

Hello Mr. Xiong,

Thank you for your email. I can schedule our discussion for Thursday, February 27, 2025 at 1:30. Please let me know if this time works for you.

[Quoted text hidden]

Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>
To: "Cescato, Victoria A.@DSS" <Victoria.Cescato@dss.ca.gov>

Tue, Feb 25, 2025 at 10:58 AM

Hello Ms. Cescato.

Thursday, February 27, 2025 at 1:30 PM works for me. I look forward to talking with you at that time.

Thanks.

Yang Xiong
[Quoted text hidden]

Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>
To: "Cescato, Victoria A.@DSS" <Victoria.Cescato@dss.ca.gov>

Thu, Feb 27, 2025 at 1:33 PM

Hello Ms. Cescato.

My wife, Mary, and I are awaiting your phone call.

Thank you.

Yang Xiong
[Quoted text hidden]

Cescato, Victoria A.@DSS <Victoria.Cescato@dss.ca.gov>
To: Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Thu, Feb 27, 2025 at 1:36 PM

Hi, do you have a different phone number? Can you provide me the number please?

[Quoted text hidden]

Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Thu, Feb 27, 2025 at 1:38 PM

To: "Cescato, Victoria A.@DSS" <Victoria.Cescato@dss.ca.gov>

My cell phone is (916) 647-7815 or my wife's (Mayr) 916-896-7267.

Call either one is fine.

Yang

[Quoted text hidden]

Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Fri, Feb 28, 2025 at 8:54 AM

To: "Cescato, Victoria A.@DSS" <Victoria.Cescato@dss.ca.gov>

Dear Ms. Cescato,

Thank you for the phone conference yesterday. I am writing to summarize our discussion.

I explained that Sacramento County IHSS mishandled the authorization of protective supervision hours, resulting in an erroneous denial of these hours beginning August 1, 2023, for my child, the IHSS recipient. Although an Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) ruled in my favor on September 4, 2024, the County retroactively authorized only 195 hours per month, rather than the 227 hours and 16 minutes to which my child was entitled.

By mid-September 2024, following my submission of additional evidence, the County acknowledged the error and confirmed my child's eligibility for 227 hours and 16 minutes per month, retroactive to August 1, 2023. However, by this time, my child's provider/mother had already submitted supplemental timesheets and received payments that correctly included standard and overtime pay for the initial 195 hours.

Despite acknowledging the additional hours owed, the County mishandled the adjustment. Rather than processing the payment through the standard payroll system, as was done previously, the County issued a special transaction check directly to my child. Furthermore, this check was \$3,872.79 short, as it failed to include overtime pay mandated by labor laws and consistent with prior payments. Since the initial 195 hours had already reached the overtime threshold, the additional 32 hours and 16 minutes owed each month should have been categorized entirely as overtime.

Due to this unresolved issue, another state hearing was held on January 2, 2025, during which the ALJ once again ruled in my favor. The judge concluded the hearing with the following remarks, as captured in the audio recording:

"I want to say, I hear what you're saying. I hear what the county is saying... It doesn't make sense to me that protective supervision can be authorized retroactively, and somebody can be prevented from receiving the full payment when they would have received the full payment had the decision been made initially... I definitely have concerns as a judge because I know I've authorized protective supervision before, and in my mind, I always thought that the person was going to be made whole."

In my view, the judge has already ruled decisively on this matter. It is now simply a matter of compliance. Should Sacramento County and CDSS fail to comply, it would render the ALJ's ruling meaningless.

Thank you, and I look forward to your written response, including citations of the regulations you claim to support your position. However, I believe I have already provided sufficient evidence, and multiple ALJs

have ruled in my favor. This matter should have been resolved long ago, and the outstanding balance of \$3,872.79 should have been issued without delay.

Sincerely,
Yang Xiong
[Quoted text hidden]

Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>
To: "Cescato, Victoria A.@DSS" <Victoria.Cescato@dss.ca.gov>

Wed, Mar 12, 2025 at 2:51 PM

Dear Ms. Cescato,

I have been waiting patiently for your written response. You and I first made contact on February 7, 2025. After several instances of phone tag, we were finally able to speak on February 27, 2025. It has now been two weeks since our last conversation.

During our call, you conveyed your message as if you had already consulted all necessary parties. However, what remains outstanding is your written response, specifically citing the regulations that state backpay for state hearings does not include overtime. In other words, your position suggests that my child does not need to be fully compensated and that partial backpay is considered appropriate.

I want to reiterate that Sacramento County has attempted to comply with the ALJ's order but has only done so partially. While some overtime has been paid, the remaining overtime remains unpaid. To be clear, a special transaction issued in September 2024 was used to circumvent the system, resulting in unpaid overtime. This practice directly contradicts the intended purpose of special transactions.

I have been waiting for a response for a considerable amount of time. Please provide your written response as soon as possible. Thank you.

Yang Xiong

[Quoted text hidden]

Cescato, Victoria A.@DSS <Victoria.Cescato@dss.ca.gov>
To: Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Thu, Mar 13, 2025 at 10:34 AM

Hello Mr. Xiong,

Thank you for your email. Our team is currently reviewing the additional information you provided during our last phone conversation. I assure you that we will provide a written response as soon as possible.

Thank you for your patience.

[Quoted text hidden]

Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>
To: "Cescato, Victoria A.@DSS" <Victoria.Cescato@dss.ca.gov>

Fri, Mar 14, 2025 at 8:39 AM

Good morning, Ms. Cescato,

You mentioned that I provided new information in our last conversation, but I have only reiterated what I previously shared with Sacramento County and CDSS. Could you clarify what you consider new so I can address it as needed?

While I appreciate your response, this process has already taken far too long. I expect this matter to be handled promptly. **Please provide clarification today so we can avoid any further delays.**

Yang Xiong
[Quoted text hidden]

Cescato, Victoria A.@DSS <Victoria.Cescato@dss.ca.gov>
To: Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Fri, Mar 14, 2025 at 1:11 PM

Hello Mr. Xiong,

The CDSS Adult Programs Division was unaware that you had already received partial payment that included overtime pay. No further clarification is required on your part. We will send you a response letter as soon as possible.

Thank you

Vicki Cescato, Manager

[Quoted text hidden]

Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>
To: "Cescato, Victoria A.@DSS" <Victoria.Cescato@dss.ca.gov>

Fri, Mar 14, 2025 at 3:06 PM

Dear Ms. Cescato,

Thank you for clarifying what CDSS considers new information. However, as I have repeatedly stated, this is not new. The very reason I pursued a hearing was that only partial overtime pay had been received. I have discussed this issue in our phone conversations and clearly documented it in my email communications with the County, which you have access to. Given this, I am disappointed that it has taken this long for CDSS to recognize this key component of the issue.

It appears that those handling this case at both Sacramento County and CDSS have failed to **thoroughly review or effectively communicate** critical details to decision-makers. As a result, I continue to face **unnecessary delays and complications**. Despite presenting all relevant information, those responsible have acted as if they were unaware of it or did not have access to it. I regret having to put it so bluntly, but after everything I have endured, I must express my frustration.

To clarify, I am the claimant on behalf of my five-year-old child, the **IHSS recipient**, with his mother as the provider. Following the **ALJ's decision in my favor in September 2024**, supplemental timesheets were issued, and she was **paid appropriately, including overtime**, based on the **initially authorized but incorrect monthly hours**. We accepted this as a first step while continuing to work with Sacramento County to ensure full compliance with the ALJ's order.

However, another issue arose when Sacramento County **refused to issue supplemental timesheets** for the remaining **32 hours and 16 minutes** of backpay (**August 1, 2023 – September 30, 2024**). Instead, they processed a **special transaction** but **failed to include the overtime amount**, creating yet another **avoidable and unresolved issue**.

I am willing to accept the decision not to issue the remaining overtime backpay **if it is clearly demonstrated that I am wrong**. This concerns **\$3,872.79**—a sum far outweighed by the time and effort I have already invested. However, this is not just about the amount; it is about **accountability, adherence to regulations, and ensuring due process**.

To date, Sacramento County and CDSS have **failed to provide any valid justification** for denying this payment. In contrast, I have presented **clear evidence** of the County's mishandling of this issue, as confirmed by **two ALJ decisions in my favor, issued on September 4, 2024 and January 2, 2025**.

I appreciate your prompt attention to this matter and look forward to your response.

Yang Xiong

[Quoted text hidden]

Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>
To: "Cescato, Victoria A.@DSS" <Victoria.Cescato@dss.ca.gov>

Mon, Apr 7, 2025 at 10:38 AM

Dear Ms. Cescato,

It has been exactly two months since our initial contact, and my last communication with you was on March 14, 2025, clearly outlining my position regarding the outstanding overtime payment. While some overtime has been compensated, an unpaid balance of \$3,872.79 remains for the period from August 1, 2023 through September 30, 2024.

To resolve this matter, please either issue the remaining payment or provide clear, documented regulations justifying the denial of these overtime hours. If payment is denied, I require an explanation as to why some overtime hours were compensated while others were not, especially considering my child has only one provider—his mother.

I trust you understand my frustration and will respond promptly. I prefer to resolve this without further escalation.

Thank you for your prompt attention.

Sincerely,
Yang Xiong

[Quoted text hidden]

Cescato, Victoria A.@DSS <Victoria.Cescato@dss.ca.gov>
To: Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>
Cc: "McNulty, Michael@DSS" <Michael.McNulty@dss.ca.gov>, "Teresi, Tony@DSS" <Tony.Teresi@dss.ca.gov>

Mon, Apr 7, 2025 at 3:29 PM

Hello Mr. Xiong,

Thank you for your email. We have provided the policy pursuant to MPP Sections 30-769.252 (a) and 30-769.734 which state that the county shall issue Special Transaction checks for payments resulting from retroactive hearing decisions, and those payments are made to the recipient. These regulations apply to this situation as well as every other state hearing decision. State Hearing decision payments are always made to the recipient and do not include overtime. Unfortunately, it appears that Sacramento County provided partial payment which incorrectly included overtime pay.

We will provide a final communication and determination as soon as possible.

[Quoted text hidden]

McNulty, Michael@DSS <Michael.McNulty@dss.ca.gov>
To: Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>
Cc: "Teresi, Tony@DSS" <Tony.Teresi@dss.ca.gov>, "Cescato, Victoria A.@DSS" <Victoria.Cescato@dss.ca.gov>

Thu, Apr 10, 2025 at 1:51 PM

Good afternoon Mr. Xiong,

Thank you for your patience as we completed our research on your case and request for unpaid overtime. As my manager shared below, the policy has been, and remains, that payments resulting from state hearing decisions awarding retroactive benefits are always made to the recipient and do not include overtime. The payment is for benefits owed to the recipient, and not time worked by a provider. Therefore, overtime is not applicable.

These regulations are further supported by Welfare and Institutions Code section 10961 which states, "The decision of the director need not specify the amount of the award to be paid unless the amount of award is an issue. If the decision is in favor of the applicant or recipient, the county department shall pay to the applicant or recipient, without the necessity of establishing his or her present need, the amount of aid the director finds he or she is entitled to receive pursuant to the director's decision..."

After a thorough review of your case, and the state hearing decision, we have determined that you received partial state hearing payment via supplemental time sheets, which included overtime, in error. We apologize for any confusion and will direct that the county not seek any overpayment for this specific case.

If you should have any additional questions regarding your child's IHSS services, please contact and work with your child's assigned social worker.

Thank you,

Michael McNulty (he, him, his) | Bureau Chief

Policy and Operations Bureau | Adult Programs Division

[California Department of Social Services](#)

[Quoted text hidden]

Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Thu, Apr 17, 2025 at 7:51 AM

To: Michael.McNulty@dss.ca.gov

Cc: "Teresi, Tony@DSS" <Tony.Teresi@dss.ca.gov>, "Cescato, Victoria A.@DSS" <Victoria.Cescato@dss.ca.gov>

Good morning Mr. McNulty and Ms. Cescato,

Thank you for sending the long-awaited regulations I requested. I will review your position carefully and follow up with any questions or comments as soon as possible.

Best regards,
Yang Xiong

[Quoted text hidden]

COUNTY REPORT OF COMPLIANCE TRANSMITTAL

Due within 30 days of receipt of decision.

Attn: Department of Social Services/Compliance Unit
Via ACMS

Name/Address (if changed)	State Hearing #	Adopt Date	Compliance Notification Date	Effective Date	Code(s) or Brief Statement
<u>Client's Name:</u> XIONG, KALEB Enter claimants address if changed	105072660 Hearing #	01/02/2025 Date on CF	01/22/2025 Date of compliance notification	08/01/2023 Enter effective date	<u>CODE: D</u> Enter brief statement 1

I certify that the above compliance information is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Name <i>Yolanda Lewis</i>	Phone Number (916) 874-9981	Date 01/27/2025
------------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------------

COMPLIANCE CODE OPTIONS

*Use program code (letter) for each program in which a compliance action is required.

*Use one or more action codes(number) for each program code.

PROGRAM CODES

- A. CalWORKS
- B. CalFresh
- C. Medi-Cal
- D. IHSS
- E. Foster Care
- F. Other: list program

ACTION CODES

1. Action rescinded - Benefits determined and issued as eligible.
2. Action rescinded - Benefits not determined or issued due to lack of information.
3. Entitlement received as aid pending (APP).
4. No eligibility for retroactive benefits found.
5. OP or OI reduced/cancelled as ordered.
6. Retro benefits reduced or not issued due to balancing against existing OP/OI.
7. SOC changed as ordered.
8. County has offered assistance to the claimant in obtaining reimbursement for any Medi-Cal covered expenses incurred.
9. Delayed compliance (brief explanation). Wait for follow up transmittal.
10. Other : (brief explanation).



JENNIFER TROIA
DIRECTOR

STATE OF CALIFORNIA—HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

State Hearings Division

PO Box 944243, MS 9-17-442 Sacramento, CA 94244-2430
PHONE: 800-743-8525 FAX: 1-833-281-0905



GAVIN NEWSOM
GOVERNOR

COMPLIANCE COMPLETED

January 29, 2025

RE: SHN-105072660

Sacramento County has notified the State Hearings Division that it complied with your state hearing decision. If you believe Sacramento County did not carry out all the actions ordered in your decision, contact them to discuss your concerns. If after contacting Sacramento County you still have questions or concerns, you may call this department at 1-800-743-8525.

If Sacramento County issued you a new notice of action, and you do not agree with it, you may ask for a new hearing.

You may reach the State Hearings Division by calling:

Toll-Free: (800) 743-8525 or (855) 795-0634

Public Inquiry and Response (PIAR): (800) 952-5253

Fax: (833) 281-0905

STATE HEARINGS DIVISION

CC:

Sacramento County

COUNTY REPORT OF COMPLIANCE TRANSMITTAL

Due within 30 days of receipt of decision.

Attn: Department of Social Services/Compliance Unit
Via ACMS

Name/Address (if changed)	State Hearing #	Adopt Date	Compliance Notification Date	Effective Date	Code(s) or Brief Statement
<u>Client's Name:</u> XIONG, KALEB Enter claimants address if changed	R-105019726 Hearing #	09/03/2024 Date on CF	09/11/2024 Date of compliance notification	08/01/2023 Enter effective date	<u>CODE: D</u> Enter brief statement 1

I certify that the above compliance information is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Name <i>Yolanda Lewis</i>	Phone Number (916) 874-9981	Date 9/12/2024
------------------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------

COMPLIANCE CODE OPTIONS

*Use program code (letter) for each program in which a compliance action is required.

*Use one or more action codes(number) for each program code.

PROGRAM CODES

- A. CalWORKS
- B. CalFresh
- C. Medi-Cal
- D. IHSS
- E. Foster Care
- F. Other: list program

ACTION CODES

1. Action rescinded - Benefits determined and issued as eligible.
2. Action rescinded - Benefits not determined or issued due to lack of information.
3. Entitlement received as aid pending (APP).
4. No eligibility for retroactive benefits found.
5. OP or OI reduced/cancelled as ordered.
6. Retro benefits reduced or not issued due to balancing against existing OP/OI.
7. SOC changed as ordered.
8. County has offered assistance to the claimant in obtaining reimbursement for any Medi-Cal covered expenses incurred.
9. Delayed compliance (brief explanation). Wait for follow up transmittal.
10. Other : (brief explanation).



KIM JOHNSON
DIRECTOR

STATE OF CALIFORNIA—HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

State Hearings Division

PO Box 944243, MS 9-17-442 Sacramento, CA 94244-2430
PHONE: 800-743-8525 FAX: 1-833-281-0905



GAVIN NEWSOM
GOVERNOR

COMPLIANCE COMPLETED

September 13, 2024

RE: SHN-R-105019726

Sacramento County has notified the State Hearings Division that it complied with your state hearing decision. If you believe Sacramento County did not carry out all the actions ordered in your decision, contact them to discuss your concerns. If after contacting Sacramento County you still have questions or concerns, you may call this department at 1-800-743-8525.

If Sacramento County issued you a new notice of action, and you do not agree with it, you may ask for a new hearing.

You may reach the State Hearings Division by calling:

Toll-Free: (800) 743-8525 or (855) 795-0634

Public Inquiry and Response (PIAR): (800) 952-5253

Fax: (833) 281-0905

STATE HEARINGS DIVISION

CC:

Sacramento County

Nicole Stemet



Exhibit D

CDSS

JENNIFER TROIA
DIRECTOR

CALIFORNIA HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

State Hearings Division – IHSS Bureau
888 S. Figueroa Street, Suite 700, Los Angeles, CA 90017
(213) 337.6243 FAX: (213) 337.6244
www.cdss.ca.gov



Page 3/3

GAVIN NEWSOM
GOVERNOR

December 10, 2024

Yang Xiong
9582 Village Tree Dr.
Elk Grove, California 95758-1198

Nicole Stemet
Legal Services of Northern California
Via ACMS Notification

**RE: Yang Xiong
SHN-R-105019726 - Compliance Request re Provider Payment**

Dear Yang Xiong and Nicole Stemet,

The State Hearings Division (SHD) has reviewed your request regarding non-compliance with state hearing decision R-105019726, issued on September 4, 2024.

The Judge ordered the following:

The claim is granted.

Sacramento County (county) shall authorize the child for Protective Supervision effective August 1, 2023; notify the child in writing of its actions; and aid the child as otherwise eligible.

The order does not address payment, nor would State Hearings Division have subject matter jurisdiction over provider payment issues. Please direct all payment issues to Sacramento County and/or the Adult Program at (866) 376-7066.

If you wish to file a new hearing on another matter, you can contact the State Hearings Division.

Sincerely,

/s/ Maria Palomares,
Presiding Administrative Law Judge
IHSS Bureau



SACRAMENTO COUNTY
IN HOME SUPPORTIVE SERVICES
P.O. BOX 269131
SACRAMENTO, CA 95826

Worker code: _____

1882

RECEIVED
01/28/2025

95758261198 R005

POSTNET barcode



US POSTAGE
METER BY BOWERS
ZIP 95827 \$ 000.97⁰
02 4W
0000345463 JAN 23 2025

NOTICE OF ACTION
IN-HOME SUPPORTIVE SERVICES (IHSS)
CHANGE

COUNTY OF Sacramento

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
 HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY
 CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

Page 2 of 2

Notice Date : 01/22/2025
 Case Name : KALEB XIONG
 Case Number : 1951916
 Social Worker Name : NORMAN CHOY
 Social Worker Number : D882
 Social Worker Telephone : 916-874-9471
 Social Worker Address :

P.O. Box 269131
 Sacramento, CA 95826

NOTE: This notice relates ONLY to your In-Home Supportive Services. It does NOT affect your receipt of SSI/SSP, Social Security or Medi-Cal. **KEEP THIS NOTICE WITH YOUR IMPORTANT PAPERS.**

(ADDRESSEE)
 KALEB XIONG
 9582 Village Tree DR Elk
 Grove, CA 95758-1198

As of 08/01/2023, the services you can get and/or the amount of time you can get for services has changed.
Here's Why:
Total Hours:Minutes of IHSS you can get each month is now: 227:16. This is a/an increase/decrease of +32:16.

