

OCRA ANNUAL REPORT
2011 – 2012

<u>TABLE OF CONTENTS</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES.....	1
A. Services are provided in a manner that maximizes staff and operational resources.....	2
1) Advocacy Reports.....	2
2) Analysis of Consumers Served.....	4
3) Outreach/Trainings.....	6
B. Issues and complaints are resolved expeditiously and at the lowest level of appropriate intervention.....	7
C. Collaborative and harmonious working relationships are fostered.....	7
1) Memorandums of Understanding.....	7
2) Meeting with Association of Regional Center Agencies (ARCA).....	8
D. Consumer Satisfaction.....	8
1) Consumer Satisfaction Survey.....	8
2) Letters of Appreciation.....	9
3) Cases will be handled in a timely manner.....	10
E. Coordination of services with the DDS contract manager, stake holder organizations, and multi-cultural community.....	10
F. Self-Advocacy Trainings.....	11
III. TITLE 17 COMPLAINTS.....	12
IV. DENIAL OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS.....	13
V. CONSUMER GRIEVANCES.....	13

<u>TABLE OF CONTENTS</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
VI. COLLECTION OF ATTORNEYS FEES.....	13
VII. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ENHANCEMENT OF SERVICES	14
VIII. CONCLUSION.....	15

EXHIBIT LIST

- EXHIBIT A...OCRA Staff Roster
- EXHIBIT B...OCRA Statistics
- EXHIBIT C...Advocacy Report Winter 2010,
Advocacy Report Spring 2011
- EXHIBIT D...Outreach and Training Annual Report
- EXHIBIT E...Report by Service Level
- EXHIBIT F...Memorandums of Understanding
- EXHIBIT G...Consumer Satisfaction Surveys
- EXHIBIT H...OCRA Advisory Committee and Meeting Minutes
- EXHIBIT I...CPF and Self-Advocacy Trainings
- EXHIBIT J...Title 17 Complaints
- EXHIBIT K...OCRA Annual Denial of Rights
- EXHIBIT L...OCRA Annual Consumer Grievances
- EXHIBIT M...OCRA Annual Attorneys Fees

(Under Separate Cover)

OCRA SELF-ADVOCACY TRAINING EVALUATION BINDER

I. INTRODUCTION

Disability Rights California provides state-wide clients' rights advocacy services for regional center consumers pursuant to a multi-year contract, HD119002, with the Department of Developmental Services (DDS) through the Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy (OCRA). The contract was renewed effective July 1, 2011, for a 5-year period ending June 30, 2016. This is the first Annual Report required under the new contract, pursuant to Exhibit A, Paragraph 13.O, for Fiscal Year 2011-2012.

OCRA takes great pride in its accomplishments. The statistics and work product for the past year, which are discussed throughout this report, give ample evidence of continuing effective advocacy. During the past year, OCRA resolved over 8,970 issues for consumers. OCRA also participated in 368 trainings last fiscal year, presenting to approximately 19,174 people.

OCRA currently operates 22 offices throughout the State of California, most of which are staffed by one CRA and one Assistant CRA. A list of the current staff and office locations is attached as Exhibit A.

Disability Rights California greatly appreciates the support and efforts of DDS and the regional centers in OCRA's performance of this contract. With support from those agencies serving people with developmental disabilities, OCRA's efforts to help ensure the rights of people with developmental disabilities throughout the State of California is extremely successful.

II. PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES

Disability Rights California's contract with DDS requires performance objectives as established in Exhibit A, Page 14, Paragraph M, of the contract. Each of the specific required outcomes is discussed in the following Sections A through F. The contract does not set specific

numbers for performance for the outcomes. OCRA is willing to establish specific numbers in consultation with DDS, if it so desires.

A. Services are provided in a manner that maximizes staff and operational resources.

OCRA continues its tradition of serving a large number of people with developmental disabilities. OCRA handled 8,970 issues for regional center consumers during the fiscal year. The breath of issues in these cases is staggering and reflects the need for staff to know the current law that affects people with developmental disabilities in a large number of areas. The statistics, attached as Exhibit B, are discussed below and show the wide variety of issues and the large number of cases handled by OCRA staff, as does a copy of the last advocacy report, which covers January through June, 2012, included as Exhibit C.

1) Advocacy Reports.

Each advocate provides on a quarterly basis a summary of at least one case that has unique situations from which others can learn and that can be used as examples of the advocacy that OCRA accomplishes. The first half of the fiscal year cases were summarized in the Summer and Fall, 2011, Advocacy Reports. The summaries from January, 2012, through June, 2012, are compiled and attached as Exhibit C. OCRA is extremely pleased that such outstanding examples of advocacy are available to show the value of the work that OCRA accomplishes. A few examples of the advocacy:

H.A. Moves Back to Her Community.

H.A. lived in the same Community Care Facility (CCF) for over 20 years. When she experienced some medical issues, H.A.'s treating physician ordered that she be moved to a Skilled Nursing Facility (SNF), almost a hundred miles from the CCF. The staff at H.A.'s day program contacted OCRA when H.A. was moved to the SNF. Since H.A. has no family and is non-verbal, the day program staff wanted to help H.A. return to the community she knew as her home.

OCRA met with H.A. at the SNF, obtained her medical records, and communicated with the regional center. Through collaboration with the regional center and a thorough review of H.A.'s medical history, it was determined that she would be better served at a less restrictive Intermediate Care Facility (ICF) in her original community.

H.A. soon moved to an ICF in the area where she lived before. She continues to attend the day program that she has been going to for years.

IHSS Recipient's Hours Increased to 266 after Due Process.

Parents of 9-year-old V.R., who has significant intellectual and physical disabilities requiring constant care, received a notice that V.R.'s IHSS hours had been reduced from 239 to 91. The county alleged that the non-provider spouse in a two-parent household was an alternative resource. OCRA helped the father to develop a work schedule chart and had him obtain letters from his employer substantiating his 60-hour work week. At the initial hearing, OCRA successfully requested a continuance, the ALJ agreed to continue aid paid pending. OCRA attended the IHSS reassessment. OCRA reviewed the county file which showed assessments of actual need which did not appear in the county's notice, as well as old notices showing that the county had awarded increasing hours during the past 5 years, consistent with the 239 hours that the county now sought to reduce.

OCRA agreed to represent V.R. at a second hearing. On the morning of the hearing, the county representative called to say that the county agreed to reinstate the hours.

J.E.'s Family Is Able to Stay in Their Apartment.

J.E. is a teenage boy with significant disabilities, including seizures which cause him to drop to the floor. J.E.'s family received a 60-day notice to move out of its apartment from the on-site manager. The downstairs apartment residents had complained about banging on the floor and other noise. Even though the family agreed to put in area rugs, and had notified the manager about J.E.'s disabilities, they were given a 60-day notice to vacate the apartment.

OCRA drafted a request for reasonable accommodation letter for the parents. J.E.'s parents signed the letter and sent it directly to the owner of the complex, since the manager had behaved inappropriately to them in the past. The owner contacted the family and apologized. He thanked them for sending the letter and rescinded the 60-day notice. He also made arrangements to put carpet in certain areas of the apartment.

Probate Court Judge Terminates Conservatorship.

H.S. is 25-years old. She has mild delays and a seizure disorder controlled by medication. H.S. was conserved 7 years ago by her parents. H.S. decided that she no longer wanted to be conserved.

H.S. consulted with OCRA to develop a plan of advocacy to strengthen the petition to terminate her conservatorship. H.S. achieved all of her IPP goals by managing her own medical and neurological care needs, voluntarily participating in counseling, succeeding in independent employment, attending a day program, and by learning public transportation throughout the Modesto and surrounding areas. H.S. demonstrated independence in all aspects of her life.