You will now get the services shown below for amount of time shown in the column "Authorized Amount of Service You Can Get." That column shows the hours/minutes you got before, the hours/minutes you will get from now on, and the difference. If you are getting less time for a service, the reason(s) is shown on the next page.

- 1) If there is a zero in the "Authorized Amount of Service You Can Get" column or the amount is less than the "Total Amount of Service Needed" column, the reason is explained on the next page(s).
- 2) "Not Needed" means that your social worker found that you do not require assistance with this task. (MPP 30-756.11)
- 3) "Pending" means the county is waiting for more information to see if you need that service. See the next page(s) for more information.

SERVICES <i>NOTE: See the back of the next page for a short description of each service.</i>	TOTAL AMOUNT OF SERVICE NEEDED	ADJUSTMENT FOR OTHERS WHO SHARE THE HOME (PRORATION)	AMOUNT OF SERVICE YOU NEED	SERVICES YOU REFUSED OR YOU GET FROM OTHERS	AUTHORIZED AMOUNT OF SERVICE YOU CAN GET HOURS:MINUTES		
	HOURS:MINUTES		HOURS:MINUTES		NOW	WAS	+/-
	DOMESTIC SERVICES (per MONTH):	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00
RELATED SERVICES (per WEEK):							
Prepare Meals	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00
Meal Clean-up	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00
Routine Laundry	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00
Shopping for Food	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00
Other Shopping/Errands	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00
NON-MEDICAL PERSONAL SERVICES (per WEEK):							
Respiration Assistance (Help with Breathing)	00:00		00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00
Bowel, Bladder Care	04:23		04:23	00:00	04:23	04:23	00:00
Feeding	00:00		00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00
Routine Bed Bath	00:00		00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00
Dressing	00:00		00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00
Menstrual Care	00:00		00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00
Ambulation (Help with Walking, including Getting In/Out of Vehicles)	00:00		00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00
Transferring (Help Moving In/Out of Bed, On/Off Seats, etc.)	01:34		01:34	00:00	01:34	01:34	00:00
Bathing, Oral Hygiene, Grooming	00:00		00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00
Rubbing Skin, Repositioning	00:00		00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00
Help with Prosthesis (Artificial Limb, Visual/Hearing Aid) and/or Setting up Medications	00:00		00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00
ACCOMPANIMENT (per WEEK):							
To/From Medical Appointments	00:05		00:05	00:00	00:05	00:05	00:00
To/From Places You Get Services in Place of IHSS	01:25		01:25	00:00	01:25	01:25	00:00
PROTECTIVE SUPERVISION (per WEEK):	168:00		160:33	00:00	45:02	37:35	+07:27
PARAMEDICAL SERVICES (per WEEK):	00:00		00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00
TOTAL WEEKLY HOURS:MINUTES OF SERVICE YOU CAN GET:					52:29		
MULTIPLY BY 4.33 (average # of weeks per month) TO CONVERT TO MONTHLY HOURS:MINUTES:					x 4.33 =		
SUBTOTAL MONTHLY HOURS:MINUTES OF SERVICE YOU CAN GET:					227:16		
ADD MONTHLY DOMESTIC HOURS:MINUTES OF SERVICE YOU CAN GET (from above):					00:00		
TOTAL HOURS:MINUTES OF SERVICE YOU CAN GET PER MONTH:					227:16		

TIME LIMITED SERVICES (per MONTH):							
Heavy Cleaning:	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00	
Yard Hazard Abatement	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00	
Remove Ice, Snow	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00	
Teaching and Demonstration	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00	00:00	
TOTAL HOURS:MINUTES OF TIME LIMITED SERVICES YOU CAN GET PER MONTH:					00:00		

Questions?: Please contact your IHSS social worker. See top of page for phone number.
State Hearing: If you think this action is wrong, you can ask for a hearing. The back of this page tells how.

1. You have the right to ask for a conference with the county to talk about this action. At the conference you can speak for yourself, or someone else (a lawyer, relative, friend, or other person) can speak for you. If you want a conference, contact the county.
2. Whether or not you ask for a conference, you also have the right to ask for a hearing if you disagree with any county action. You have only 90 days to ask for a hearing. The 90 days started the day after the county gave or mailed you this notice.
3. If you ask for a hearing before an action on your In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) takes place, your services will continue until the hearing. If you make your request in good faith, you will not have to repay any money you receive for services you get pending the hearing, even if the hearing decision says the county's action was right.
4. You can ask for a hearing in person or in writing. You have to say that you want a hearing and tell the reason(s) you want one.
5. You can ask for a hearing on your own or you can ask the county for assistance. Either way, you should tell your worker as soon as possible.
6. At a hearing, you can speak for yourself, or someone else (a lawyer, relative, friend, or other person) can speak for you. You can get free legal help at your local legal aid or welfare rights office. For a legal aid referral, call the toll-free number listed on this page.
7. If you do not want to go to the hearing alone, you can bring a relative, friend, or other person with you.
8. You can review the regulations about hearings at your local IHSS office.
9. Information Practices: The information you give to ask for a hearing is required to process your request according to state law. A case file will be made up for the hearing and you have the right to look at the information in the file. Any information you give may be shared with the county or the United States Department of Health and Human Services.

- Fill out this page.
- Make a copy of the front and back of this page for your records. If you ask, your worker will get you a copy of this page.
- Send this page to:

California Department of Social Services
State Hearings Division
P.O. Box 944243
Mail Station 8-16-50
Sacramento, CA 94244-2430

OR Call toll free:
11-800-952-5253 or for hearing or speech impair
who use TDD, 1-800-952-8349.

REQUEST FOR HEARING:

I want a hearing because I disagree with the action of the county regarding my social services. Here's why:

- If you need more space, check box and add a page.
- I need the state to provide me with an interpreter at no cost to me. (A relative or friend cannot interpret for you at the hearing.) My language or dialect is:

PERSON WHOSE SOCIAL SERVICES WERE DENIED, CHANGED OR STOPPED

Telephone _____ Birthdate _____

Street Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip Code _____

Signature _____ Date _____

NAME OF PERSON COMPLETING THIS FORM

- I want the person named below to represent me at this hearing. I give my permission for this person to see my records and/or go to the hearing for me. (This person can be a friend or relative but this person cannot interpret for you.)

Name _____

Telephone _____

Street Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip Code _____

NOTICE OF ACTION

COUNTY OF Sacramento

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

IN-HOME SUPPORTIVE SERVICES (IHSS) CHANGE (CONTINUED)

Notice Date: 01/22/2025
Case Name: KALEB XIONG
Case Number: 1951916

As of 08/01/2023, you will no longer get In-Home Supportive Services through the IHSS Plus Option (IPO) Program (W&IC 14132.952)

You will now get IHSS through the Community First Choice Option (CFCO) Program (W&IC 14132.956)

You will get services from the CFCO Program because your authorized services, due to an assessed change in your condition, meet the requirements for the CFCO program.

Your hours of service are increased. Here's why: You now receive your services from the CFCO program, which allows you to receive 195 hours of Protective Supervision plus additional hours for your other IHSS services (W&IC 14132.956).

All or some of your IHSS services will be provided by a person selected by you. Please contact the county IHSS office when you select a provider(s). (MPP 30-767)

As of 08/01/2023, you can get 45 hours, 2 minutes per week of protective supervision services. At your last assessment we found that you are mentally impaired or mentally ill and you cannot assess when something is dangerous and take action to avoid getting hurt. You need 24-hour supervision to help you avoid getting hurt. During times outside of IHSS authorized protective supervision, supervision must be provided through another agency or person to make sure you have supervision 24-hours a day. [MPP 30-757.171]

The amount of hours/minutes per week of protective supervision services you will get is shown on the first page of this notice. This is the amount of service you need or the weekly program limit, whichever is less. The number of protective supervision hours you can get is calculated by subtracting your weekly hours for other IHSS services and subtracting your alternative resource hours from 168 hours, which is one week of the 24-hour supervision you need to help you avoid getting hurt. The weekly program limit on the number of hours you can get depends on if you are severely or non-severely impaired, and the funding program for your services. The county decides if you are severely impaired under regulations at MPP Section 30-701(s)(1)(A)-(D).

The maximum number of Protective Supervision hours you may receive per month is 195 because you receive your IHSS services through the CFCO program. (MPP 30-765; MPP 30-780)

You get IHSS as a service of your Medi-Cal. See your Medi-Cal notice for information about your Medi-Cal eligibility and any Medi-Cal share-of-cost you may have to pay.

If you have a share-of-cost, a letter will be sent to you each time one of your providers' timesheets are processed telling you how much you need to pay your provider.

This Notice of Action reflects the outcome of your state hearing. To comply with the order, you received a one-time payment issued 09/26/2024 for the months of August 2023-September 2024. This Notice of Action replaces the Notices of Action issued 9/11/2024 and 9/20/2024. (MPP 22-078.21)

Free legal assistance for your IHSS case may be available from:
Legal Services of Northern California - Sacramento (916) 551-2150
Or
Coalition of California Welfare Rights Organizations (CCWRO) (916) 736-0616

You must immediately tell the county about any changes that might affect your eligibility or need for IHSS, including changes in income, property, living arrangements, medical conditions or the ability to work. If you have any questions or think more facts should be considered, call your social worker.

Rules: The applicable Manual of Policies and Procedure (MPP) sections are shown above and on the previous page in parentheses. You may review the MPP at your local IHSS office.

Questions?: Please contact your IHSS social worker.

State Hearing: If you think this action is wrong, you can ask for a hearing. The back of the first page of this notice tells how.

IN-HOME SUPPORTIVE SERVICES (IHSS) DESCRIPTION OF SERVICES

DOMESTIC SERVICES

General household chores to maintain the cleanliness of the home. [MPP 30-757.11]

RELATED SERVICES

Meal Preparation: Planning menus, preparing foods, cooking and serving meals. [MPP 30-757.131]

Meal Clean-up: Cleaning up the cooking area and washing, drying and putting away cookware, dishes and utensils. [MPP 30-757.132]

Routine Laundry: Washing, drying, folding and putting away clothes and household linens. [MPP 30-757.134]

Shopping for Food: Making a grocery list, traveling to/from the store, shopping, loading, unloading, and storing food purchased. [MPP 30-757.135(b)]

Other Shopping/Errands:

1. Shopping for other necessary supplies; and
2. Performing small and necessary errands, e.g., picking up a prescription. [MPP 30-757.135(c)]

NON-MEDICAL PERSONAL SERVICES

Respiration Assistance: Assisting the recipient with nonmedical breathing related services such as self-administration of oxygen and cleaning breathing machines. [MPP 30-757.14(b)]

Bowel and/or Bladder Care: Assisting the recipient with using the toilet (including getting on/off), bedpan/bedside commode or urinal; emptying and cleaning ostomy bag, enema and/or catheter receptacles; applying diapers, disposable undergarments and disposable barrier pads; wiping and cleaning recipient; and washing/drying recipient's hands. [MPP 30-757.14(a)]

Feeding: Assisting the recipient to eat meals, including cleaning their face and hands before and after meals. [MPP 30-757.14(c)]

Routine Bed Bath: Giving a recipient who is confined to bed a routine sponge bath. [MPP 30-757.14(d)]

Dressing: Assisting the recipient to put on and take off their clothes as necessary throughout the day. [MPP 30-757.14(f)]

Menstrual Care: Assistance with the external placement of sanitary napkins and barrier pads. [MPP 30-757.14(j)]

CONTINUES ON THE NEXT PAGE →

NON-MEDICAL PERSONAL SERVICES (CONTINUED)

Ambulation and Getting In/Out of Vehicles: Assisting the recipient with walking or moving about the home, including to/from the bathroom, and to/from and into/out of the car for transporting to medical appointments and/or alternative resources. [MPP 30-757.14(k)]

Transfer (Moving In/Out of Bed and/or On/Off Seats): Assisting the recipient from standing, sitting, or prone position to another position and/or from one piece of furniture or equipment to another. [MPP 30-757.14(h)]

Bathing, Oral Hygiene and/or Grooming: Assisting the recipient with bathing or showering; brushing teeth, flossing, and cleaning dentures; shampooing, drying, and combing/brushing hair; shaving; and applying lotion, powder, deodorant. [MPP 30-757.14(e)]

Rubbing Skin and Repositioning: Rubbing skin to promote circulation and/or prevent skin breakdown; turning in bed and other types of repositioning; and supervising range of motion exercises. [MPP 30-757.14(g)]

Care of/Assistance with Prosthesis and Help Setting Up Medications: Taking off/ putting on and maintaining and cleaning prosthetic devices, including vision/hearing aids; reminding the recipient to take prescribed and/or over-the-counter medications, and setting up Medi-sets. [MPP 30-757.14(i)]

TRANSPORTATION SERVICES

Transporting recipient to and from:

1. Appointments with physicians, dentists and other health practitioners; or
2. Sites necessary for fitting health related appliances/devices and special clothing, when transportation for these purposes is not provided under Medi-Cal.

This also includes transporting the recipient to sites where alternative resources provide in-home supportive services to the recipient in place of IHSS. [MPP 30-757.15]

HEAVY CLEANING

Thorough cleaning of the home to remove hazardous debris or dirt. Authorized one time only and only under certain circumstances. [MPP 30-757.12]

YARD HAZARD ABATEMENT

Light work in the yard to:

1. Remove high grass or weeds, and rubbish when these materials pose a fire hazard (authorized one time only); or
2. Remove ice, snow or other hazardous substances from entrances and essential walkways when these materials make access to the home hazardous. [MPP 30-757.16]

PROTECTIVE SUPERVISION

Protective Supervision is when an IHSS provider watches a person who is mentally impaired or mentally ill on a continual basis to prevent them from doing things which will cause them to get hurt. [MPP 30-757.17]

TEACHING AND DEMONSTRATION SERVICES

Teaching and demonstrating those services provided by IHSS providers so the recipient can perform services which are currently performed by IHSS providers by themselves. Certain limitations apply. [MPP 30-757.18]

PARAMEDICAL SERVICES

Services meeting the following conditions:

1. Activities which recipients would normally perform themselves if they did not have functional limitations;
2. Activities which, due to the recipient's physical or mental condition, are necessary to maintain the recipient's health; and
3. Activities which include the administration of medications, puncturing the skin, or inserting a medical device into a body orifice, activities requiring sterile procedures, or requiring a judgment based on training given by a licensed health care professional.

Special limitations apply. [MPP 30-757.19]

FOR A MORE DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF SERVICES, YOU MAY VIEW THE MANUAL OF POLICY AND PROCEDURES (MPP) SECTIONS REFERENCED ABOVE AT YOUR LOCAL WELFARE OFFICE.

For assistance with the hearings process, you can contact the State Hearings Division at 1-855-795-0634. An interpreter will be provided to you at no cost.

SPANISH:	Para obtener asistencia con el proceso de audiencias, puede comunicarse con la División de Audiencias Estatales al 1-855-795-0634. Se le facilitará un intérprete sin costo alguno.
TRAD CHINESE:	有關聽證會流程的幫助，可撥打 1-855-795-0634 與州聽證處聯絡。我們將免費為您提供翻譯。
TAGALOG:	Para sa tulong sa proseso ng pagdinig, maaari kang makipag-ugnay sa Sangay ng mga Pagdinig ng Estado sa 1-855-795-0634. Isang tagasalin sa ibang wika ang ibibigay sa iyo nang walang gastos.
VIETNAMESE:	Để được trợ giúp về quy trình điều trần, quý vị có thể gọi Phòng Điều Trần Tiểu Bang ở số 1-855-795-0634. Quý vị sẽ được cung cấp miễn phí một thông dịch viên.
KOREAN:	심리공청회 진행 과정에 도움이 필요하시면, 주 정부 심리공청회 사무국, 1-855-795-0634 번으로 연락하여 주십시오. 귀하에게 통역 서비스를 무료로 제공해 드립니다.
CAMBODIAN:	សូមបំប៉នយក្នុងដំណើរការសវនាការស្តីពីការស្តាប់សំឡេង។ State Hearings Division ៧៩ 1-855-795-0634 ។ អ្នកបកប្រែសិន្យបានផ្តល់ឱ្យអ្នកដោយឥតគិតថ្លៃ។
HMONG:	Yog xav paub tus txheej txheem ntawm cov rooj sib tham los mloog ob tog cov lus, koj yuav hu tau rau lub Xeev Qhov Chaw Tuav Dejnum Rau Kev Teem Rooj Sib Tham Los Mloog Ob Tog Cos Lus (State Hearing Division) ntawm 1-855-795-0634. Yuav npaj muaj ib tus kws txhais lus pub dawb rau koj.
ARABIC:	للحصول على المساعدة بشأن عملية جلسات الاستماع، يمكنك الاتصال بقسم جلسات الاستماع في الولاية على الهاتف رقم 1-855-795-0634. سوف تزود بمترجم شفهي بدون أن تتحمل أي تكلفة.
ARMENIAN:	Եթե լսում և ներքին գործընթացի վերաբերյալ ունեք օգնություն անկարելի, գանգառեք Երևանի քաղաքում գտնվող լսում և ներքին բաժնի: Հեղադրեք լսումը և արձանագրեք քաղաքում գտնվող բաժնի:
FARSI:	برای دریافت کمک در روال رسیدگی قضایی، می توانید از طریق شماره تلفن 1-855-795-0634 با بخش دادرسی ایالتی تماس بگیرید. یک مترجم به صورت رایگان در اختیارتان قرار خواهد گرفت.
PUNJABI:	ਸੁਣਵਾਈ ਦੀ ਪ੍ਰਕਿਰਿਆ ਵਿੱਚ ਸਹਾਇਤਾ ਲਈ, ਤੁਸੀਂ 1-855-795-0634 'ਤੇ ਸਟੇਟ ਹਿਅਰਿੰਗ ਡਿਵੀਜ਼ਨ ਨਾਲ ਸੰਪਰਕ ਕਰ ਸਕਦੇ ਹੋ। ਤੁਹਾਨੂੰ ਬਿਨਾਂ ਕਿਸੇ ਕੀਮਤ 'ਤੇ ਇੱਕ ਦੁਬਾਸ਼ੀਆ ਮੁਹੱਈਆ ਕੀਤਾ ਜਾਵੇਗਾ।
RUSSIAN:	Для получения помощи в процессе проведения слушания вы можете обратиться в Отдел слушаний штата по телефону 1-855-795-0634. Вам будут предоставлены бесплатные услуги устного переводчика.
HINDI:	सुनवाई प्रक्रिया में सहायता के लिए, आप राज्य सुनवाई डिवीजन से 1-855-795-0634 पर संपर्क कर सकते हैं। आपको बिना किसी कीमत के एक दुभाषिया प्रदान किया जाएगा।
JAPANESE:	この聴聞手続について手助けを必要とされる場合は、州政府聴聞課（電話番号 1-855-795-0634）にご連絡ください。この場合、通訳のサービスが無料で提供されることとなります。
LAO:	ສຳລັບການຊ່ວຍເຫຼືອໃນຂະບວນການໄຕ່ສວນພິຈາລະນາຄະດີ, ທ່ານສາມາດຕິດຕໍ່ພະແນກການໄຕ່ສວນຂອງລັດຢູ່ 1-855-795-0634. ຈະມີນາຍແປພາສາໃຫ້ທ່ານຟຣີ.
THAI:	ท่านสามารถติดต่อแผนกการพิจารณาคดีของรัฐที่หมายเลข 1-855-795-0634 เพื่อขอความช่วยเหลือในกระบวนการพิจารณาคดี จะมีการจัดเตรียมบริการล่ามให้คุณโดยไม่มีค่าใช้จ่าย

APPEAL RIGHTS

Your hearing decision is attached to this letter.

Compliance Information

If there is an order for the agency or health plan to do something:

- They have to report to State Hearings what work they are doing to carry out the decision. This report is due 30 calendar days after the decision.
- Managed care plans (including Mental Health, Dental, and Substance Use Disorder plans) must carry out the decision within 72 hours.
- If the agency or Plan has not carried out or are not carrying out the decision, call 800-743-8525. We will follow up with the agency or health plan. You will be told the result.

If You Disagree with Your Hearing Decision

There are two ways to appeal. You can ask for a rehearing and you can also go to court. You may wish to call your local Legal Aid office. They may be able to help with your appeal. A list of Legal Aid organizations is on the State Hearings website. You may also call 411 and ask for the phone number of your local free Legal Aid organization.

Review of Your Hearing Decision (all except Covered California cases)

You can ask for a review of your decision. This is called a rehearing.

You must ask for a rehearing within 30 calendar days after you get the hearing decision. If you show a good reason for not asking for a rehearing within 30 calendar days, your time limit may be up to 180 days. In some cases, the time limit to ask for a rehearing may be longer.

In your rehearing request:

- List the date you got the decision

- Explain why a rehearing should be granted
- If you want us to review new evidence:
 - describe the new evidence
 - explain why you did not give it to the judge during the hearing or during any extra time given to turn in evidence
 - tell us how you think that evidence would change the decision
 - if you can, send us a copy of the new evidence

If your case is **not** a Covered California case, send a written request to the State Hearings Rehearing Unit. This can be done by:

- **Online Appeals Account:** <https://acms.dss.ca.gov/acms/>
- **Email:** SHDRehearings@dss.ca.gov
- **Fax number:** 833-281-0902
- **Mail to: (Allow at least 5 days for mailing. Keep your originals.)**

State Hearings Division

PO Box 944243, MS 9-16-431, Sacramento, CA 94244-2430

Review of Covered California Hearing Decisions

If you disagree with your hearing decision about Covered California, you may appeal in writing to Health Insurance Marketplace. This includes:

- Any decision regarding Covered California Health Plan eligibility and enrollment
- Advanced Payments of Premium Tax Credits
- Cost Sharing Reductions

You must do this within 30 calendar days after you get the decision. Your appeal may still be reviewed after 30 calendar days if you have a good reason for sending it in late. Explain the reason for the late appeal.

Send this request to: Health Insurance Marketplace, 465 Industrial Blvd., London, KY 40750-0061.

You can also fax in your appeal request. Include any copies of documents you think help your case. Fax to: 1-877-369-0130.

You have a right to get free help and information about your Covered California appeal.

Call 1-800-318-2596 for help in your language.

Court Review

For all decisions you can go to court without asking for a rehearing. You can also go to court after asking for a rehearing. You must ask for court review within one year of the date you got the decision. To ask for court review, you must file a "petition" in Superior Court. The law about this is found at California Code of Civil Procedure section 1094.5. You will not have to pay court filing fees. If you win in court, and had a lawyer represent you, you may be able to get reasonable attorney's fees and costs.

California Department of Social Services
Department of Health Care Services

DECISION

Hearing No. 105072660

In the Matter of Claimant(s):

Yang Xiong
9582 VILLAGE TREE DR,
ELK GROVE, CA 95758-1198
yangcounty@gmail.com

Pursuant to the authority of the Director, I adopt the attached final decision.



Angelika Oliver
Administrative Law Judge

Adopt Date: **January 02, 2025**

Hearing Information

Hearing Date: December 19, 2024 10:00 AM

Release Date: January 2, 2025

Aid Pending: No

Issue Codes: 615-1

Language: ENGLISH

Responsible Agency: Sacramento County

Attendees

Attendee Type	Attendee
----------------------	-----------------

<i>Hearing Rep:</i>	Yolanda Lewis, Sacramento County
---------------------	----------------------------------

SUMMARY

Sacramento County (county) incorrectly authorized the child's In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) benefits at 195 hours per month, effective August 1, 2023, as the child requires 227:16 (hours: minutes) per month of IHSS benefits, effective August 1, 2023, to remain safely at home, under the Community First Choice Option (CFCO) program.

[615-1]

FACTS

By Notice of Action dated October 6, 2023, Sacramento County (county) approved IHSS for the child (the recipient) effective August 1, 2023. The county authorized IHSS for 6:04 (hours: minutes) per month and denied Protective Supervision effective August 1, 2023.

Pursuant to SHN 105019726, which was heard on July 29, 2024, and the rehearing decision adopted on September 3, 2024, the ALJ determined the child eligible for Protective Supervision. The county issued the Notice of Action dated September 11, 2024, authorizing the child 195 hours per month effective August 1, 2023.

By Notice of Action dated September 20, 2024, the county authorized the child 227:16 (hours: minutes) per month effective October 1, 2024, an increase of 32:16 (hours: minutes) per month from the prior authorization for services. The notice placed the child in the CFCO program.

On September 24, 2024, the county authorized a special transaction check for the difference between 227:16 (hours: minutes) per month and the 195 hours per month that was originally paid out for that period from August 1, 2023, to August 31, 2024.

On October 3, 2024, the claimant, who is the child's father, requested a hearing to dispute that the county properly complied with the order from SHN 105019726.

A noticed hearing was held on December 27, 2024. The county representative, claimant, and the claimant's wife/ the child's mother appeared by phone.

Documentary Evidence Submitted:

Prior to the hearing, the county representative submitted a Statement of Position setting forth the county's arguments, which included the following attachments: Notice of Actions, dated September 11, 2024, and September 20, 2024; Timesheet/ Payment from August 1, 2023, through August 31, 2023, and a special transaction check dated September 26, 2024.

Prior to the hearing, the claimant a statement of position and a rebuttal to the county's evidence which included the following additional documents not already included above:

State Hearing Decision SHN 105019726; emails between the claimant and the county; and 26 pages of timesheets.

The claimant's request for a hearing (Hearing Request Summary dated October 3, 2024) was also submitted.

The documents were marked and admitted into evidence. No other documentary evidence was submitted, and the record was closed. All documentary and testimonial evidence was carefully considered.

County's Position

The county's statement of position states that the County correctly complied with the order of State Hearing Decision in SHN 105019726 in which the claim was granted to authorize the child for Protective Supervision effective August 1, 2023. The county stated that the funding source was not changed when Protective Supervision was authorized by the September 11, 2024 Notice of Action.

The county contends that they are unable to repay the differential between the special transaction amount and the amount that would have been received had Protective Supervision been authorized initially in the CPCO program because they are not permitted to pay overtime.

Claimant's Position

The claimant testified that that the county made a mistake from the beginning when the child was not placed in the correct program so the time he was assessed to need, including Protective Supervision, was not correctly authorized. The claimant disagrees that the county cannot pay the difference. He testified that the regulations do not state that overtime cannot be authorized. The claimant testified that the county did not comply with the state decision for SHN 105019726.

IHSS Program and Maximum Hours

The decision for SHN 105019726 did not order that the child be placed into any particular IHSS program. Therefore, the County was not prevented from placing the child into any other program that he was eligible for, effective August 1, 2023.

The County appeals representative does not dispute that the child became eligible for the Community First Choice Option (CFCO) program as of August 1, 2023, pursuant to the eligibility requirements of All County Letter 16-40 because there is no dispute that the child is eligible for full-scope Medi-Cal the child has a total assessed need of 195 hours per month or more as the decision for SHN 105019726 authorized the child Protective Supervision, effective August 1, 2023.

As there is no dispute that the child became eligible for CFCO effective August 1, 2023, pursuant to the decision in SHN 105019726, the child is eligible for CFCO, effective August 1, 2023. As the child is eligible for CFCO, effective August 1, 2023, the child is eligible for up to 283 hours per month, effective August 1, 2023.

LAW

Hearings are to be conducted in accordance with regulations and procedures set forth by the California Department of Social Services (CDSS). Those regulations are set forth in Division 22 of the Manual of Policies and Procedures (MPP) issued by the CDSS. (Title 22, California Code of Regulations (CCR) § 50953.)

All regulations referred to herein are set forth in the Manual of Policies and Procedures (MPP) issued by the Department of Social Services unless otherwise specified. For purposes of this decision, W&IC is the abbreviation for the Welfare & Institutions Code.

A County action is one which requires adequate notice, as well as any other County action or inaction relating to the Claimant's application for or receipt of aid.

(MPP § 22-001(c)(5).)

A state hearing shall be available to a Claimant who is dissatisfied with a County action and requests a state hearing. (MPP § 22-003.1.)

The state hearing decision shall determine only those circumstances and issues existing at the time of the County action in dispute or otherwise agreed to by the parties. (MPP § 22-062.4.)

The issues at the hearing shall be limited to those issues which are reasonably related to the request for hearing or other issues identified by either the County or the Claimant which they have jointly agreed to discuss. (MPP § 22-049.5.)

The burden of proof is the obligation of a party to establish by evidence, a requisite degree of belief concerning a fact in the mind of the trier of fact or the court. Except as otherwise provided by law, the burden of proof requires proof by a preponderance of the evidence. (Cal. Evidence Code §115.)

The burden of producing evidence is the obligation of a party to produce evidence sufficient to avoid a ruling against him on the issue. (Cal. Evidence Code § 110)

The County has the burden of going forward in the state hearing to support its determination. (MPP § 22-073.36.)

IHSS Overview

The term IHSS is often used to refer generally to four distinct state/County programs which provided in-home services to disabled populations. These programs are the following:

(1) Personal Care Services Program (PCSP) is a program funded through Medi-Cal and provides services to individuals who otherwise qualify for Medi-Cal and have a chronic disabling condition. Eligibility is fully based on Medi-Cal eligibility. PCSP is unavailable to individuals whose provider is their spouse or to minor individuals whose parent is the provider. It is also unavailable if the provider is receiving advance payment or the recipient is receiving a restaurant meal allowance. (See generally, W&IC § 14132.95.)

(2) IHSS Plus Option (IPO) is a program funded through Medi-Cal, which provides services for federally eligible Medi-Cal recipients who do not qualify for the PCSP Program. Such recipients often include individuals where the spouse is the provider or minors when the parent is the provider. Eligibility is fully based on Medi-Cal eligibility. (See generally, W&IC § 14132.97.)

(3) Community First Choice Option (CFCO) is a program that provides services for federally eligible Medi-Cal recipients who meet IPO requirements and in addition require 195 hours over service or meet certain other levels of severity of need. (See generally, All County Letter (ACL) No. 14-60, August 29, 2014.)

(4) IHSS Residual (IHSS-R) is a program limited to disabled individuals who do not qualify for federal Medi-Cal program participation, primarily legal aliens. Eligibility is based on linkage to the SSI/SSP program. (See generally, W&IC §§ 12300 et seq.)

CONCLUSION

IHSS Needs Effective August 1, 2023

In this case Sacramento County (the county) authorized the child 227:16 (hours: minutes) per month of IHSS benefits effective October 1, 2024.

Based on the above findings of fact, the child is eligible for 227:16 (hours: minutes) per month of IHSS benefits in the CPCO program, effective August 1, 2023, according to the following chart:

<u>Service:</u>	<u>Weekly</u>	<u>Monthly</u>	<u>Total</u>
Bowel and Bladder care:	4:23		
Transfers:	1:34		
Medical Transportation:	0:05		
Accompaniment to/from Places You Get Services in Place of IHSS:	1:25		
Protective Supervision:		195:00	
Total (weekly x 4.33):	32:16	195:00	227:16

Sacramento County's authorization for 227:16 (hours: minutes) per month of IHSS benefits effective October 1, 2024, is not sustained as the child requires 227:16 (hours:

minutes) per month of IHSS benefits, in the CPCO program effective August 1, 2023, to remain safely at home.

ORDER

The claim is granted in part.

Sacramento County shall rescind the September 11, 2024, and September 20, 2024 Notices of Action; authorize the child 227:16 (hours: minutes) per month, effective August 1, 2023; place the child in the CFCO program effective August 1, 2023; and aid the claimant and child as otherwise eligible.

For assistance with the hearings process, you can contact the State Hearings Division at 1-855-795-0634. An interpreter will be provided to you at no cost.

SPANISH:	Para obtener asistencia con el proceso de audiencias, puede comunicarse con la División de Audiencias Estatales al 1-855-795-0634. Se le facilitará un intérprete sin costo alguno.
TRAD CHINESE:	有關聽證會流程的幫助，可撥打 1-855-795-0634 與州聽證處聯絡。我們將免費為您提供翻譯。
TAGALOG:	Para sa tulong sa proseso ng pagdinig, maaari kang makipag-ugnay sa Sangay ng mga Pagdinig ng Estado sa 1-855-795-0634. Isang tagasalin sa ibang wika ang ibibigay sa iyo nang walang gastos.
VIETNAMESE:	Để được trợ giúp về quy trình điều trần, quý vị có thể gọi Phòng Điều Trần Tiểu Bang ở số 1-855-795-0634. Quý vị sẽ được cung cấp miễn phí một thông dịch viên.
KOREAN:	심리공청회 진행 과정에 도움이 필요하시면, 주 정부 심리공청회 사무국, 1-855-795-0634 번으로 연락하여 주십시오. 귀하에게 통역 서비스를 무료로 제공해 드립니다.
CAMBODIAN:	សូមបំប៉នយក្នុងដំណើរការសវនាការស្តីពីការអនុវត្តច្បាប់។ State Hearings Division ទូរស័ព្ទ 1-855-795-0634 ។ អ្នកបកប្រែសិន្យបានគ្រប់គ្រងដោយឥតគិតថ្លៃ។
HMONG:	Yog xav paub tus txheej txheem ntawm cov rooj sib tham los mloog ob tog cov lus, koj yuav hu tau rau lub Xeev Qhov Chaw Tuav Dejnum Rau Kev Teem Rooj Sib Tham Los Mloog Ob Tog Cos Lus (State Hearing Division) ntawm 1-855-795-0634. Yuav npaj muaj ib tus kws txhais lus pub dawb rau koj.
ARABIC:	للحصول على المساعدة بشأن عملية جلسات الاستماع، يمكنك الاتصال بقسم جلسات الاستماع في الولاية على الهاتف رقم 1-855-795-0634. سوف تزود بمترجم شفهي بدون أن تتحمل أي تكلفة.
ARMENIAN:	Եթե լսում և ներքին գործընթացի վերաբերյալ ունեք օգնություն անկարելի, գրեք կամ զանգահարեք Նահանգային հիմնական և ներքին բաժին: Հեղափոխությունը կարող է լինել բացարձակ և անհրաժեշտ:
FARSI:	برای دریافت کمک در روال رسیدگی قضایی، می توانید از طریق شماره تلفن 1-855-795-0634 با بخش دادرسی ایالتی تماس بگیرید. یک مترجم به صورت رایگان در اختیارتان قرار خواهد گرفت.
PUNJABI:	ਸੁਣਵਾਈ ਦੀ ਪ੍ਰਕਿਰਿਆ ਵਿੱਚ ਸਹਾਇਤਾ ਲਈ, ਤੁਸੀਂ 1-855-795-0634 'ਤੇ ਸਟੇਟ ਹਿਅਰਿੰਗ ਡਿਵੀਜ਼ਨ ਨਾਲ ਸੰਪਰਕ ਕਰ ਸਕਦੇ ਹੋ। ਤੁਹਾਨੂੰ ਬਿਨਾਂ ਕਿਸੇ ਕੀਮਤ 'ਤੇ ਇੱਕ ਦੁਬਾਸ਼ੀਆ ਮੁਹੱਈਆ ਕੀਤਾ ਜਾਵੇਗਾ।
RUSSIAN:	Для получения помощи в процессе проведения слушания вы можете обратиться в Отдел слушаний штата по телефону 1-855-795-0634. Вам будут предоставлены бесплатные услуги устного переводчика.
HINDI:	सुनवाई प्रक्रिया में सहायता के लिए, आप राज्य सुनवाई डिवीजन से 1-855-795-0634 पर संपर्क कर सकते हैं। आपको बिना किसी कीमत के एक दुभाषिया प्रदान किया जाएगा।
JAPANESE:	この聴聞手続について手助けを必要とされる場合は、州政府聴聞課（電話番号 1-855-795-0634）にご連絡ください。この場合、通訳のサービスが無料で提供されることとなります。
LAO:	ສໍາລັບການຊ່ວຍເຫຼືອໃນຂະບວນການໄຕ່ສວນພິຈາລະນາຄະດີ, ທ່ານສາມາດຕິດຕໍ່ພະແນກການໄຕ່ສວນຂອງລັດຢູ່ 1-855-795-0634. ຈະມີນາຍແປພາສາໃຫ້ທ່ານຟຣີ.
THAI:	ท่านสามารถติดต่อแผนกการพิจารณาคดีของรัฐที่หมายเลข 1-855-795-0634 เพื่อขอความช่วยเหลือในกระบวนการพิจารณาคดี จะมีการจัดเตรียมบริการล่ามให้คุณโดยไม่มีค่าใช้จ่าย

APPEAL RIGHTS

Your hearing decision is attached to this letter.

Compliance Information

If there is an order for the agency or health plan to do something:

- They have to report to State Hearings what work they are doing to carry out the decision. This report is due 30 calendar days after the decision.
- Managed care plans (including Mental Health, Dental, and Substance Use Disorder plans) must carry out the decision within 72 hours.
- If the agency or Plan has not carried out or are not carrying out the decision, call 800-743-8525. We will follow up with the agency or health plan. You will be told the result.

If You Disagree with Your Hearing Decision

There are two ways to appeal. You can ask for a rehearing and you can also go to court. You may wish to call your local Legal Aid office. They may be able to help with your appeal. A list of Legal Aid organizations is on the State Hearings website. You may also call 411 and ask for the phone number of your local free Legal Aid organization.

Review of Your Hearing Decision (all except Covered California cases)

You can ask for a review of your decision. This is called a rehearing.

You must ask for a rehearing within 30 calendar days after you get the hearing decision. If you show a good reason for not asking for a rehearing within 30 calendar days, your time limit may be up to 180 days. In some cases, the time limit to ask for a rehearing may be longer.

In your rehearing request:

- List the date you got the decision

- Explain why a rehearing should be granted
- If you want us to review new evidence:
 - describe the new evidence
 - explain why you did not give it to the judge during the hearing or during any extra time given to turn in evidence
 - tell us how you think that evidence would change the decision
 - if you can, send us a copy of the new evidence

If your case is **not** a Covered California case, send a written request to the State Hearings Rehearing Unit. This can be done by:

- **Online Appeals Account:** <https://acms.dss.ca.gov/acms/>
- **Email:** SHDRehearings@dss.ca.gov
- **Fax number:** 833-281-0902
- **Mail to: (Allow at least 5 days for mailing. Keep your originals.)**

State Hearings Division

PO Box 944243, MS 9-16-431, Sacramento, CA 94244-2430

Review of Covered California Hearing Decisions

If you disagree with your hearing decision about Covered California, you may appeal in writing to Health Insurance Marketplace. This includes:

- Any decision regarding Covered California Health Plan eligibility and enrollment
- Advanced Payments of Premium Tax Credits
- Cost Sharing Reductions

You must do this within 30 calendar days after you get the decision. Your appeal may still be reviewed after 30 calendar days if you have a good reason for sending it in late. Explain the reason for the late appeal.