OCRA wrote a letter to the court supporting the petition to terminate the conservatorship and requested letters of support from various medical professionals, counselors, social workers, supported living service workers, former teachers, and employers. OCRA assisted H.S. by helping her file her petition to terminate the conservatorship. OCRA provided technical assistance to the probate court. At the probate court hearing, the judge ordered the termination of the conservatorship. The judge specifically noted that all constitutional rights had been restored.

2) Analysis of Consumers Served.

OCRA handled a total of 8,970 cases from July 1, 2011, through June 30, 2012. Included as Exhibit B is the complete compilation of data for the fiscal year.

The data has been compiled by:

1. Age
2. County
3. Disability
4. Ethnicity
5. Gender
6. Living Arrangement
7. Type of Problem (Problem Codes)
8. Service Level

The largest number of consumers served by age, 2,312 during this time period, has consistently been the 4-to-17 years-old age group. The next largest is the 23-40 age group with 1,351 people served. The ratio of males to females served also remains consistent. For those cases where gender is recorded, OCRA has traditionally served more males than females, with 65 percent of the consumers served being male and 35 percent being female. This roughly corresponds to the percentage of regional center consumers who are male versus female. As of January, 2008, approximately 60 percent of all regional center consumers were male and 39 percent female.

The percentage of consumers residing in the parental or other family home remains by far the largest number of consumers served with 6,486 consumers living in the family home or 72 percent of the cases handled. The next largest group served is those living independently, with OCRA serving 1,129 people or 13 percent with this living arrangement.

OCRA's statistics on the ethnicity of consumers served for the year show OCRA's continuing commitment to serve underserved communities. DDS has changed the format for its reporting of the ethnicities of the consumers served by each regional center. DDS now reports four ethnicities and a category called other. Charts showing a comparison by percentage of the ethnicities served by OCRA and those served by the regional centers are attached as Exhibit B1. The ethnicities reports do not completely correspond but do show that OCRA is generally in parity statewide in its provision of services to the ethnicities identified as served statewide by the regional centers.

3) Outreach/Trainings.

OCRA recognizes that outreach and training are an essential part of providing effective advocacy for regional center consumers and also recognizes that trainings are one of the best ways to maximize staff and operational resources. Therefore, OCRA offers training on a wide variety of issues to a large variety of participants, including consumers, parents, regional center staff, vendors, and other interested people. Topics covered include, but are not limited to, consumers' rights, abuse and neglect issues, special education, voting rights, SSI, rights in the community, and conservatorships, among other topics.

During the last fiscal year, OCRA presented at 368 trainings with a total attendance of approximately 19,174 people at the various trainings. Interestingly, though OCRA presented at fewer trainings this year, the total number of people trained was increased by more than 1,000 people. The current statistics represent a tremendous amount of training.

OCRA understands the need to provide assistance to individuals from traditionally underserved communities. To further the goal of meeting this need, OCRA has each office target at least three outreaches per year to a specific group of persons who are underrepresented in the office's catchment area. To help with this, OCRA has appointed Beatriz Reyez as the Southern California Outreach Coordinator and Kendra McWright as the Northern California Outreach Coordinator. The coordinators advise staff in implementation of their target outreach plans. Based upon an evaluation of the original outreach plans' results, and using new census data and figures from DDS regarding the ethnicity of consumers served by each regional center, the OCRA offices update their target outreach plans on a bi-annual basis. This fiscal year was the first year of the two-year cycle. A detailed report on target outreach and training is included as Exhibit D.

A. Issues and complaints are resolved expeditiously and at the lowest level of appropriate intervention.

From July 1, 2011, through June 30, 2012, OCRA resolved 8,970 issues for consumers. Of those served, all but 60 were resolved informally. This means that more than 99 percent of all the matters that OCRA handled were resolved informally. Data showing this is attached as Exhibit E.