Send this request to: Health Insurance Marketplace, 465 Industrial Blvd., London, KY 40750-0061.

You can also fax in your appeal request. Include any copies of documents you think help your case. Fax to: 1-877-369-0130.

You have a right to get free help and information about your Covered California appeal.

Call 1-800-318-2596 for help in your language.

Court Review

For all decisions you can go to court without asking for a rehearing. You can also go to court after asking for a rehearing. You must ask for court review within one year of the date you got the decision. To ask for court review, you must file a "petition" in Superior Court. The law about this is found at California Code of Civil Procedure section 1094.5. You will not have to pay court filing fees. If you win in court, and had a lawyer represent you, you may be able to get reasonable attorney's fees and costs.

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

DECISION

Re-Hearing No. 105019726

In the Matter of Claimant(s):

Yang Xiong
9582 VILLAGE TREE DR,
ELK GROVE, CA 95758-1198
yangcounty@gmail.com

Pursuant to the authority of the Director, I adopt the attached final decision.



Paula Clamurro

Administrative Law Judge

Adopt Date: **September 03, 2024**

Re-Hearing Information

Re-Hearing Date: July 29, 2024 01:00 PM

Release Date: September 4, 2024

Aid Pending: N/A

Issue Codes: 642-1

Language: ENGLISH

Responsible Agency: Sacramento County

Attendees

Attendee Type	Attendee
---------------	----------

Authorized Rep:	Nicole Stemet, Legal Services of Northern California
-----------------	--

SUMMARY

Sacramento County's determination the child is not eligible for Protective Supervision is not sustained. The county shall determine the child eligible for Protective Supervision effective August 1, 2023 because the child is nonself-directing, engages in potentially dangerous activities, requires significantly more time than routine childcare, and requires 24-hour supervision to remain safely in the home.

[642-1]

FACTS

Procedural History

By Notice of Action dated October 6, 2023, Sacramento County (county) approved IHSS for the claimants' child effective August 1, 2023. The county authorized IHSS for 6:04 (hours: minutes) per month and denied Protective Supervision effective August 1, 2023.

On October 11, 2023, the claimants, who are the parents, requested a hearing to dispute denial of Protective Supervision.

A noticed hearing was held on January 10, 2024 (State Hearing No. 104946193 [SHN 6193]). The county representative, claimants, and county social worker appeared and testified in-person. The parties agreed that the only issue for hearing was the denial of Protective Supervision effective August 1, 2023.

According to the Decision for SHN 6193 (adopted February 7, 2024), the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) sustained the county's denial of Protective Supervision effective August 1, 2023 because the child did not meet all the regulatory requirements for the service.

The claimants timely appealed by requesting a Rehearing, which was granted on the basis the Decision did not adequately consider the child's propensity to place himself in danger.

A noticed rehearing was held on July 29, 2024. The claimants and claimants' counsel appeared by phone. The county appeared via submission of the record for SHN 6193.

Documentary Evidence Submitted:

The record for SHN 6193 was incorporated. After the record was held open, the parties supplied the following documents:

1. County and Claimants' Position Statement; Claimant's written arguments and clarifications; Video compilation of the child;
2. State Hearing No. 104946193 Decision (adopted February 7, 2024)

3. 2020 Ocular Oncology Visit Summary;
4. 2020 Social Security Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefit verification;
5. January 8, 2023 Individualized Program Plan (IPP);
6. March-April 2023 Initial Functional Vision Assessment;
7. April 2023 Interdisciplinary Assessment Report;
8. May 9, 2023 Orientation and Mobility Report;
9. May 9, 2023 Individualized Education Plan (IEP);
10. Parent's notes (August to September 2023);
11. August 2023 Medical Patient Health Summary;
12. August 15, 2023 IHSS Program Health Care Certification form (SOC 873);
13. September 15, 2023 Needs Assessment form (SOC 293) and Case Assessment Narrative;
14. September 20, 2023 Ophthalmologist Assessment of Need for Protective Supervision forms (SOC 821);
15. September 21, 2023 Claimant correspondence to County;
16. October 3, 2023 Orientation & Mobility Assessment of Need for Protective Supervision forms (SOC 821) and letter of support;
17. October 3, 2023 Pediatrician Assessment of Need for Protective Supervision forms (SOC 821);
18. October 6, 2023 Notice of Action (IHSS Approval);
19. October 11, 2023 Request for Hearing and Request Summary;
20. October 13, 2023 Early Development Screening correspondence;
21. November 21, 2023 Regional Center Social Assessment;
22. November 28, 2023 Caregiver/ Teacher Questionnaire;
23. December 13, 2023 Psychological Assessment;
24. December 27, 2023 Regional Center letter to Claimants;
25. January 3, 2024 Claimant correspondence to County;
26. January 5, 2024 letter of support from child's pediatrician;
27. May 1, 2024 Individualized Education Plan (IEP);
28. July 25, 2024 letter of support from child's speech therapist;
29. July 23, 2024 Individualized Education Plan (IEP); and
30. Age-Appropriate Guidelines.

The county was provided an opportunity to respond to new information provided by the claimants [post-January 5, 2024 documentary evidence], which was identified in the Open Record Letter. The documents were marked and admitted into evidence. No other documentary evidence was submitted, and the record was closed. All documentary and testimonial evidence was read, reviewed, carefully considered.

Assessment and Functional Limitations

An IHSS application was submitted on behalf of the child on August 1, 2023. The documentary evidence states that the child is blind with no light perception. Per the documentary evidence the child has Autism, Global Developmental Delay, with Language and/or Learning Disorder.

The child lives with family members, which includes six older and one younger sibling, in a single-family residence. On September 15, 2023, the county social worker completed an initial assessment of the child's need for IHSS. The child was three years and six months old at the time of the initial assessment. The Case Assessment Narrative documented the social worker's observations and child's functional impairment(s) and documentation reviewed.

Following the initial assessment, the county issued the October 6, 2023 Notice of Action, which concluded the child needed 6:04 (hours: minutes) per month in IHSS effective August 1, 2023 for help with Transferring. The county reviewed and considered the Age-Appropriate Guidelines regarding non-Protective Supervision needs and services.

The claimants confirmed that Protective Supervision remains the only service in dispute.

Protective Supervision Testimony

County's Position

The county representative submitted documents in lieu of testimony. Per the county statements, that they do not dispute that the child has mental impairments. According to the case assessment narrative, the social worker noted the child has Developmental Delay and may be on the autism spectrum. During pendency of the hearings, the county became aware the child was diagnosed with Autism in the mild to severe range, with Language Disorder, and Global Developmental Delay.

Per the Statement of Position, the county completed a home visit on September 15, 2023. Concerning the child's functional impairments, the assessment narrative states the child is totally blind and has developmental delays.

According to the case assessment narrative, the child did not engage with the social worker. The child was observed to complete transfers on and off the couch. The child was playing and twirling around in a circle. During the visit, the child was walking around the living room, and had to be redirected several times as he was playing next to the edge of a table or told to get down from the sofa chair. The social worker noted the child can transfer at time times, but he cannot see how or where to get up and down from.

The assessment narrative states the child appeared to enjoy standing in the sofa chair and rocking it back and forward. It was reported the child likes to twirl, repeats things he has heard and flap his arms. The social worker noted the child mimicked sounds and sometimes repeated what the social worker said. The social worker also noted the child can identify sounds and smells. It was reported the child always wants his mother nearby, and if his mom is not nearby, he becomes upset.

Per the case assessment narrative, the social worker noted the documents presented by the parents, which were (1) the parent's personal summary, (2) the school's teacher

report, (3) the school's vision assessment, (4) the Individualized Education Plan (IEP), (5) School's Interdisciplinary Assessment Report, (6) SSI award letter, (7) Medical Center Health Summaries and the Health Care Certification form (SOC 873), and (8) three Assessment of Need for Protective Supervision form (SOC 821) forms.

The social worker documented that the Health Care Certification form (SOC 873) states the child is legally blind, needs assistance with eating, bathing, dressing and other instrumental activities (play time, learning) for age, has blindness and developmental delay. The social worker cites the three Assessment of Need for Protective Supervision form (SOC 821) forms and the examiners' diagnoses while noting differences, missing information, and opinions on the child's mental functioning, including opinions where the child has severely impaired memory, orientation, and judgment. The social worker noted there is an additional letter written by the specialist explaining the need for supervision.

The social worker noted in the assessment narrative that an Interdisciplinary Assessment report list the child as delayed. The social worker noted that the May 2023 Individualized Education Plan (IEP) suggests the child has a good memory and likes music. The social worker noted the school reported the child has a good memory and recalls songs. The social worker noted the school reported the child can walk independently; he walks on his own with a cane, can use his hands to guide himself and follows the wall as he walks, and uses his feet to tell the texture difference from hard floor from carpet.

The social worker noted the child's goals in the IEP were to locate and orient to Braille-language books, use a Braille writer, learn to take turns with his peers, and to use words to get his feelings across. The social worker noted that the IEP reported that due to deficits in receptive language, the child would have a difficult time following classroom directions and discussions. When it comes to social and behavioral concerns, the social worker noted the report indicated the child did not exhibit any excessive behaviors during the week and his parents reported to the school they did not have behavioral concerns currently.

The social worker opined the child has age-appropriate memory, the child appears to know where is his inside the home and knows the layout but will not be aware of his surroundings when outside the home due to blindness and young age.

Regarding reported behaviors, the social worker noted that for judgment the child may go places he should not and opined that this behavior is age appropriate. The social worker reasoned that the child is totally blind, he is very curious and wants to explore. He has wandered over to a neighbor's house when his father turned away from for a few moments. Because the child can't see, he puts things in his mouth. He will unplug plugs and put the plugs in his mouth. He moves quickly and will bump into things. He doesn't sleep well, therefore he can be up late or up early. He jumped into the bathtub where he younger brother was bathing. He likes to sweep his hands across tables to see what is there, without regard for what is there. He has turned the knobs on the stove and has attempted to touch the stove. The child tantrums when upset or not

getting his way, he will throw a tantrum and has hit his head. If he loses a toy, he can get upset and have a tantrum.

Based on the assessment, the child has moderate or intermittent memory deficit (Rank 2); no disorientation (Rank 1); and judgment is mildly impaired (Rank 2).

According to the county's position statement, the social worker concluded that the supervision that the child needs is for a medical condition and that Protective Supervision cannot be authorized when the need is caused by a medical condition or for medical supervision. The social worker states in the assessment narrative that:

"If he was sighted, it does not appear he would get himself into so much trouble. ... If child was not blind, he could avoid some dangers. Protective Supervision is not based on vision. ... While [the child] is blind and may be on the Autism spectrum, his blindness appears to be the limiting factor, if he could see something, he would not have to put in his mouth to 'see' what it is or run his hand across a table to 'see' what is there. ... It appears his needs for Protective Supervision is more for his vision vs. memory, orientation, and judgement."

Claimant's Position

The claimants testified the child is completely blind, has severe autism, and unknowingly places himself in harmful situations every day. Because of Autism and Developmental Delay:

- The child has propensity for wandering and elopement. The child has attempted to leave the house and wander around the neighborhood. He succeeded in eloping to the neighbor's garage door when the front door was open. If he leaves, he does not know where he is, where he is going, or how to get back home. The parents ensure the door to the bathrooms and front and back door are always locked.
- The child climbs and plays on furniture unsafely, jumping or falling off furniture, spinning, swinging from objects and he sustained some minor self-injuries and fell off a dining chair.
- The child plays with and mouth any object that he finds in his environment. He has put a charging cable in his mouth after unplugging it from the wall. The child tries to touch unsanitary areas like inside the toilet during potty training.
- The child has a habit of playing with things in the kitchen, including glass objects, the stove, and will indiscriminately without understanding trail his hands along the counters where he could touch hot surfaces or dangerous items.
- The child stims in the form of jumping or twirling around while singing or engaging in echolalia. He twirls or spins in circles and is unaware of any potential hazards around him. He is not aware of proximity and does not show regard to

his relative closeness to other children, walls, furniture, etc. While engaging in sensory seeking behaviors he will lose balance and hit his head against the wall and other hard surfaces. Even after sustaining an injury from getting his head bumped at a corner, he still twirls at the same place and repeatedly gets hurt until someone intervenes.

- The child has difficulty sleeping and staying asleep which requires additional supervision and will engage in stimming behaviors throughout the night such as hitting his head on a bed frame, placing objects in his mouth.
- For self-soothing purposes and as ways to communicate different forms of anxieties, the child engages in self-injurious behaviors when he can't communicate, which includes hitting himself with his hand, banging his head on the couch, floor, and wall, and rolling all over the floor, which leads to bumping into walls and the legs of chairs, tables, and other objects.
- The child engages in meltdowns. During meltdowns hits himself and hits his head against any nearby surfaces.

He will typically forget safety instructions and directions after the next day. He may stop temporarily, but he will engage in the same behavior again. The child does not understand when he is being corrected or told not to do something.

The child's gross motor skills are not a concern. His fine motor skills, speech, and cognition are areas of concern and can place the child in potentially dangerous situations. The child is not able to use sentences to communicate consistently. According to the child's speech therapist, he does not engage in reciprocal conversation. The child is completely unresponsive to the nonverbal communication of others, or changes in tone and sounds denoting danger.

The child is unable to follow multi-step directions. He has to be either verbally or physically directed through each step of a task and does not initiate self-care and grooming related tasks on his own.

The child currently speaks in single- or 2-word phrases. The child frequently uses both immediate and delayed echolalia making it often unclear if he is comprehending safety instructions or directives. The child does not respond to his name and will only respond to directives about his safety after numerous attempts. Moreover, the child does not have the ability to differentiate strangers from people he knows.

Protective Supervision Findings of Fact

It is acknowledged that documentary evidence from early 2023 has little to support the child engages in the later reported behaviors. For example, the August 15, 2023 Health Care Certification (SOC 873) fails to mention the child has a mental impairment, stating

only that the child “legally blind; needs assistance with eating, bathing, dressing, and other instrumental activities of daily living (playtime, learning) for age.” The March-April 2023 Initial Functional Vision Assessment states the child is a high-functioning child and has many age-appropriate skills, but also with deficits associated with his blindness. The parents reported the child has a very good memory with songs and per the April 2023 Interdisciplinary Assessment Report and May 2023 Individualized Education Plan (IEP), there were no behaviors that appeared to be sensory based. The social worker’s summation of the documentary evidence that was provided at the time was also accurate. This is aligned with the Decision in State Hearing No. 6193 (adopted February 7, 2024), with some minor clarifications herein.

It is acknowledged that the child was not diagnosed with Autism until December 2023, for which behaviors may have been previously overlooked as typical for a toddler or solely due to blindness. According to the May 2024 Individualized Education Plan (IEP), the parents expressed concerns that the prior IEPs were not fully considering the child’s additional medical diagnoses of Autism, Language Disorder, and Global Developmental Delay, and how these will be considered in the development of the IEPs. The parents shared that the child has always demonstrated behaviors that are consistent with his formal Autism diagnosis, as well as his Language Disorder and developmental delays. The parents shared that they wish for the child’s educational team to be familiar with his medical diagnoses so that they can factor these needs.

The county was informed of the unfolding circumstances as the child developed. The county had an opportunity to propose a reassessment after multiple requests, as well as respond to the evidence in this hearing. Since that option passed and the county deferred to an administrative decision, which was expressed in their September 2023 correspondence, the 2024 documentary evidence is deemed more comprehensive to the child’s functional impairments and are incorporated into the August 1, 2023 effective date.

Additionally, the December 2023 Psychological Assessment is given more weight than the April 2023 Interdisciplinary Assessment Report. The April report states the child’s cognitive functioning skills could not be directly measured due to vision impairment and the scores are still cautioned due to the child’s vision needs and speech/language delays. The December report is thus found to be more complete, comprehensive, and closer in time to the disputed time period. Starting in December 2023 the child was diagnosed with Autism as well as Speech Delay and Global Developmental Delay. The April 2023 Interdisciplinary Assessment Report is not disregarded entirely, however, since much of the information is consistent with the majority of the other documentary evidence.

As to specific behaviors:

Based on the documentary evidence, it is found that the child is not attempting to elope from the home. Per the November 2023 Regional Center Social Assessment, the parents reported the child does not bolt/wander while his is out in public. Parents

expressed that the child would cling onto them, especially in new environments, because he may get scared of the sounds surrounding him.

Concerning wandering, it is understood that the child uses touch to feel his way around a room to become familiar with objects and places. The November 2023 Regional Center Social Assessment and May 2023 Orientation and Mobility Report states when walking in outdoor and indoor environments the child will explore his surroundings and follow the wall and trail with his hands or will walk in free space, holding his hands out in front of himself to contact what he is walking towards. Outdoors he uses his cane to explore in front of his house, tapping it against different surfaces to hear how they sound. They state the child uses the cane to trail along to wall and taps it against the garage door when walking along that area. It states the child is very comfortable and familiar moving independently in his home and will independently travel between rooms where he knows the arrangement of furniture and doors. Therefore, there is no eloping due to confusion.

According to the documentary evidence, the child is aware of when he is in a different place and not at home. For example, the 2023 Initial Functional Vision Assessment states that on the first day of coming to the assessment Center Preschool, the child was very attached to his parents and held onto his dad saying "home?", "home?" After a little while though he started exploring the preschool environment independently.

However, if the door is left open even inadvertently, as with any unimpaired child of comparable age, they may go outside. Per the case assessment narrative, the parents reported they left the door open briefly for errands and the child went outside. An unimpaired child of comparable age would not be aware of the potential risks of traffic to stop before crossing streets or know how to get back home. An unimpaired child of comparable age will likely become lost if they get too far from the home. The child's functional impairment does not create the likelihood of the parents leaving the door open. Based on the claimants' report to the social worker that they keep all the doors closed and locked, this indicates that the doors being closed and secured effectively deters the child from attempting to elope. Therefore, the time that door was left open was an isolated incident.

Next, the claimants testified the child tries to touch unsanitary areas like inside the toilet during potty training. The claimant further contend the child attempts to put his hands in his mouth after having touched his excrement. This is found inconsistent with the November 2023 Caregiver/ Teacher Questionnaire and May 2024 Individualized Education Plan (IEP) which state the child has a low tolerance for touching select textures, various slimy, silky, sticky substances etc., due to possible tactile defensiveness. The documentary evidence states the child is not yet toilet trained, however makes no mention of the child's tendency to lack hand hygiene or unsafe behaviors with toileting. It does state that the child imitates the sound of the toilet flushing. Therefore, it is found the child is not attempting to manipulate feces or touch unsanitary areas of the toilet.

This is further supported by the December 2023 Psychological Assessment which states the child has a propensity for slamming doors. Relating to the finding above, this infers the child is slamming the doors inside the home. Because the doors are closed, the parents are trying to reduce the propensity for slamming, but not for the purpose of preventing the child from going into the bathroom.

The claimant testified the child does not have the ability to differentiate strangers from people he knows. It is found the child is not disorientated or lacks memory to be unable to decipher friends, family, or strangers. Per the case assessment narrative and other documentary evidence, the child always wants his mother nearby, and if his mom is not nearby, he becomes upset. According to the November 2023 Regional Center Social Assessment, the child can be affectionate towards certain people that he is comfortable with, such as his mother, but that he normally does not want to be around others. Per the December 2023 Psychological Assessment, he primarily clung to his mother. According to the assessment reports, the child goes to specific siblings when he wants a particular activity that sibling is known to engage with him.

It is understood that the child displays limited stranger awareness and will approach others if they have something that he wants. This is not eligible for Protective Supervision since an unimpaired child of comparable age can be expected to want something that someone else has and be unaware the particular person may have ill intentions. The child's functional impairment does not create the likelihood of this exigent or circumstantial risk.

Regarding the interplay between the child's co-occurring functional impairments, the social worker concluded that the supervision that the child needs is for a medical condition, and that were the child not blind, the child would not engage in potentially dangerous activities. The county would be correct if the supervision was solely medical in nature or if it was to prevent a medical emergency. Per the regulations, the examples include a person who has diabetes and the need for Protective Supervision is to help if or when the recipient has an episode of hypoglycemia. Conversely, Protective Supervision would be authorized for a recipient considered to have fall risk tendencies if she is unable to walk unassisted, but due to a mental impairment, she forgets and frequently attempts to walk on her own.

In this case, it is difficult to separate the risks caused by blindness versus behaviors due to Autism and Developmental Delay. It is pure speculation to opine that the child would not be putting himself in danger if he was not blind. As noted in the December 2023 Psychological Assessment, "It is in this examiner's opinion that regarding his cognitive skills, the child's delays are above and beyond influence of his blindness." Likewise, per the January 5, 2024 letter of support from child's pediatrician, the doctor stated that despite blindness, which is a medical condition, the child's needs primarily lay with Developmental Delay and Autism. It goes on to say that the parents made accommodations to support the child's independence for his visual impairment, but as the child grew, the difficulties of managing him became greater due to Autism. The doctor states that even if the child were not blind, his moderate to severe range of

Autism would create a challenging care environment. Per the December 2023 Psychological Assessment, the child was ranked Level 3 (requiring very substantial support) for social communication and Level 2 (requiring substantial support) for restrictive, repetitive patterns of behavior.

It is found that the protection the child needs is not medical in nature, nor is it to prevent a medication condition from happening. There is no medical intervention or prevention for the child's blindness, and the parents cannot prevent the child from blindness nor suffering physiological (physical/ bodily) medical effects of blindness, whatever that may be. Moreover, blindness is not a potentially dangerous condition because as the letter of support from child's pediatrician states, many adapt to their environment.

While blindness and Autism have different effects on the body, the co-occurring functional impairments nonetheless affects the other. Indeed, the May 2024 Individualized Education Plan (IEP) states that there can be an overlap in behaviors that are consistent with Autism and students who have total blindness, and it can be difficult to tease out the cause of these behaviors. In the April 2023 Interdisciplinary Assessment Report, it states that children with visual impairments often exhibit more repetitive play and spend less time exploring, which has negative impacts on social development. It states that as children get older and play becomes more complicated, children with visual impairments may get left behind and miss out on peer interactions. It also states many children with visual impairments require explicit instruction in order to understand and navigate social situations. In the 2023 Initial Functional Vision Assessment it states that sighted children can glance around the room and see what their peers are doing, but this child is unable to do that, so it will be important for him to understand the routine of a school day and what that means in terms of the physical behaviors expected of him.

The issue for this child is whether he adapts to his environment via memory, orientation, and judgment notwithstanding blindness and Autism, which is discussed below.

LAW

All the regulations cited refer to the Manual of Policies and Procedures [Man. Pol. & Pro.], unless otherwise noted.

State Hearings

If any applicant for or recipient of public social services is dissatisfied with any county department action relating to an application for or receipt of public social services, if the county does not act upon the application with reasonable promptness, or if any person who desires to apply for public social services is refused the opportunity to submit a signed application, they shall be given an opportunity for a state hearing. (Man. Pol. & Pro. §22-003.1; Welfare and Institutions [Welf. & Inst.] Code § 10950)

The burden of proof is the obligation of a party to establish by evidence a requisite degree of belief concerning a fact in the mind of the trier of fact or the court. Except as otherwise provided by law, the burden of proof requires proof by a preponderance of the evidence. Preponderance of the evidence means “more likely than not.” The county has the initial burden of proof in the state hearing to support its determination. Once the party asserting the claim has met its burden of proving its claim, the burden to prove otherwise shifts to the other party. (Cal. Evid. Code § 115; *In re Cipro Cases I & II*, 61 Cal. 4th 116, 157 (2015); *Tellabs, Inc. v. Makor Issues & Rights, Ltd.*, 551 U.S. 308, 127 S.Ct. 2499, 2513 (2007); Man. Pol. & Pro. § 22-073)

Although evidence may be admissible, the Administrative Law Judge shall consider the nature of the evidence in assessing its probative value. (Man. Pol. & Pro. §22-050.3). The Administrative Law Judge’s experience, technical competence, and specialized knowledge may be used in evaluating evidence. (Gov’t Code § 1425.50(c).)

IHSS Program Generally

In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) is a program which provides a range of supportive services to qualified individuals who are unable to perform the services themselves and who cannot safely remain in their homes or abodes of their own choosing unless these services are provided. The IHSS program is funded through four subprograms: Community First Choice Option (CFCO), the Personal Care Service Program (PCSP), the IHSS Plus Option (IPO), and the IHSS Residual program (IHSS-R). (Welf. and Inst. Code §12300)

Protective Supervision

Protective Supervision consists of observing recipient behavior and intervening as appropriate to safeguard the recipient against injury, hazard, or accident.

Protective Supervision is available for observing the behavior of nonself-directing, confused, mentally impaired, or mentally ill persons only. (Man. Pol. & Pro. § 30-757.17 effective June 26, 2006 and revised effective Feb. 5, 2007).

Mentally Impaired/Mentally Ill and Nonself-Directing

In addition to all other relevant eligibility criteria, a person must be both mentally impaired or mentally ill and nonself-directing to be eligible for Protective Supervision. It is not sufficient for someone to just be mentally impaired/mentally ill, there must also be evidence that they are nonself-directing.

For Protective Supervision eligibility, nonself-direction is an inability, due to a mental impairment/mental illness, for individuals to assess danger and the risk of harm, and therefore, the individuals would most likely engage in potentially dangerous activities that may cause self-harm. (All County Letter No. 15-25 (Mar. 19, 2015)).

Mental Health Functioning

The recipient's mental function shall be evaluated on a three-point scale (Ranks 1,2, and 5) in the functions of memory, orientation, and judgment. This scale is used to determine the need for Protective Supervision. (Man. Pol. & Pro. § 30-756.37).

ACIN No. I-97-20 (Dec. 30, 2020), Attachment B Annotated Assessment Criteria, provides the following:

Memory: Recalling learned behaviors and information from distant and recent past.

Rank 1: No problem: Memory is clear. Recipient can give accurate information about their medical history; can talk appropriately about comments made earlier in the conversation; has good recall of past events. The recipient can give detailed information in response to questions.

Rank 2: Memory loss is moderate or intermittent: Recipient shows or reports evidence of some memory impairment, but not to the extent where s/he is at risk.

Rank 5: Severe memory deficit: Recipient forgets to start or finish activities of daily living that are important to their health and/or safety. Recipient cannot maintain much continuity of thought in conversation.

Orientation: Awareness of time, place, self, and other individuals in one's environment.

Rank 1: No problem: Orientation is clear. Recipient is aware of where s/he is and can give you reliable information when questioned about activities of daily living, family, etc.; is aware of passage of time during the day.

Rank 2: Occasional disorientation and confusion is apparent, but recipient does not put self at risk: Recipient has general awareness of time of day and can provide limited information about family, friends, age, daily routine, etc.

Rank 5: Severe disorientation which puts recipient at risk: Recipient wanders off; lacks awareness or concern for safety or well-being; is unable to identify significant others or relate safely to environment or situation; has no sense of time of day.

Judgment: Making decisions so as not to put self or property in danger. Whether recipient has capacity to respond to changes in the environment (e.g., fire, cold house) and understands alternatives and risks involved and accepts consequences of decisions.

Rank 1: Judgment unimpaired: Able to evaluate environmental cues and respond appropriately.

Rank 2: Judgment mildly impaired: Shows lack of ability to plan for self; has difficulty deciding among alternatives but is amenable to advice; social judgment is poor.

Rank 5: Judgment severely impaired: Recipient fails to make decisions or makes decisions without regard to safety or well-being.
(All County Information Notice No. I-97-20 (Dec. 30, 2020)).

SOC 821 – Assessment of Need for Protective Supervision

The "Assessment of Need for Protective Supervision for In-Home Supportive Services Program," (Form SOC 821) should be completed by a physician or other appropriate medical professional to certify the need for Protective Supervision and returned to the county. The form SOC 821 shall be used in conjunction with other pertinent information, such as an interview or report by the social service staff or a Public Health Nurse, to assess the person's need for Protective Supervision. The completed form SOC 821 shall not be determinative but considered as one indicator of the need for Protective Supervision. Other pertinent information such as the social worker's interview with the recipient is part of the overall assessment, as well as Regional Center services/reports, school reports, other social service/ community/ medical collateral contacts, use of Durable Medical Equipment, etc. (Man. Pol. & Pro. § 30-757.173; All County Information Notice No. I-97-20 (Dec. 30, 2020)).

Fluctuating/Episodic Behavior

Protective Supervision is only available under the following conditions as determined by social service staff: (a) At the time of the initial assessment or reassessment, a need exists for twenty-four-hours-a-day of supervision in order for the recipient to remain at home safely; (b) If the behavior in question is considered predictable, and the need for supervision is at certain times of the day, there is no Protective Supervision eligibility because there is not a 24 hour-a-day need. Alternatively, unpredictable episodic behavior does meet the 24/7 requirement, as the need for supervision is constant. The unpredictable episodic behavior must be frequent and long enough that constant supervision is necessary. Leaving a recipient alone for some fixed short period of time, is not, by itself, a reason to deny Protective Supervision. (Man. Pol. & Pro. § 30-757; All County Letter No. 15-25 (Mar. 19, 2015)).

Actual Injury vs. Propensity to Harm Self

A person does not have to suffer actual injury to be eligible for Protective Supervision, but only have a history of a propensity for placing him/herself in danger. For example, a person with a documented history of nonself-direction, who has a tendency to open the front door and start walking away, does not necessarily have to make it into the street in order for this to be considered potentially hazardous behavior. Other evidence of a propensity for placing oneself in danger may come from doctor evaluations,

Individualized Education Plans (IEPs), etc. (All County Letter No. 15-25 (Mar. 19, 2015)).

Protective Supervision and Fall Risk

For Protective Supervision eligibility, the reason for the fall risk must be related to the individual's mental impairment/illness. Protective Supervision shall not be authorized solely because of one's inability to ambulate safely, thereby creating an increased risk of fall. For example, Protective Supervision would be authorized for a recipient considered to have fall risk tendencies if she is unable to walk unassisted, but due to a mental impairment, she forgets and frequently attempts to walk on her own. (All County Letter No. 17-95 (Sept. 12, 2017)).

In Anticipation of Emergencies or Exigent Circumstances

Protective supervision is not available merely to provide constant oversight in anticipation of environmental or medical emergency or exigent circumstances. For example, a mentally ill/mentally impaired recipient who would not know how to exit their home in the event of a fire is not eligible for Protective Supervision based on that behavior (or lack of appropriate response/behavior) alone. (All County Letter No. 15-25 (Mar. 19, 2015)).

Protective Supervision- Excluded Needs and Behaviors

Protective Supervision shall not be authorized when the need is caused by a medical condition and the form of the supervision required is medical (examples include a person who has diabetes and the need for Protective Supervision is to help if or when the recipient has an episode of hypoglycemia or a person who has diabetes and the need for Protective Supervision is to help if or when the recipient has an episode of hypoglycemia); In anticipation of a medical emergency. (All County Letter No. 15-25 (Mar. 19, 2015)).

Routine Child Care

Protective Supervision cannot be authorized for routine childcare or supervision. This policy is based on the requirement that Protective Supervision must be related to the functional limitations of the child as set forth in WIC § 12300(e)(4). This policy is also supported by MPP § 30-763.456(d), and it is CDSS' interpretation that this criterion applies to all providers, not just parent providers. (All County Letter No. 15-25 (Mar. 19, 2015)).

A minor may not be denied protective supervision solely based on their age, although age may be one factor in determining if protective supervision should be granted. It also mandates that when a minor is non-self-directed and mentally ill/impaired, the county must determine whether the minor needs more supervision because of their mental impairments than a minor of the same age without such impairment. (*Lam v. Anderson*

and in *Garrett v. Anderson*, San Diego County Superior Court No. 712208, Stipulation for Entry of Final Judgment and Judgment, June 12, 1998; All County Letter No. 98-87 (Oct. 30, 1998)).

Assessing Minors for Protective Supervision

A county social worker must always assess an IHSS eligible minor for mental functioning (memory, orientation, and judgment) on an individualized basis and must not presume a minor of any age has a mental functioning score of 1 (unimpaired). In doing so, the worker must request the parent or guardian to obtain available information and documentation about the existence of a minor's mental impairment. A county social worker is not required to independently obtain such information and documentation but must review any information provided. (Welf. and Inst. Code §§ 12300, 12301, 12309; Man. Pol. & Pro. § 30-756).

Four-Step Process for Assessing Minors for Protective Supervision

Counties must assess all eligible minors, which include anyone up to the age of 18 years old, for a mental impairment/ mental illness and mental functioning.

If the child is mentally impaired/mentally ill, All County Letter No. 15-25 provides the following four-step process for counties to use when applying the terms of the *Garrett v. Anderson* stipulated judgment:

- 1) Is the minor nonself-directing due to the mental impairment/mental illness?
If the answer is no, then the minor is not eligible for Protective Supervision pursuant to *Calderon v. Anderson* and *Marshall v. McMahon*, and Protective Supervision should not be granted. The county should document that because the child is self-directing, the minor does not meet the *Garrett* criteria of needing more supervision than another minor of the same age without a mental impairment/ mental illness. Counties should also document the underlying facts which are basis for this determination. If the answer is yes, then move to question 2;
- 2) If the minor is mentally impaired/mentally ill and nonself-directing, is the minor likely to engage in potentially dangerous activities?
Consider here whether the minor retains the physical ability to put him/herself at risk of harm. If the answer is no, then the minor is not eligible for Protective Supervision under the *Calderon v. Anderson* court decision, and Protective Supervision should not be granted. The county should document that because the child is not likely to engage in potentially dangerous activities, the minor does not meet the *Garrett* criteria of needing more supervision than another minor of the same age without a mental impairment/mental illness. If the answer is yes, then move to question 3;
- 3) Does the minor also need more supervision than a minor of comparable age who is not mentally impaired/mentally ill pursuant to the *Garrett v. Anderson* court order? "More supervision" can be more time, more intensity, or both. The

additional supervision required must be significantly more than routine childcare, and not only be related to the functional limitations of the child, but also allow the child to remain safely in their own home with this assistance. If the answer is no, then the minor is not eligible for Protective Supervision under the *Garrett v. Anderson* court order, and Protective Supervision should not be granted. The county should document that because the child does not need more supervision than another child of the same age without a mental impairment/mental illness, the minor does not meet the *Garrett* criteria of needing 24 hours-a-day of supervision. If the answer is yes, then move to question 4;

- 4) When it is found that “more supervision” is needed, is 24 hour-a-day supervision needed for the minor to remain at home safely pursuant to MPP § 30-757.173? If the answer is no, then the minor is not eligible for Protective Supervision, and it should not be granted. If the answer is yes, the minor qualifies for Protective Supervision, if otherwise eligible.

(All County Letter No. 15-25 (Mar. 19, 2015)).

CONCLUSION

Protective Supervision Analysis

In this case, Sacramento County (county) denied Protective Supervision.

Protective Supervision is available for the monitoring of behavior of a nonself-directing, confused, mentally impaired or mentally ill recipient, likely to engage in potentially dangerous activities to safeguard the recipient against injury, hazard, or accident. Protective Supervision requires a need for 24-hours-a-day of supervision.

A four-step analysis is used to determine whether a minor who has a mental impairment or mental illness is entitled to Protective Supervision. The minor must: (1) be nonself-directing due to her/his mental impairment/illness, (2) be likely to engage in potentially dangerous activity, (3) need more supervision than a minor of comparable age who is not mentally impaired/mentally ill, and (4) need 24-hour-a-day supervision for the minor to remain safely at home. The minor must meet all four requirements. If the minor does not meet all four requirements, the minor is not entitled to Protective Supervision.

Mental Impairment

There is no dispute between the parties that the child has Developmental Delay as of the initial assessment, which is a mental impairment. Therefore, it is determined that this element is met. There is also no dispute the county was made aware the child was subsequently diagnosed with Autism and Speech Delay.

The next step then is whether the child is nonself-directing because of his mental impairment.

NonselF-Direction

“NonselF-direction” is an inability, due to a mental impairment or mental illness, for individuals to assess danger and the risk of harm, thereby causing the individuals to most likely engage in potentially dangerous activities that may cause self-harm. An applicant or recipient’s mental functioning shall be evaluated on a three-point scale (Ranks 1, 2, and 5) in the functions of memory, orientation, and judgment. This scale is used to determine the need for Protective Supervision.

Memory

Memory is recalling learned behaviors and information from distant and recent past. Based on the preponderance of the evidence, it is determined that the child’s memory meets a rank 5 (severe memory deficit). Severe deficit in memory is when the recipient cannot maintain continuity of thought in conversation, and he forgets to start or finish activities of daily living that places him at risk of injury, hazard, or accident.

There are times where the child shows good memory. Per the documentary evidence, the child remembers songs he likes and avoids others he does not by covering his ears. The child can sometimes communicate in his own way via gesturing and limited words to convey the things that he likes and does not like. An IEP states the child’s academic skills are emerging. However, based on the preponderance of the documentary evidence and testimony, the child has severe memory deficit which puts him at risk.

The December 2023 Psychological Assessment states that based on observed deficits in language and/or attention, the child has severely low intelligence. Regarding his cognitive skills, the child’s delays are above and beyond influence of his blindness.

The child cannot maintain continuity of thought in conversation. It is commonly anticipated that an unimpaired child of comparable age would use communication in some consistent way to convey needs or wants. The December 2023 Psychological Assessment states the child made no attempts at social engagement. The April 2023 Interdisciplinary Assessment Report states the child will verbalize and often repeats words/phrases with most utterances being two-word phrases. The parent reported that sometimes the child repeats words/phrases when parents ask him a question, rather than giving a direct response which leads to confusion and having to interpret his behaviors to meet his needs. Per the November 2023 Regional Center Social Assessment and December 2023 Psychological Assessment, the child’s verbal skills are delayed in that his spontaneous language consisted primarily of echolalia and did not have a social component. Per the reports, these words were not directed to another person nor spoken for social purposes. His verbal communication was a mixture of minimal meaningful speech and peculiar speech such as jargon, echolalia, or pronoun reversal. The child frequently imitates others’ verbalizations in an echolalic manner with no sense of social communication evident.

The child cannot accurately recall comments made earlier in the conversation. It is commonly anticipated that an unimpaired child of comparable age could respond or follow to prompts in some consistent way or used previously learned information to relate to another. The April 2023 Interdisciplinary Assessment Report states the child does not demonstrate understanding of preschool-level concepts (spatial, use of objects, pronouns). The May 2023 Individualized Education Plan (IEP) states he is also not understanding concepts such as same/different, prepositions, or descriptive word [size, texture, shape, etc.]. Both reports state the child's social emotional development is significantly below age and was not able to respond to his name without physical gestures. The December 2023 Psychological Assessment states the child does not respond to his name being called even if repeated. It also states the child does not respond to social praise and will generally will not follow a whole classroom or small group instruction without it being repeated by an instructional paraprofessional.