B. Collaborative and harmonious working relationships are fostered.

OCRA staff makes every attempt to foster collaborative and harmonious working relationships with the consumers and parents who OCRA serve, regional center staff, stakeholders, and members of the general community. This philosophy is not only incorporated into Disability Rights California's contract with DDS, but is also recognition that some of the most effective advocacy takes place because of interpersonal relationships and informal advocacy. The success of this philosophy is demonstrated by the number of calls OCRA receives, by its many successes, and by its recognition as an excellent resource for people with developmental disabilities.

1) Memorandums of Understanding.

OCRA has established Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) with each regional center that addresses that center's individual needs, concerns, and method of operation. MOUs are updated as needed. Copies of all MOUs have been forwarded to DDS. The status of each revised MOU is discussed in Exhibit F.

In general, the meetings regarding the MOUs have been productive and extremely congenial. It is clear that OCRA's working relationship with the various regional centers has become well established and that concerns between the two agencies can be addressed with minimum difficulty in almost every situation.

2) Meeting with Association of Regional Center Agencies (ARCA).

Catherine Blakemore, Executive Director, Disability Rights California and Eileen Richey, Executive Director of the Association of Regional Center Directors (ARCA), met on -----, to discuss matters of interest between the two organizations. No concerns about OCRA services were identified. Further meetings with ARCA will be convened, should concerns arise.

C. Consumers and families are satisfied with the services provided.

Disability Rights California recognizes that consumer satisfaction is a primary goal for the people whom it serves. OCRA is committed to reaching consumers and parents in a manner and with results that ensure consumer and family satisfaction with the services provided.

a. Consumer Satisfaction Survey.

OCRA measures consumer satisfaction by use of an instrument developed jointly by staff, the OCRA Consumer Advisory Committee, and DDS.

From the results of the most recent survey, it is clear that consumers remain extremely satisfied with the services provided by OCRA.

Two thousand seven hundred and sixty-seven (2,767) surveys were mailed out. Four hundred and fifty-six (456) people returned the survey. This represents a 16 percent return rate of the surveys.

Of those responding to the questions, 96 percent of the responders felt they were treated well by the staff, 93 percent understood the information they were provided, 95 percent believed their CRA listened to them, 93 percent believed they were helped by the CRA, and 93 percent would ask for help from OCRA again. See Exhibit G, which discusses the results of OCRA's survey.

b. Letters of Appreciation.

OCRA staff receives numerous letters of appreciation that confirm not only the value of the services that OCRA performs, but also the manner in which the services are provided. OCRA values these letters. Below is just a sampling of the many letters received.¹

- * From the bottom of my heart, thank you for helping me have a voice and giving me the right questions to ask. I have felt very helpless. I cannot express enough how comforting it is to have someone to call.
- * Words simply cannot express our heartfelt thanks for the considerable amount of time and effort you have put into assisting us....We're sure that your knowledge and assistance in preparing us helped in bringing about the judges favorable ruling.
- * Thank you for participating in this year's Opportunity Fair. We really do feel that this event provides a great opportunity for SDC residents, family, and general public to become acquainted with community resources that are available to them. We do appreciate your time and effort to provide this valuable information.
- * Podria escribir un libro completo, expresando todo mi agradecimiento para la oficina de los derechos al cliente.... (I can write a whole book expressing my gratitude to Office of Clients Rights....)
- * Their effort, professionalism, and understanding about this case lead me to believe right from the start that at least ___ and I had a chance....Thank you so much for everything. We could not have done this on our own. We are grateful. Our blessings go out to you.
- * We would like to thank you sincerely for all the assistance, patience and care you've given us. Without you and your organization, ___ will not receive the benefits she's entitled to.
- * Documents for Notification for Resolution have been signed and faxed. No Fair Hearing! Hurray, it is REALLY over this time. Thank you all for all your support and help. I truly do not think I could have done it without the whole team!!!!

¹ OCRA is providing the letters of appreciation with the wording from the originals unless otherwise indicated.