The October 2023 Pediatrician Assessment of Need for Protective Supervision form (SOC 821) states the child's memory is severely impaired. The pediatrician explains that the child can retain some information, but not in a meaningful way for safety. It states the child has no sense of danger, and every situation includes repeat safety issues. It states the child does not recall usual safety norms appropriate for three-year olds.

The child cannot recall learned behaviors and information from the distant or recent past. Per the May 2024 Individualized Education Plan (IEP), the parents are concerned that the child will repeat words that he hears but has not been able to use these words correctly in novel situations. For example, he will use the term "walking, walking" to protest having to leave a preferred activity. The April 2023 Interdisciplinary Assessment Report and May 2023 Individualized Education Plan (IEP) also state the child demonstrates delays in receptive language and expressive communication in comparison with what is expected for his age. Expressively he communicates using body language, gestures, and verbal language that is often repetitive, but he is not yet relying on verbal language for a variety of pragmatic purposes, responding to questions, or telling simple stories. He does not answer questions. The April 2023 Interdisciplinary Assessment Report states the child was not observed to communicate for all pragmatic functions; instead, he primarily communicated to label or request. He was not observed to use verbal language to ask for help, gain attention, share/ show items or interest, or request repetition. The November 2023 Regional Center Social Assessment states he does not know how to use "yes" and "no" in certain situations and the child struggles with participating in conversations with others, and he often does not ask questions or respond appropriately. It also states the child needs information to be rephrased to a simpler level to enhance his understanding. The child's parents stated that tasks need to be broken down into simple steps to aide in his learning of a new task/subject.

The child cannot convey accurate information about himself. The November 2023 Caregiver/ Teacher Questionnaire states the child often communicates by requesting and rejecting objects/activities but does not often respond to greetings or to his name. When answering questions, he is often prompted from an adult to answer. The

November 2023 Regional Center Social Assessment states the child will show a "big reaction" towards pain when he gets hurt but will not indicate what happened.

The child cannot convey information in response to questions. The December 2023 Psychological Assessment does not use others' hand as a tool or to gesture. He does not point to items of interest or desired items. The child does not point or nod his head to signify "yes" or "no". The child does not use conventional or instrumental gestures. The child imitates the noises and words, but not behaviors of others. It states the child can complete some simple instructions if they are simplified and repeated. However, the child is generally unresponsive to communication from others. The child uses some speech to alert caregivers to immediate needs or wants, but little or no purely social use of verbalizations. He evidences little or no reciprocal conversation. Furthermore, he evidences very little spontaneous speech as the majority of his verbalizations are echolalic in nature. His phrases are almost exclusively stereotyped utterances.

It is determined that the above qualifies as severely impaired memory because these are the basic necessities in memory for an unimpaired child of comparable age to keep themselves safe.

Orientation

Orientation is awareness of time, place, self, and other individuals in one's environment. Based on the preponderance of the evidence, it is determined that the child's orientation meets a rank 2 (apparent occasional disorientation and confusion). Occasional disorientation and confusion is when the recipient has general awareness of time of day and can provide limited information about family, friends, age, and daily routine, etc.

It is noted there are times when the child shows severe disorientation. The December 2023 Psychological Assessment observed the child did not orient towards others nor did he direct his vocalizations towards others despite clearly knowing where his parents and this examiner were located. He did not reciprocate communication with others. The child shows few or no attempts to share enjoyment with others. He does not offer comfort to others. He did not request items, nor did he attempt to engage with others. He was unresponsive to his name being called by his parents or by the examiner. He was generally aloof to the presence of others and did not respond when others gave directives or attempted to engage with him. The December 2023 Psychological Assessment also states the child does not respond to others' change in voice tone.

Regarding self-awareness and emotional reactions, the December 2023 Psychological Assessment states the child shows a markedly limited range of facial expressions. His parents further noted that it is difficult to discern his emotional state except when he is engaging in tantrum behaviors. It states the child overreacts and underreact to sounds to an extremely marked degree, regardless of the type of sound. He will cover his ears for some noises but can tolerate other noises of similar frequency and volume.

The child's orientation is not severely impaired the majority of the time. The child has general awareness of time of day and routines. According to the December 2023 Psychological Assessment, the child follows a specific daily routine in which he will explore various parts of his home and engage in specific rigid behaviors unique to each location. For example, he requires his mother to give him his bottle and she must hold his feet while he feeds. The child also isolates specific behaviors and interactions for specific people. For example, he will go to his sister for her to play a specific song, he will go to his father for a specific type of play and go to his mother for a specific type of comfort. The child also will add additional steps that he feels is part of a sequence in a repetitive manner. If his mother directs him to put away a toy and he knows where to put it, he will still approach her before putting the toy in the bin. However, the November 2023 Regional Center Social Assessment states the child appears to have trouble with adapting to change easily, which is discussed under *Judgment*.

The child has some awareness about family, friends, age, etc. As above, the child directs certain wants to specific family members. The May 2023 Orientation and Mobility Report states child is very curious and readily explores things around his immediate environment with his hands and asking questions about things he happens to be touching. When encountering objects along the wall such as on shelves, he would explore what the item was with his hands and ask questions about what he was feeling. He also used his hearing to direct himself to things of that sounded interesting. At one point he sensed the assessing specialist's presence on the family's couch and came over to investigate who it was.

The April 2023 Interdisciplinary Assessment Report also states the child explores for better awareness. The child was observed exploring his environment by feeling what was around him. His parent was observed trying to use the sound of their voice or tapping of their foot to guide him as he navigated around the classroom setting. The May 2023 Orientation and Mobility Report states the child can identify activities by sound such as closing of a door or washing dishes, as well as by smell. Outside, the child will follow voices when walking with his cane and is good with using voice directionality and freely walks on different surfaces including pavement and grass.

The April 2023 Interdisciplinary Assessment Report states that at home, the child can navigate himself independently around the house since he has become familiar with the setting and placement of furniture. The parents report he is learning to use his cane outside to navigate. The May 2023 Orientation and Mobility Report also states the child uses a cane and knows how to sweep with it. He uses it explore his classroom, inside his home, and the front of his house, tapping the cane against different surfaces to hear how they sound, and to trail along to wall, tapping it against the garage door when walking along that area. As was found above, the child does not wander off due to confusion.

The October 2023 Pediatrician Assessment of Need for Protective Supervision forms (SOC 821) states the child has severe disorientation. However, the doctor's opinion on disorientation states the child's environment poses safety threats without consistent

supervision because there are unexpected dangers of things getting moved. This is discussed under *Judgment*.

Judgment

Judgment is the recipient making decisions so as not to put self or property in danger and whether recipient has capacity to respond to changes in the environment (e.g., fire, cold house), understands alternatives and risks involved, and accepts consequences of decisions. Based on the preponderance of the evidence, it is determined that the child's judgment meets a rank 5 (severely impaired judgment) when he engages in Autism behaviors. Severely impaired judgment means the recipient's behaviors would result in risk of injury, hazard, or accident and/or the recipient makes decisions without regard to safety or well-being.

It is noted that the child will follow simple one-step directions and per the May 2024 Individualized Education Plan (IEP) can transition from one activity to another with the help of his one-to-one vision support staff and priming. However, beyond these routine compliance instructions, the child generally will not follow a whole classroom or small group instruction without it being repeated by an instructional paraprofessional. However, based on the preponderance of the documentary evidence and testimony, the child has severely impaired judgment which puts him at risk when it comes to certain behaviors rooted in his mental impairments, Autism and Developmental Delay.

The child makes decisions without regard to safety or well-being. The April 2023 Interdisciplinary Assessment Report states the child has significant adaptive functional skill limitations and per the December 2023 Psychological Assessment scored Extremely Low in all adaptive functioning and adaptive skills.

In the letter of support, the Orientation and Mobility specialist states the child may be familiar with the layout of his home but lacks the judgment or maturity to avoid hazardous situations or deal with unexpected changes in his environment. This lack of judgment means he cannot correctly determine if something puts him in danger of harm. It states this can create hazardous situation in the home if he explores or touches things which could cause harm, such as a hot stove or pushing heavy computer monitor that he could accidentally knock onto himself. The November 2023 Regional Center Social Assessment states that parents recalled when the child ran towards the hot stove and has tried to climb into the bathtub with his clothes on. The letters from the Orientation and Mobility specialist and pediatrician note that these are common every-day household items that cannot be prevented from typical daily use for the family's needs.

The December 2023 Psychological Assessment states the child will push away cups and refuse to have them in his area during mealtimes. The November 2023 Regional Center Social Assessment states that if the child does not like something, he will toss it over, and that he has spilt hot tea over onto the table.

The May 2024 Individualized Education Plan (IEP) states the child independently explores his classroom and school environment without hesitation to touch things around him and on the ground.

The documentary evidence states the child will often try to put items into his mouth. The December 2023 Psychological Assessment states the child engages in frequent object mouthing with nearly everything in his environment. The July 2024 Individualized Education Plan (IEP) states that the education team is in agreement that without continuous adult supervision, it is possible that the child could be a danger to himself, due to mouthing behavior. The Special Education Teacher indicated that the child will mouth objects two to three times in a 10–15-minute period. The parents also shared that they have observed the child grab and/or mouth potentially harmful objects at home, such as scissors. The November 28, 2023 Caregiver/ Teacher Questionnaire states the child has intense interest in some objects (pepperoni from board game), often holding and putting objects in his mouth.

The May 2024 Individualized Education Plan (IEP) states the child seeks and explores his environment by putting non-food items in his mouth. It specifically states the child requires 1:1 adult support to prevent him from putting items in his mouth and to ensure safety of student in the area of mouthing (for example, putting sharp, non-food items, or adult hand in his mouth). Adults have used verbal redirection, provided safer alternative items and limited access to unsafe materials to help support. Although these measures are taken, the child still needs to and will explore his environment. It goes on to state the child could potentially hurt himself by mouthing objects if he is not provided with continuous adult supervision.

The November 2023 Regional Center Social Assessment states the child has vestibular (movement) issues and engaged in many body movements enjoying the feeling of swinging and spinning around in a circle, such as spinning around in a circle, jumping up and down, placing toys into his mouth/against his face, and fidgeting. The December 2023 Psychological Assessment states the child sometimes does not sit still in highchair, booster seat, or chair, without climbing or sliding off.

The November 2023 Regional Center Social Assessment states the child tends to be overactive while in the home and appears to have a lot of energy and the child has been observed to repetitively jump and spin for sustained periods. Parents mentioned that the child will show the daily repetitive behaviors of twirling, jumping, always having a toy in his hands, and placing objects into his mouth.

Per the December 2023 Psychological Assessment, the child displays a significant lack of safety and environmental awareness and definite signs of inappropriate type and/or degree of emotional response. It states the child requires constant supervision as he engages in climbing onto furniture. Furthermore, the child is unresponsive to his parents' warnings and verbal instructions to "stop" or "don't touch" items in his environment. It states the child appears to not retain previously learned information and will typically forget such information after approximately one to two days.

The April 2023 Interdisciplinary Assessment Report states that if the child cannot convey in some way what he wants, he can get frustrated. He can say "no" when not wanting something. When his requests weren't met, he got louder and louder. He does not say "yes". Parents reported that this is typical behavior, and they have to interpret his actions in order to meet his needs. The December 2023 Psychological Assessment states the child will engage in tantrum behaviors if people other than his mother take him to school. The child will get "stuck" on a specific item and will engage in tantrum behaviors until he gains access to that item. The child is highly sensitive to sounds and will cover his ears. He will engage in tantrum behaviors when exposed to such stimuli. The December 2023 Psychological Assessment states the child will refuse or engage in tantrum behaviors if his hands meet an unfavorable texture.

The child cannot evaluate and respond appropriately to environmental cues. The October 2023 Pediatrician Assessment of Need for Protective Supervision forms (SOC 821) states the child self-soothes with self-hitting which has caused minor injuries from bumping his head. The November 2023 Regional Center Social Assessment states the child will engage in self-injurious behaviors (such as hitting himself and headbanging) when he is upset. Parents mentioned that the child tends to take a while for him to "setting himself" in new environments.

The November 2023 Regional Center Social Assessment states the child reportedly will engage in "meltdowns," showing challenges with expressing himself. For example, parents shared that if the child loses a toy and cannot find it, he will become frustrated and begin to hit himself and headbang. Parents shared that this is a daily behavior that occurs when the child is upset at home. The child displays significant sound sensitivities and will cover his ears or engage in tantrum behaviors when overstimulated. The child is sensitive to the texture of his clothing and will refuse to wear specific articles based on how they feel. He is sensitive to textures other than hard and will engage in tantrum behaviors if he touches slimy textures. He also is a highly selective eater in that he has an extremely limited variety of accepted foods.

Per the December 2023 Psychological Assessment, child the displays definite preoccupations that intrude into family life (e.g., opening and closing doors) and he displays significant distress if his routines are not followed or completed (e.g., being fed by his mother while she plays with his feet and holds him a specific way. The child is highly particular about how his food is presented to him. It states the child also gets preoccupied with using an object or toy in some strange way; he focused on insignificant part of a toy. The child played with cause-and-effect toys in a repetitive manner. He also repetitively taps items in a nonfunctional manner.

Per the documentary evidence, the child displays definite and frequent stereotyped body movements (e.g., repetitive jumping/spinning). The child's play is also linked to highly stereotypic use of objects (e.g., tapping/flicking). The child shows constant sensory interest in objects (e.g., mouthing). In the video compilation, the child is seen mouthing toys that are the approximate size of the child's hand. The child is seen reaching onto the counter for what appears to be a plastic Tupperware container,

putting the bottom of the container in his mouth, and it is later seen on the floor. The cabinets have child-proofing devices on them. The child is seen in several clips bouncing on two feet in a circle within a confined space. The child is seen in the kitchen with a toy in his mouth next to the counter and then bouncing on two feet after putting his hand on the counter. When the child was bouncing in a circle, he was seen falling towards the floor and bracing himself with his arms and hands. The child has a bump on his temple. The child is seen jumping on the couch while propelling himself holding onto the back of the sofa chair.

The child is not amenable to social overtures. The May 2023 Individualized Education Plan (IEP) states the child is not seeking others out for fun/enjoyment, taking conversational or social turns, responding to his name or bids for his attention consistently, or showing or sharing things he finds interesting. Overall, his engagement with others is reduced for what would be expected at his age.

The child is not amenable to advice once he is fixated on something. December 2023 Psychological Assessment states that the child displays significant behavioral rigidities and when he becomes stuck on specific things (e.g., toys), he cannot be redirected. The April 2023 Interdisciplinary Assessment Report states that while playing, he wasn't reliably responsive to others and did not respond when dad asked him to move on to other toys.

The December 2023 Psychological Assessment states the child shows no interest in other children. The child prefers to play alone. He consistently avoids or ignores the approaches of other children. The child does not seek play involving groups of other children. He does not have peer relationships that involve selectivity and/or sharing. Furthermore, the child does not spontaneously offer to share items with others in any form. He generally ignores the overtures of others and shows no interest in interacting with peers. He does not display empathy or offer comfort to others. Rather, if he hears others crying, he will imitate the sounds that they are making. The child does not display any imaginative play skills.

It is noted that the under self-directing behavior, the November 2023 Regional Center Social Assessment states the child will self-initiate some tasks such as requesting food items (chips and cookies) when he is hungry. The preponderance of the evidence states the child's behaviors are otherwise severely impacted by his co-occurring functional impairments. The above deficits are what an unimpaired child of comparable age would typically rely on to maintain their needs.

In summary, it has been determined the child's mental functioning in orientation is moderately impaired, and memory and judgment are severely impaired. Based on the preponderance of the above evidence, it is determined that the child is nonself-directing. The July 2024 letter of support from child's speech therapist sums up why the child is nonself-directing. It states the child's Autism makes it difficult for him to access his environment as a typical child would. He demonstrates inability to care for himself, orient to activities, and demonstrates the need for full-time supervision. The child seeks

physical experiences that provide a high level of sensory input. These activities may include jumping, spinning, swinging, and physical tensing of muscles. The child does not show regard to his relative closeness to other children, walls, furniture, etc. while engaging in sensory seeking behaviors. Because he is not aware of proximity during these activities, they are often dangerous if not directly supervised.

Engagement in Potentially Dangerous Activities

There is no dispute that the child has the physical ability to engage in potentially dangerous behavior. Protective Supervision requires the child to likely engage in potentially dangerous activities, with consideration of his physical ability to put himself at risk of injury, hazard, or accident.

Based on the preponderance of the above evidence, the child does engage in potentially dangerous activities, which are as follows and documented above under *Judgment*:

The child explores his environment without hesitation in an attempt to be more familiar with textures and sounds, which could expose him to potentially dangerous items that are commonly found in the household, like sharp, bulky, heavy, spiky, edgy and protruding, or excessively hot items.

The child seeks and explores his environment by putting non-food items in his mouth (for example, putting sharp, non-food items in his mouth).

The child engage in many body movements enjoying the feeling of swinging and spinning around in a circle, such as spinning around in a circle, jumping up and down, placing toys into his mouth/against his face, and fidgeting without regard to proximity to potentially dangerous areas or objects. The child also excessively climbs and jumps on furniture while unresponsive to his parents' warnings and verbal instructions to "stop" or "don't touch" items in his environment.

The child self-soothes with self-hitting (self-injurious behavior) and has severe emotional dysregulation that causes meltdowns due to over-stimulation and high selectivity and rigidity.

24-Hour Supervision and More Supervision Required

Protective Supervision requires 24-hour supervision. If the behavior in question is considered predictable, and the need for supervision is at certain times of the day, there is no Protective Supervision eligibility because there is not a 24-hour need. Unpredictable episodic behavior must be frequent and long enough that constant supervision is necessary.

Per the documentary evidence, the child's potentially dangerous activities above have been observed at home (per case assessment narrative), during special needs

evaluations (per Psychological Assessments), and at school (per IEPs). The documentary evidence is consistent that child engages in these behaviors every day and frequently. One example such example is that per the July 2024 Individualized Education Plan (IEP), the Special Education Teacher indicated that the child will mouth objects two to three times in a 10–15-minute period. Whether they happen at night is immaterial. Due to the child’s Autism, there is no specific trigger that makes the above-mentioned potentially dangerous activities more or less likely to happen.

Additionally for minors, Protective Supervision requires that the child needs more supervision than a minor of comparable age, who is not mentally impaired or mentally ill. “More supervision” can be more time, more intensity, or both. The additional supervision required must be significantly more than routine childcare, and not only be related to the functional limitations of the child, but also allow the child to remain safely in their own home with this assistance.

The accommodations and modifications for the child are in excess of what an unimpaired child of comparable age would need to adapt. Per the May 2024 Individualized Education Plan (IEP), the child requires priming by reviewing expectations, changes or expected behavior prior to the activity before changes in the routine or activity to support appropriate skills, e.g. appropriate coping skills, transitions, or play skills, social skills training, feeding appropriate words, etc. For example, the child requires priming, letting him know that recess will be over soon to help him have a smoother transition that would alleviate or reduce a potentially dangerous activity, or meltdown. Per the May 2024 Individualized Education Plan (IEP) the child can transition from one activity to another with the help of his one-to-one vision support staff.

The October 2023 Pediatrician Assessment of Need for Protective Supervision forms (SOC 821) states the child has multiple needs beyond that of a typical 3-year-old. The December 2023 Psychological Assessment states the child receives specialized vision services, orientation and mobility, and individual and small group instruction. The December 2023 Psychological Assessment states that because the child was consistently aloof or unaware of what adults were doing in the room, only the most persistent attempts to get his attention had any effect.

Based on the preponderance of the evidence, the child does require 24-Hour supervision and significantly more supervision than an unimpaired minor of comparable age.

ORDER

The claim is granted.

Sacramento County (county) shall authorize the child for Protective Supervision effective August 1, 2023; notify the child in writing of its actions; and aid the child as otherwise eligible.



Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

SHN-105121263

7 messages

Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>
To: garciade@saccounty.gov

Fri, Feb 28, 2025 at 9:25 AM

Hello Ms. Garcia,

I'm glad to see that you have been assigned as the Sacramento County Hearing Representative for my child's case:

APPEAL SUBMISSION CONFIRMATION

Your hearing request has been received and is being reviewed.

Your case number is **SHN-105121263**.

You can return to your [account home page](#) or call **1-800-743-8525** at any time to check the status of your case.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE

Hearing Representative

Debra Garcia - Sacramento County
(Primary)
Contact: 9168744545
Email: garciade@saccounty.gov

IHSS Mailbox - Sacramento County
(Backup)
Email: DCFA S-SASIHSSHearing@saccounty.gov

I'm looking forward to talking with you about the matter. Please let me know when we can begin.

Thank you.

Yang Xiong

Garcia. Debra <garciade@saccounty.gov>
To: Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Fri, Feb 28, 2025 at 9:36 AM

Good morning, Mr. Xiong.

I am preparing for other hearing cases coming up next week. I will be reaching out to you after I have reviewed your appeal.

Thank you.



Debra L. Garcia
Hearing Program
Specialist

Office Phone: (916) 874-4545

Cell Phone: (916) 798-8461

Fax : (916) 874-2753

Email :
garciade@saccounty.gov

P.O. Box 269131

Sacramento, CA 95826

Department of Child, Family,
& Adult Services (IHSS)

Confidentiality Notice: This e-mail message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure, or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender without using reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message.

From: Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 28, 2025 9:26 AM
To: Garcia, Debra <garciade@saccounty.gov>
Subject: SHN-105121263

⚠ EXTERNAL EMAIL: If unknown sender, **do not** click links/attachments. **⚠**
If you have concerns about this email, please report it via the Phish Alert button.

Hello Ms. Garcia,

I'm glad to see that you have been assigned as the Sacramento County Hearing Representative for my child's case:

APPEAL SUBMISSION CONFIRMATION

Your hearing request has been received and is being reviewed.

Your case number is **SHN-105121263**.

You can return to your [account home page](#) or call **1-800-743-8525** at any time to check the status of your case.

HEARING REPRESENTATIVE

Hearing Representative

Debra Garcia - Sacramento County
(Primary)
Contact: 9168744545
Email: garciade@saccounty.gov

IHSS Mailbox - Sacramento County
(Backup)
Email: DCFAS-SAIHSSHearing@saccounty.gov

[Quoted text hidden]

Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>
To: "Garcia. Debra" <garciade@saccounty.gov>

Fri, Feb 28, 2025 at 10:03 AM

Dear Ms. Garcia,

Thank you for promptly acknowledging receipt of my email. Please take your time to thoroughly review my appeal, and let me know when you would be available for a discussion.


While I have already uploaded the reasons and supporting evidence for my appeal to ACMS, I am also attaching them here for your convenience.

I look forward to our conversation.

Thank you,

Yang Xiong

[Quoted text hidden]

 **February-9-2025-Appeal.pdf**
11829K

Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>
To: "Garcia. Debra" <garciade@saccounty.gov>

Mon, Mar 10, 2025 at 9:18 AM

Dear Ms. Garcia,

I understand that you are handling other claims and that my hearing has yet to be scheduled. However, I would like to move forward as soon as possible in resolving my claim, as it has been pending since August 1, 2023.

I want to be upfront—if we can resolve my claim outside of state hearings, I would prefer to do so. This would be my fourth state hearing for the same matter, and with the exception of the first, each Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) has ruled in my favor. Despite these rulings, Sacramento County has only been partially compliant, whether due to errors by IHSS staff handling my child's case or a larger systemic issue. As a

result, I have repeatedly had to rely on state hearings to compel the County to fulfill its obligations, unnecessarily wasting time and resources for all parties involved.

At its core, the issue comes down to a simple question: **Is Sacramento County obligated to make my child whole based on the ALJ's rulings?**

- **If yes**, the County should issue the remaining \$3,872.79, which has already been confirmed by Sacramento County staff and the prior County Hearing Representative, Ms. Yolanda Lewis.
- **If no**, please provide the specific regulation that justifies withholding this overdue overtime payment.

During a phone call with Ms. Vicki Cescato at CDSS on **February 7, 2025**, I confirmed that the regulation previously cited by Ms. Lewis (MPP Section 30-769.734) **does not support the County's stance that overtime is not paid**. Since then, Sacramento County has been unable to provide any alternative regulation justifying the withholding of \$3,872.79 in overtime payments. This amount has been arbitrarily withheld without a valid reason.

According to **ACL 17-102**, as the County's hearing representative, you:

- **"... are given the authority to make determinations on behalf of the county about whether or not a case should proceed to hearing and how to resolve the case throughout the hearing process."**
- **Shall not be required "... to seek prior approval before entering into an agreement with a claimant to resolve any aspect of the issues for hearing."**

As I understand it, you have the authority to approve my claim. I would appreciate your prompt attention to this matter so we can resolve it without the need for yet another state hearing. Please let me know how you intend to proceed.

Sincerely,
Yang Xiong

[Quoted text hidden]

Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>
To: "Garcia. Debra" <garciade@sacounty.gov>

Thu, Apr 24, 2025 at 2:50 PM

Hello, Ms. Garcia.

I just heard your voice message. Will you be available at 3 PM today?

I'll call you at that time.

Thanks.

Yang Xiong
[Quoted text hidden]

Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>
To: "Garcia. Debra" <garciade@sacounty.gov>

Thu, Apr 24, 2025 at 3:57 PM

Dear Ms. Garcia,

I am writing to confirm the substance of our brief phone conversation at approximately 3 p.m. today (about three minutes in duration).

- **Exhibit H** Upon my introduction, you stated that you would be “**sending a request for dismissal**” of my appeal.
- You explained—without further discussion—that the matter is, in your view, a “care-provider payment issue already heard” and therefore outside the State Hearings Division’s jurisdiction.
- When I clarified that my appeal concerns the County’s failure to comply with the ALJ’s previous order affecting my son **Kaleb Xiong’s** IHSS benefits (not a provider-payment dispute), you replied, “That is where we disagree.”
- No statutes, regulations, or evidence were provided during the call.
- You concluded by stating that you would upload your paperwork to ACMS “maybe by tomorrow,” noting my status as an e-filer.

Please let me know if any part of this summary is inaccurate. Thank you for your prompt attention.

Sincerely,

Yang Xiong

[Quoted text hidden]

Garcia. Debra <garciade@saccounty.gov>
To: Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Thu, Apr 24, 2025 at 4:04 PM

Good afternoon, Mr. Xiong.

Thank you for confirming our conversation.

[Quoted text hidden]



Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

1951916 K.X. IHSS hours & MediCal funding

26 messages

Love, Suzanne <LoveSu@saccounty.gov>
To: "yangcounty@gmail.com" <yangcounty@gmail.com>
Cc: "Choy, Norman" <choyna@saccounty.gov>

Thu, Sep 12, 2024 at 3:20 PM

Good afternoon Mr. Xiong,

My name is Suzanne Love and I am Mr. Norman Choy's supervisor. Mr. Choy has looped me in on your concerns about your son's Medi-Cal funding source and the hours being capped at 195 when you were under the assumption they would be 195 plus.

Here is the breakdown of when and why:

You are correct, the NOA dated 10/6/2023, that was sent out after Kaleb's case was approved, did indicate he was funded through the PCSP program. (at this time there was not an enrolled care provider on his case as it was a new intake)

However, once Kaleb's mother completed the enrollment process to be the paid care provider, one of four criteria were met for the funding source to switch from PCSP to IPO. The date of that NOA was 11/29/2023.

During the time there were issues with Kaleb's MediCal, the funding source switched from IPO to Residual which happens when there is a problem with MediCal. However, once you sorted out the issue, Kaleb's case correctly went back to IPO funding.

Now that Kaleb's funding source is IPO (because the paid care provider is a parent), and at this time he is not considered severely impaired (SI), the authorized hours will remain capped at 195. An IHSS client is considered severely impaired when there is a "Combined Individual Need" of 20 hours or more per week in certain tasks (notice that Protective Supervision is not one of those tasks) ...

preparation of meals, meal clean-up (if preparation of meals and feeding are assessed needs), respiration, bowel and bladder care, feeding, routine bed baths, dressing, menstrual care, ambulation, transfer, bathing, oral hygiene, grooming, repositioning and rubbing skin, care and assistance with prosthesis/medication, paramedical services

Kaleb currently has 5 hours and 57 minutes authorized per week in the aforementioned tasks. Since Kaleb is only 4 years old, several of these tasks still fall under parental responsibility and hours cannot be authorized. As Kaleb ages and if certain milestones are not met, additional hours may be approved according to the Age Appropriate Guidelines. (I believe Mr. Choy has shared that chart with you). When/if the threshold of more than 20 hours is met, the hours will change accordingly.

Best regards,

Exhibit I

Suzanne Love

IHSS Human Services Supervisor

DCFAS, County of Sacramento

Phone: 916-874-2018

Email: lovesu@saccounty.gov

Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>
To: "Love. Suzanne" <LoveSu@saccounty.gov>
Cc: "Choy. Norman" <choyna@saccounty.gov>

Thu, Sep 12, 2024 at 4:24 PM

Good afternoon, Ms. Love.

I appreciate you taking the time to help address my questions. I will take some time to digest what you emailed more fully, and then I'll get back to you with my comments. In the meantime, please send me a copy of the 11/29/2023 NOA. I have a copy of all the others, but for some reason, I don't have a copy of that particular one.

Thank you.

Yang Xiong
[Quoted text hidden]

Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>
To: "Love. Suzanne" <LoveSu@saccounty.gov>
Cc: "Choy. Norman" <choyna@saccounty.gov>, Mary Xiong <maryxiong19@yahoo.com>

Sun, Sep 15, 2024 at 10:20 AM

Dear Ms. Love and Mr. Choy,

I deeply appreciate both of you dedicating your time and effort to assist me in resolving my son's IHSS service arrangement, a vital aspect of his life. Your dedication is truly commendable. I am committed to working collaboratively with you to ensure that my son's IHSS services are provided in accordance with the regulations. After a year-long appeal, an ALJ has now determined, and the county has agreed, that Kaleb has been eligible for protective supervision since August 1, 2023. I am eager to see this order fully implemented.

As I understand it, protective supervision is an all-or-nothing deal in that you either get 195 hours per month or you don't. Since Kaleb is eligible for PS, I would like the county to follow through and authorize him 195 hours per month. However, the current indication on the NOA shows that Kaleb was not given the total 195 hours as it had been reduced by the same number of hours of the services he had been eligible for (32:16). This reduction, which is incorrect, needs to be rectified immediately.

You explained that this arrangement occurred because Kaleb was put into the IPO program when his mother signed up as his provider. I have shared with you that I know many other families where the parents are the providers for their IHSS recipient minors, yet they were not capped at 195. I have continued to do more research and found some information that explains how other recipients, whose situation is similar to Kaleb's, are not capped at 195. I ask that you consider what I will be sharing below and take the necessary actions to fix the issue so that Kaleb's service hours are appropriately authorized.

Exhibit I

I've found that when Kaleb was determined to be PS eligible, he met the criteria to be put into the CFCO program, where the cap is 283 per ACL 14-60, regardless of his mother being his provider. The IPO program would be appropriate for Kaleb if he did not have PS. However, because Kaleb actually should have had PS since August 1, 2023, Kaleb should have been put into the CFCO program. Again, now that the ALJ has issued the order for the county to grant PS back-dating to August 1, 2023, I ask that Kaleb be put into the CFCO program immediately so that his PS hours are not impacted.

I understand that Kaleb's IHSS is linked to his Medi-Cal eligibility, so you are also limited in what you can do to correct the situation based on what's showing on their end. I have also looked into this matter and learned of the following. Kaleb is currently coded with a P7, but it would have been more appropriate if he had been coded with 20, 60, or 6V – all of which are related to his disability. This incorrect coding appears to be affecting his eligibility for the CFCO program, which is a "2k" code from my research. On Friday, I went to DHA and spoke extensively with Margie Lu and Sandy __ (I didn't get her last name). Please work with them and make the necessary corrections to the system so that Kaleb's IHSS hours can be appropriately authorized.

I am ready and willing to work with all of you to ensure that Kaleb's hours are appropriately authorized based on his eligibility and the regulations. This issue is of utmost importance to us, and I kindly request that you keep me updated on the progress of my request. If there is anything else you need from me to facilitate the corrections, please do not hesitate to let me know. I am looking forward to a swift resolution to this matter.

Thanks.

Yang Xiong

[Quoted text hidden]

Love, Suzanne <LoveSu@saccounty.gov>
To: Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>
Cc: "Choy, Norman" <choyna@saccounty.gov>, Mary Xiong <maryxiong19@yahoo.com>

Mon, Sep 16, 2024 at 8:42 AM

Good morning Mr. Xiong,

Thank you for taking the time to lay out your thoughts regarding your son's case.

In response to your email, your son has in fact been authorized 195 hours. There were several NOAs sent out since the ALJ at the re-hearing ordered PS be granted back to the date of application. The NOA dated 9/11/2024 that starts out "As of 8/1/2023..." clearly indicates the authorization is 195 hours. This was an increase of 162:44 hours which were added to the hours already authorized for your son. As I mentioned in my email last week, because of the Medi-Cal funding, the hours are capped at 195 and not 195 plus whatever hours were authorized before. In looking at the timesheet history, 195 hours have already been claimed going back to 8/1/2023 which was ordered by the re-hearing ALJ.

IHSS does not determine the Medi-Cal funding source. Any Medi-Cal related information flows from DHA's system to ours. Based on your email below, it sounds like you are already actively working with DHA to address your concerns about the funding source for your son. When/if that is augmented or changed in any way on DHA's end, the information will flow to our system and your son's case will be updated accordingly.

Exhibit I
Best regards,

Suzanne Love

IHSS Human Services Supervisor

DCFAS, County of Sacramento

Phone: 916-874-2018

Email: lovesu@saccounty.gov

From: Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 15, 2024 10:21 AM
To: Love. Suzanne <LoveSu@saccounty.gov>
Cc: Choy. Norman <choyna@saccounty.gov>; Mary Xiong <maryxiong19@yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: 1951916 K.X. IHSS hours & MediCal funding

EXTERNAL EMAIL: If unknown sender, **do not** click links/attachments.
If you have concerns about this email, please report it via the Phish Alert button.

[Quoted text hidden]

Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>
To: "Love. Suzanne" <LoveSu@saccounty.gov>
Cc: "Choy. Norman" <choyna@saccounty.gov>, Mary Xiong <maryxiong19@yahoo.com>

Mon, Sep 16, 2024 at 9:29 AM

Good morning, Ms. Love.

Thank you for your email. Can you also please respond to the following questions:

1. Is Protective Supervision an "all or nothing" of 195 monthly hours?
2. Is my son eligible to be placed in the CFCO subprogram?

In my prior email, I shared how I see it regarding the two questions. Would you please verify my understanding or correct me if I've misunderstood?

Thank you.

Yang Xiong

[Quoted text hidden]

Love. Suzanne <LoveSu@saccounty.gov>
To: Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>
Cc: "Choy. Norman" <choyna@saccounty.gov>, Mary Xiong <maryxiong19@yahoo.com>

Mon, Sep 16, 2024 at 2:45 PM

Exhibit I

Good afternoon Mr. Xiong,

Here are my responses to your two questions:

1. I am not quite sure I understand what you mean by “all or nothing” as it relates to protective supervision. Protective supervision is either approved or not approved if that helps. As for the 195 monthly hours, no. PS does not equate to automatically authorizing a block of 195 hours. Anytime a client has time authorized in personal care, those hours are factored into the calculation for PS since ostensibly the client is being watched as client is receiving assistance with bowel & bladder, dressing, showering, etc.
2. As for your question about your son being in the CFCO “subprogram”, you mentioned earlier that you did some research. As your research must have revealed, all CFCO participants must be eligible for Full-Scope Medi-Cal (which your 4-year-old child has) **AND** meet the CFCO Nursing Facility Level of Care. In other words, the program is designed for individuals who would otherwise require a nursing facility level of care. For IHSS, clients are deemed severely impaired when there is a “Combined Individual Need” of 20 hours or more per week in certain tasks. (see my email below where I lay out what those tasks are...once again, Protective Supervision is NOT one of the tasks). Kaleb currently has 5 hours and 57 minutes authorized per week in the tasks used to determine whether or not he is severely impaired. Since Kaleb is only 4 years old, several of the tasks still fall under parental responsibility and hours cannot be authorized. As Kaleb ages and if certain milestones are not met, additional hours may be approved according to the Age Appropriate Guidelines. When/if the threshold of more than 20 hours is met, the hours will change accordingly.

Best regards,

Suzanne Love

IHSS Human Services Supervisor

DCFAS, County of Sacramento

Phone: 916-874-2018

Email: lovesu@saccounty.gov

[Quoted text hidden]

Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Tue, Sep 17, 2024 at 9:37 AM

To: "Love, Suzanne" <LoveSu@saccounty.gov>

Cc: "Choy, Norman" <choyna@saccounty.gov>, Mary Xiong <maryxiong19@yahoo.com>

Good morning, Ms. Love.

Thank you for responding to my questions. I have some follow up questions.

Regarding the number of PS hours, why is that some recipients are authorized the full amount of 45:02 per week while others are not? Why does your explanation for Kaleb being authorized less than 45:02 per week not apply to others where they get both the full 45:02 plus the additional hours for other service areas?

Regarding eligibility to be placed in the CFCO program, per ACL 14-60, to meet CFCO NF LOC eligibility, Kaleb only

Exhibit I
needs to have met "one" of the three criteria listed. You cited that Kaleb did not meet criterion 3. I agree that he doesn't meet that particular criterion.

But Kaleb meets criterion 1 which simply says "Have a total assessed need (excluding heavy cleaning and yard hazard abatement) of 195 or more IHSS hours per month." As stated before, the ALJ has determined that Kaleb's hours should have been at least 195 since August 1, 2023. Because of this determination, Kaleb clearly meets this criterion and therefore, he has met the eligibility for CFCO NF LOC which means that he has met the eligibility criteria to be placed in the CFCO as he does have full-scope Medi-Cal.

Furthermore, suppose that he does not meet criterion 1 for whatever reason, in that he has less than 195 hours, he still meets eligibility for CFCO NF LOC based on criterion 2. This criterion states "Have a total assessed need (excluding heavy cleaning and yard hazard abatement) under 195 IHSS hours per month and ..." where it listed two bullet points, where one OR the other bullet point can be used. In Kaleb's case, he met the second bullet point where he has a "combined FI Rank of 6 or higher in mental functioning (memory, orientation, and judgment)." Per the ALJ, Kaleb has a combined FI Rank of 12 (memory-5, orientation-2, and judgement-5). Therefore, Kaleb has met all the eligibility criteria to be placed in the CFCO program.

Please take the necessary actions to properly place Kaleb in the CFCO program and increase his PS hours from 37:35 per week to 45:02 per week.

Thank you.

Yang Xiong
[Quoted text hidden]

2 attachments

 **ALL COUNTY LETTER NO. 14-60.pdf**
532K

 **8.1.2023.pdf**
9048K

Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>
To: "Love. Suzanne" <LoveSu@saccounty.gov>
Cc: "Choy. Norman" <choyna@saccounty.gov>, Mary Xiong <maryxiong19@yahoo.com>

Wed, Sep 18, 2024 at 11:02 AM

Hello, Ms. Love.