- * This has been a long haul. We appreciate everything you have done past and present. Words can't explain how we feel of what you have accomplished for not only ___ but our family as a whole.
- * Palabras de agradecimiento para las personas que estuvieron ahi, cuando pense que no habria nada mas que hacer, personas como ellos y ellas, no hay muchas que alluden a los que no se saben expresar pedir ayuda.... (Words of appreciation for the people that were there when I thought there was nothing more that could be done. There are not very many people like them that will help the ones that cannot express that they need help....)

3) Cases will be handled in a timely manner.

It is important that advocacy services be provided in a timely manner. Consumers and families are frequently in emergency situations, in danger of losing their placement in the least restrictive environment, losing their source of income, unable to get their medical needs met and a myriad of other dangerous or difficult situations. For this reason, OCRA has, since its establishment, had a policy that all calls will be returned as soon as possible, but not later than closing of the next business day. OCRA measures its performance in this area by use of its consumer satisfaction survey, see Exhibit G, discussed more fully above. OCRA statistics shows that 88 percent of all callers to OCRA received a call back within two days during the last fiscal year. This level of performance is two percent higher than last year, and continues to provide verification that cases are resolved in a timely manner. OCRA will continue to train on this requirement to ensure that it provides exceptional services for all callers.

D. The provision of clients' rights advocacy services is coordinated in consultation with the DDS contract manager, stakeholder organizations, and persons with developmental disabilities and their families representing California's multi-cultural diversity.

OCRA works through the OCRA Advisory Committee to ensure that this performance outcome is achieved. Attached as Exhibit H is a list

of the members of the Disability Rights California Board of Director's OCRA Advisory Board Committee effective June 30, 2012.

Public members of the Advisory Committee are appointed by the Board of Directors. In the selection process, the Board considers geographical diversity, both rural and urban and north and south, type of developmental disability represented, and ethnic background, in addition to the qualifications of the individual applicants.

The Board OCRA Advisory Committee is a knowledgeable, constructive, and helpful group of volunteers who continue to provide valuable guidance to the OCRA staff. The meetings are lively and informative and provide a forum for exchange of ideas and information. Minutes for the meeting held on September 23, 2011, were provided with the Semi Annual Report. The minutes for the March 2, 2012, meeting are included as Exhibit H.

DDS staff is invited and encouraged to participate in the next meeting, which is set for September 20, 2012, in Sacramento.

E. Self-advocacy training is provided for consumers and families at least twice in each fiscal year.

Welfare and Institutions Code, Section 4433 (d)(5), requires that the contractor providing advocacy services for consumers of regional center services provide at least two self-advocacy trainings for consumers and family members. Disability Rights California's contract with DDS mirrors this language. OCRA has been proactive in this matter and requires each of its offices to provide at least one self-advocacy training for consumers a year, so OCRA far exceeds the two mandated trainings. Many offices provide more than one training and an advocate may use information from any of OCRA's self-advocacy packets in presenting his or her self-advocacy trainings to consumers.

To date, OCRA has developed four separate packets of information for OCRA staff to use in the mandated trainings:

Clients' Rights Information (Several versions of basic materials are used.)

Voting Rights

Clients' Rights Bingo Hands off My \$\$\$

Additionally, OCRA worked with DDS on a self-advocacy training developed by DDS for consumers on consumer safety which may be used for the self-advocacy trainings.

OCRA is currently in the process of developing a new training on least restrictive housing and services, which OCRA hopes to complete the first half of the new fiscal year.

Samples of the OCRA self-advocacy packets (most are in both English and Spanish), were provided separately in a binder marked OCRA Training Materials with the 2007-2008 Annual Report. In discussions with DDS's Contract Manager, it was decided that OCRA should not submit duplicate training packets in this year's annual report. As always, OCRA welcomes comments from DDS on any training packets.

OCRA is required to report in its Annual Report an evaluation of the self-advocacy trainings. OCRA has randomly selected consumer training satisfaction evaluations for inclusion in this Annual Report. Almost without exception, consumers are pleased with OCRA trainings.

Self-Advocacy Trainings held last year are listed in Exhibit I.

III. TITLE 17 COMPLAINTS

CCR, Title 17, Section 50540, sets forth a complaint procedure whereby a regional center consumer, or his or her authorized representative, who believes a right has been abused, punitively withheld or improperly or unreasonably denied, may file a complaint with the Clients' Rights Advocate. The Complaint process is similar to that established by Welfare & Institution Code, Section 4731. However, the later law offers more consumer protections. There was one Title 17 Complaint filed during the last fiscal year. Please see Exhibit J for a chart showing the Title 17 Complaints.

IV. DENIAL OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS

CCR, Title 17, Section 50530, sets forth a procedure whereby a care provider may deny one of the basic rights of a consumer if there is a danger to self or others or a danger of property destruction caused by the actions of a consumer. The Clients' Rights Advocate must approve the procedure and submit a quarterly report to DDS by the last day of each January, April, July, and October. OCRA is including the reports concurrently with the contractual date to provide OCRA's reports. If this is not acceptable to DDS, OCRA will submit duplicate reports as requested. Attached as Exhibit K is the current log of Denials of Rights from the OCRA Offices.

V. CONSUMER GRIEVANCES

Exhibit A, Paragraph 12, of the contract between DDS and Disability Rights California requires OCRA to establish a grievance procedure and to inform all clients about the procedure. DDS has approved the grievance procedure developed by OCRA. The procedure is posted prominently in both English and Spanish at each office. Additionally, the grievance procedure is included in all letters to consumers or others who contact OCRA, when an office declines to provide the requested service to that person.

There were five grievances filed by consumers or their families during the past fiscal year. Three grievances continued to the second level to be heard by the Disability Rights California Board of Directors. Information concerning each grievance has previously been submitted to DDS. Attached as Exhibit L is a chart detailing the grievances filed against OCRA during this period.

VI. COLLECTION OF ATTORNEYS FEES

OCRA does not charge consumers, their families or advocates fees for services nor does OCRA seek to recover costs from these individuals. Clients' Rights Advocates who are licensed to practice law in California, or Assistant, Associate, or unlicensed Clients' Rights Advocates, all of whom work under the supervision of an attorney, can collect attorney's fees and costs similar to those

collected by private attorneys or advocates for special education cases or other cases where there are statutory attorney's fees. OCRA collects fees only in special education cases or Writs of Mandamus. Fees and costs may be negotiated at mediation or can be received in those cases where an Administrative Law Judge has made a determination that the petitioner is the prevailing party. Fees are collected from the opposing party, which is normally a school district. Costs include any expenses to the Petitioner or OCRA for suing, such as filing fees or costs of expert evaluations. Neither Disability Rights California nor OCRA ever collect attorney's fees from consumers.

The amount collected for any individual case depends upon several factors such as the geographical location where the consumer lives, and the years of experience of the attorney who handled the case. Attached as Exhibit M is a chart showing the amount and source of any attorney's fees collected by OCRA during the past fiscal year.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ENHANCEMENT OF SERVICES

The contract between DDS and Disability Rights California requires that on an annual basis Disability Rights California make recommendations to DDS as to potential methods of enhancing the services that OCRA provides for regional center consumers.

As reflected in the case load statistics, the number of consumers and their families requesting assistance has remained high during the first year of the current contract. OCRA is proud of the fact that its staff attempts to provide some level of assistance for every request. Although we believe the large number of requests for assistance at some regional centers justifies the need for additional staff, Disability Rights California understands this is not feasible given the state's fiscal climate. We are extremely appreciative of DDS' support of the OCRA program during these difficult economic times.

VIII. CONCLUSION

OCRA's statistics show its staff's continuing commitment to the protection of the rights of people with developmental disabilities. OCRA handled over 8,970 cases the last year, provided 368 trainings to over 19,174 people, and met each of its performance objectives. OCRA remains dedicated to ensuring that the rights of all of California's citizens with developmental disabilities are enforced.