Can I get a quick update on whether you need more time to respond to my email or if you are still not changing the county's position?

Thank you.

Yang Xiong
[Quoted text hidden]

Love. Suzanne <LoveSu@saccounty.gov>
To: Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>
Cc: "Choy. Norman" <choyna@saccounty.gov>, Mary Xiong <maryxiong19@yahoo.com>

Thu, Sep 19, 2024 at 8:46 AM

Good morning Mr. Xiong,

My response is a bit delayed as I was in meetings all day yesterday.

I am going to have one of our program specialists look at your son's case to ensure there isn't a special process or particular circumstances I am missing. Once I hear back, I will let you know.

Exhibit I

Thank you in advance for your patience.

[Quoted text hidden]

Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Thu, Sep 19, 2024 at 8:59 AM

To: "Love. Suzanne" <LoveSu@saccounty.gov>

Cc: "Choy. Norman" <choyna@saccounty.gov>, Mary Xiong <maryxiong19@yahoo.com>

Good morning, Ms. Love.

No problem, thank you for the update.

As you know, I must operate within a time frame as specified in the NOA. I prefer that we resolve the matter as soon as possible so that I do not have to contact the State Hearings Division and/or submit an appeal. I received the "Compliance Completed" letter from them yesterday, and it says I should contact them if "Sacramento County did not carry out all the actions ordered ..."

I want to thank you ahead for diligently working on my request.

Yang Xiong

[Quoted text hidden]

Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Thu, Sep 19, 2024 at 10:14 AM

To: "Love. Suzanne" <LoveSu@saccounty.gov>

Cc: "Choy. Norman" <choyna@saccounty.gov>, Mary Xiong <maryxiong19@yahoo.com>

By the way, please email me a copy of the 11/29/2023 NOA or send me a hard copy. I'm pretty good at keeping these important documents, but I don't see this one in my records.

Thanks.

Yang Xiong

[Quoted text hidden]

Love. Suzanne <LoveSu@saccounty.gov>

Thu, Sep 19, 2024 at 10:24 AM

To: Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Cc: "Choy. Norman" <choyna@saccounty.gov>, Mary Xiong <maryxiong19@yahoo.com>

Good morning Mr. Xiong,

The requested NOA was put in the mail to you on Monday this week.

[Quoted text hidden]

Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Thu, Sep 19, 2024 at 10:26 AM

To: "Love. Suzanne" <LoveSu@saccounty.gov>

Cc: "Choy. Norman" <choyna@saccounty.gov>, Mary Xiong <maryxiong19@yahoo.com>

Ok, thank you.

Yang Xiong

[Quoted text hidden]

Love. Suzanne <LoveSu@saccounty.gov>

Thu, Sep 19, 2024 at 11:36 AM

To: Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Cc: "Choy. Norman" <choyna@saccounty.gov>, Mary Xiong <maryxiong19@yahoo.com>

Exhibit I

Hello Mr. Xiong,

Thankfully I asked for another set of eyes!

The rankings for memory, orientation, and judgment for your 4-year-old child were adjusted to equal at least 6 thereby changing the case into being a CFCO-funded case. By doing this, the overall authorized hours have increased from 195 to 227:16. Because time has already been claimed for the months dating back to 8/1/2023, I will be processing a special transaction for the difference in hours for the 14 months (August 2023 – September 2024). A special transaction means a payment will be made directly for the difference in the hours for the previous 14 months.

Moving forward, beginning October 1st with the assessed hours as they currently are, the total authorized amount will be 227:16.

I know there is a reassessment scheduled for next Tuesday so things could possibly change.

I appreciate your patience and understanding.

[Quoted text hidden]

Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Thu, Sep 19, 2024 at 12:43 PM

To: "Love. Suzanne" <LoveSu@saccounty.gov>

Cc: "Choy. Norman" <choyna@saccounty.gov>, Mary Xiong <maryxiong19@yahoo.com>

Good afternoon, Ms. Love.

Thank you for your cooperation in working with me to get to where we are now.

I am happy to hear that you will be taking the necessary actions to process a special transaction for the difference in hours for the 14 months (August 2023 - September 2024) and that going forward, Kaleb will be in the CFCO program where he will be authorized a total of 227:16 monthly hours beginning October 1, 2024.

I fully understand that things could change based on the upcoming reassessment. If we have a disagreement, we will work through the matter again as this is how we ensure that public funds are properly used and clients who rightly have qualified are given the resources that they need.

Thank you once again for your cooperation and diligence in working with me.

Yang Xiong

[Quoted text hidden]

Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Mon, Sep 23, 2024 at 9:08 AM

To: "Love. Suzanne" <LoveSu@saccounty.gov>

Cc: "Choy. Norman" <choyna@saccounty.gov>, Mary Xiong <maryxiong19@yahoo.com>

Good morning, Ms. Love.

You indicated last week that you would be processing a special transaction for the remaining period for the difference in hours for the 14 months (August 2023 – September 2024). That payment would be made directly for the difference in the hours for the previous 14 months.

Can you please clarify further whether Kaleb's provider would see this directly deposited, whether a check would be

Exhibit I
coming in the mail, and whether there is a need for Kaleb's provider to complete some timesheets or paperwork? Also, what is the timeline for this special transaction to be processed?

Thank you.

Yang Xiong
[Quoted text hidden]

Love. Suzanne <LoveSu@saccounty.gov>
To: Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>
Cc: "Choy. Norman" <choyna@saccounty.gov>, Mary Xiong <maryxiong19@yahoo.com>

Mon, Sep 23, 2024 at 12:03 PM

Good afternoon Mr. Xiong,

As discussed last week, the request for the special transaction was submitted. The special transaction is processed by a different set of workers on the money side of things which is kept separate from the social worker side of things to prevent any conflict.

Once the special transaction is processed, it will be paid directly to Kaleb in the form of a check. There are no additional timesheets or paperwork needed.

As for the timeline, since it is not done on the social worker side of things, I cannot speak to the timeline or process. I did flag the task as subsequent to a re-hearing.

[Quoted text hidden]

Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>
To: "Love. Suzanne" <LoveSu@saccounty.gov>
Cc: "Choy. Norman" <choyna@saccounty.gov>, Mary Xiong <maryxiong19@yahoo.com>

Mon, Sep 23, 2024 at 1:48 PM

Thank you for the clarification.

But I am concerned that if the check is paid directly to Kaleb, we will not be able to do anything with it as Kaleb is a child without a bank account under his name. Would it be made out to one of his parents? Would you please ensure the payment is made to one of his parents?

Thanks.

Yang Xiong
[Quoted text hidden]

Love. Suzanne <LoveSu@saccounty.gov>
To: Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>
Cc: "Choy. Norman" <choyna@saccounty.gov>, Mary Xiong <maryxiong19@yahoo.com>

Mon, Sep 23, 2024 at 1:57 PM

Good afternoon Mr. Xiong,

As mentioned previously, the money side of the house is separate from the social worker side of the house and is not something either myself nor Mr. Choy oversee.

Exhibit I
The check will be made out to Kaleb as he is the recipient. I would advise discussing the matter with your bank.

[Quoted text hidden]

Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Mon, Sep 23, 2024 at 2:13 PM

To: "Love. Suzanne" <LoveSu@saccounty.gov>

Cc: "Choy. Norman" <choyna@saccounty.gov>, Mary Xiong <maryxiong19@yahoo.com>

Ms. Love.

It is very disappointing to hear that you will not even attempt to communicate with fiscal regarding my request, yet you advised me to talk to the bank for several reasons:

- 1) The bank has nothing to do with what's going on between the County and Kaleb. If the bank is his fiscal agent, then it makes sense for me to work with them, but they are not.
- 2) Sure, Kaleb is the recipient of services, but he is not the one providing services for himself. The check should be made out to his provider - his mother (Mary Xiong). But if the County insists that the check must be made out to a 4 -year child Kaleb, then it should be made to me, his father and authorized representative.

Since you will not attempt to communicate with fiscal or the "money side of the house," I request their contact information so I can handle this matter on my end. I will include you in my communications.

Thank you.

Yang Xiong

[Quoted text hidden]

Mail Delivery Subsystem <mailer-daemon@googlemail.com>

Mon, Sep 23, 2024 at 2:13 PM

To: yangcounty@gmail.com



Message blocked

Your message to **maryxiong19@yahoo.com** has been blocked.
See technical details below for more information.

[LEARN MORE](#)

▲ *This link will take you to a third-party site*

The response from the remote server was:

554 Message not allowed - [BL01] Email not accepted for policy reasons. Please visit <https://senders.yahooinc.com/error-codes>

Final-Recipient: rfc822; maryxiong19@yahoo.com

Action: failed

Status: 4.4.2

Remote-MTA: dns; mta5.am0.yahoodns.net. (67.195.228.94, the server for the

Exhibit I
domain (yahoo.com.)

Diagnostic-Code: smtp; 554 Message not allowed - [BL01] Email not accepted for policy reasons. Please visit

<https://senders.yahooinc.com/error-codes>

Last-Attempt-Date: Mon, 23 Sep 2024 14:13:16 -0700 (PDT)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

To: "Love. Suzanne" <LoveSu@saccounty.gov>

Cc: "Choy. Norman" <choyna@saccounty.gov>, Mary Xiong <maryxiong19@yahoo.com>

Bcc:

Date: Mon, 23 Sep 2024 14:13:03 -0700

Subject: Re: 1951916 K.X. IHSS hours & MediCal funding

----- Message truncated -----

Love. Suzanne <LoveSu@saccounty.gov>

Mon, Sep 23, 2024 at 4:27 PM

To: Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Cc: "Choy. Norman" <choyna@saccounty.gov>, Mary Xiong <maryxiong19@yahoo.com>

Hello Mr. Xiong,

As I mentioned previously today, the payroll side of things are completely separate from the social worker side of things. Neither Mr. Choy nor myself oversee any aspect of the protocols and procedures adhered to on the payroll side nor do we assert any influence over them.

The contact number for payroll is 916-874-9805.

[Quoted text hidden]

Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Thu, Sep 26, 2024 at 10:54 AM

To: "Love. Suzanne" <LoveSu@saccounty.gov>

Cc: "Choy. Norman" <choyna@saccounty.gov>, Mary Xiong <maryxiong19@yahoo.com>, ihss-payroll@saccounty.gov

Exhibit I

Good morning, Ms. Love.

I contacted Payroll this morning and spoke to Ray N. or it could be M. regarding the remaining backpay. According to Ray, nothing in the system indicates that there is still a backpay due for August 1, 2023 - September 30, 2024. All that he sees is that beginning October 1, 2024, around 227 hours will be authorized.

Unless I have misunderstood Ray, you and/or Mr. Choy need to initiate on your end how many hours still need to be added from August 2023 to September 2024. Payroll will then make the hours available for Kaleb's provider to complete the supplemental timesheets.

Ray is copied on this email via ihss-payroll@saccounty.gov. Please correct me if I've misunderstood you, Ray. However, if my understanding is correct, would the two of you please do whatever is appropriate based on your protocols to issue the check payable to Kaleb's mother/provider (Mary Xiong) or make the supplemental timesheets available so Kaleb's provider can complete and submit them?

I've attached our communications from the last few weeks in PDF form for background information regarding the remaining backpay. Please process this remaining task as ordered by the ALJ soon.

Thank you.

Yang Xiong

[Quoted text hidden]

 **Gmail - 1951916 K.X. IHSS hours & MediCal funding.pdf**
353K

Love, Suzanne <LoveSu@saccounty.gov>

Fri, Sep 27, 2024 at 4:34 PM

To: Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Cc: "Choy, Norman" <choyna@saccounty.gov>, Mary Xiong <maryxiong19@yahoo.com>, DCFAS SAS-IHSS-Payroll <IHSS-payroll@saccounty.gov>

Good afternoon Mr. Xiong,

Just to recap the information provided earlier to you, there will not be supplemental timesheets to complete. There is no additional paperwork needed from Kaleb's mother/paid caregiver. The payment will be processed as a special transaction which explains why there aren't any additional hours to claim within the timesheet portal.

The payment will be made outside of hours claimed on timesheets. The payment will be issued in the form of a check made payable to the client. As for the process of issuing the check, since there aren't any timesheets to reconcile the amount being paid out, the payment must go through an approval process within payroll prior to issuance.

Thank you for your continued patience.

[Quoted text hidden]

Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com>

Mon, Sep 30, 2024 at 9:20 AM

To: "Love, Suzanne" <LoveSu@saccounty.gov>

Cc: "Choy, Norman" <choyna@saccounty.gov>, Mary Xiong <maryxiong19@yahoo.com>, DCFAS SAS-IHSS-Payroll <IHSS-payroll@saccounty.gov>

Good morning, Ms. Love and IHSS Payroll.

My concern is that I am receiving different information from both of you, During my conversation with Ray at IHSS Payroll

last week, I was informed that there is no record in the payroll system of the remaining backpay for the period of August 1, 2023, through September 30, 2024, which should have been 32:16 each month. Instead, the system only shows a future increase to 227:16 per month starting October 1, 2024. This aligns with the NOA, dated 9/20/2024, which I received on 9/27/2024.

It is my understanding that whenever there is a change or correction to recipients' services/hours, an NOA must be generated. Why was an NOA not generated to document the need to increase my son's hours to 227:16 per month, backdating to August 1, 2023? The ALJ had ordered it, and you confirmed on 9/19/2024 that my son's hours should have been 227:16 per month instead of 195 per month, backdating to August 1, 2023. I had expected multiple NOAs to be issued reflecting the correction going back to August 1, 2023, as multiple NOAs were issued on 9/11/2024 when you first attempted to carry out the ALJ's order.

Given the different responses I've received from IHSS Payroll and you, Ms. Love, and the absence of an NOA reflecting the need to increase my son's hours, I am concerned that the necessary communications and authorizations have not occurred. I would greatly appreciate clarification on this matter. If these have indeed occurred, please provide a clear timeline for when we can expect the remaining backpay to be issued.

Thank you.

Yang Xiong
[Quoted text hidden]

Yang Xiong <yangcounty@gmail.com> Tue, Oct 1, 2024 at 10:00 AM
To: "Love, Suzanne" <LoveSu@saccounty.gov>
Cc: "Choy, Norman" <choyna@saccounty.gov>, Mary Xiong <maryxiong19@yahoo.com>, DCFAS SAS-IHSS-Payroll <IHSS-payroll@saccounty.gov>

Good morning.

The State of California \$7,748.05 adjustment check, dated 9/26/2024, was issued to Kaleb Xiong (see attached), and we received it on 9/30/2024 for the remaining IHSS hours of 32:16 each month from August 2023 through September 2024 as we have discussed even though the Service Period listed on the adjustment check stub says 8/1/2024 to 08/31/2024. Per existing labor laws, these remaining 32:16 hours should have been considered overtime; therefore, these hours should have been paid at the Overtime pay rate. Had these hours been paid as overtime, the total would have been **\$11,620.84**. However, because only \$7,748.05 has been issued, a remaining balance of **\$3,872.79** (\$11,620.84 - \$7,748.05 = \$3,872.79) must be issued immediately.

The table below shows the calculations. We recognize that our figure for the total Regular pay is \$7,747.23; the adjustment check is slightly different at \$7,748.05, which is \$0.82 more than our calculation.

Monthly Hours to Be Paid	32.26666667			
Month	Pay Rate	Regular	Overtime	Difference
Aug-23	\$16.50	\$532.40	\$798.60	\$266.20
Sep-23	\$16.50	\$532.40	\$798.60	\$266.20
Oct-23	\$16.50	\$532.40	\$798.60	\$266.20
Nov-23	\$16.50	\$532.40	\$798.60	\$266.20
Dec-23	\$16.50	\$532.40	\$798.60	\$266.20
Jan-24	\$17.00	\$548.53	\$822.80	\$274.27
Feb-24	\$17.00	\$548.53	\$822.80	\$274.27
Mar-24	\$17.00	\$548.53	\$822.80	\$274.27
Apr-24	\$17.00	\$548.53	\$822.80	\$274.27
May-24	\$17.00	\$548.53	\$822.80	\$274.27
Jun-24	\$18.15	\$585.64	\$878.46	\$292.82
Jul-24	\$18.15	\$585.64	\$878.46	\$292.82


Exhibit I

Aug-24	\$18.15	\$585.64	\$878.46	\$292.82
Sep-24	\$18.15	\$585.64	\$878.46	\$292.82
Total		\$7,747.23	\$11,620.84	\$3,873.61

Thank you ahead of time for working on this request. Please let me know whether the County will issue the balance of \$3,872.79.

Yang Xiong

[Quoted text hidden]

 **9.26.2024 Backpay.pdf**
909K

Summary of February 27, 2025 Phone Conference with Victoria Cescato, California Department of Social Services (CDSS)

Yang Xiong's Clarification of the Specific Dispute: 32:16 Additional Monthly Hours Were Shorted Overtime

- **Facts Presented by Yang Xiong:**
 - The County initially authorized **195 hours/month** after the ALJ ruling, and the provider was **properly paid**, including overtime, for these hours via the normal electronic timesheet system.
 - After further advocacy, the County acknowledged **32:16 additional hours/month** were owed, retroactively.
 - However, for these 32:16 hours, instead of paying through timesheets, the County issued a **special transaction check at only the standard hourly rate, omitting overtime**.
 - This caused a total shortfall of approximately **\$3,872** in unpaid overtime.
-

CDSS Argument 1: Payment After a State Hearing Goes to the Recipient, Not the Provider

- **Victoria Cescato's Position:**

Payments issued following a State Hearing go directly to the **recipient**, not to the **provider**, because the services were "not technically authorized" until after the hearing decision.
 - **Regulatory Reference by CDSS:**

Victoria Cescato cited **MPP 30-769.734**, stating it supports this process.
 - **Yang Xiong's Response:**

Yang Xiong asked for the exact regulation that supports this position, noting that **MPP 30-769.734** mentions payment to the recipient but **does not address overtime or negate labor law obligations**.
-

CDSS Argument 2: No Overtime is Owed if Services Were Not Authorized Beforehand

- **Victoria Cescato's Position:**
Because services were not officially authorized before the ALJ's decision, there is no obligation to backpay overtime wages to providers.
 - **Yang Xiong's Response:**
Yang Xiong explained that services **had actually been provided** the entire time, and that the **ALJ's retroactive authorization** validated the necessity of those services. He emphasized that once services are authorized retroactively, **standard labor protections**, including overtime pay, must apply.
-

CDSS Argument 3: State Hearing Payment Structure Calculates Overtime Differently (or May Exclude It)

- **Victoria Cescato's Position:**
Even though some overtime was paid earlier, Victoria Cescato suggested that **State Hearing payments** may treat overtime differently or may not calculate it at all under normal wage and hour rules because the award is to the **recipient**, not tied directly to provider wage structures.
 - **Yang Xiong's Response:**
Yang Xiong challenged this, insisting that **there is no regulation** that authorizes **ignoring labor law** for services that were actually rendered, retroactively authorized, and that **overtime must be paid when weekly hours exceed 40**, regardless of administrative mechanisms.
-

Conclusion of the Call

- **CDSS Commitment:**
Victoria Cescato agreed to **escalate the matter to CDSS leadership** and promised to **obtain a written policy explanation** that specifically cites the regulation or policy being relied upon.
- **Yang Xiong's Closing Reminder:**
Yang Xiong reiterated the need for a **written response** with clear citations because of Sacramento County's repeated pattern of denying claims until regulations were directly pointed out.