OFFICE OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS ADVOCACY LISTING

STATEWIDE TTY TOLL-FREE NUMBER 1-877-669-6023

Toll Free Number: 1-800-390-7032

Changes to offices – *as of June 30, 2012* - Change is italicized.

ALTA CALIFORNIA REGIONAL CENTER

Matthew O'Neill -Temp CRA

Ramona Landeros - Assistant CRA

Esther Lee - VOLUNTEER

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy

1831 K Street

Sacramento, CA 95811

Phone: (916) 504-5944 /Fax: (916) 504-5821

Email: Matthew.ONeill@disabilityrightsca.org

Ramona.Landeros@disabilityrightsca.org

Esther.Lee@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Tim Poe

CENTRAL VALLEY REGIONAL CENTER

Margie Oppel - CRA

Kay Spencer - Assistant CRA (part-time)

Maricruz Magdaleno - Temp Assistant CRA

567 W. Shaw Avenue, Suite C-3

Fresno, CA 93704

Phone: (559) 271-6736/Fax: (559) 476-2051

E-mail: Margaret.Oppel@disabilityrightsca.org,

Kay.Spencer@disabilityrightsca.org,

Maricruz.Magdaleno@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Kathy Mottarella

EASTERN LOS ANGELES REGIONAL CENTER

Jackie Dai – CRA (on leave)

Wendy Dumlao - Temp CRA

Lucy Garcia - Assistant CRA

1000 S. Fremont Avenue

(P.O. Box 7916)

Alhambra, CA 91802

NOTE: All items that are not mail should be directed to the ELARC reception area, 2nd floor at Bldg. A2 Room #3232 and not OCRA's office.

Phone: (626) 576-4437/(626) 576-4407/Fax: (626) 576-4276

E-mail: Wendy.Dumlao@disabilityrightsca.org

Jackie.Dai@disabilityrightsca.org

Lucy.Garcia@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Irma Wagster

FAR NORTHERN REGIONAL CENTER

Andy Holcombe - CRA

Lorie Atamian - Assistant CRA

1280 East 9th Street, Unit E

Chico, CA 95928

Phone: (530) 345-4113/Fax: (530) 345-4285

E-mail: Andrew.Holcombe@disabilityrightsca.org

Lorie.Atamian@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Jeanne Molineaux

GOLDEN GATE REGIONAL CENTER

Katy Lusson - CRA

Aruti Patel - Assistant CRA

35 Mitchell Blvd., Suite 9

San Rafael, CA 94903

Phone: (415) 499-9724

Fax: (415) 499-9728

Toll Free: (866) 833-6713

E-mail: Katy.Lusson@disabilityrightsca.org

Aruti.Patel@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Gail Gresham

HARBOR REGIONAL CENTER

Eva Casas-Sarmiento - CRA

VACANT - Assistant CRA

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy

13005 Artesia Blvd., Suite A214

Cerritos, CA 90703

Phone: (562) 623-9911/Fax: (562) 623-9929

E-mail: Eva.Casas-Sarmiento@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Katie Hornberger

INLAND REGIONAL CENTER

Veronica Cervantes - CRA

Beatriz Reyes - Assistant CRA

1585 South D Street, Suite # 206

San Bernardino, CA. 92408

Phone: (909) 383-1133

FAX (909) 383-1113

E-mail: Veronica.Cervantes@disabilityrightsca.org

Beatriz.Reyes@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Katie Hornberger

KERN REGIONAL CENTER

Mario Espinoza - CRA

Valerie Geary - Assistant CRA

Wanda Arreola - Temp Administrative Assistant (part-time)

3200 North Sillect Ave.

Bakersfield, CA 93308

Phone: (661)327-8531, Extension 313

Fax: (661)322-6417

E-mail: Mario.Espinoza@disabilityrightsca.org

Valerie.Geary@disabilityrightsca.org

Wanda.Arreola@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Kathy Mottarella

FRANK D. LANTERMAN REGIONAL CENTER

Tim Poe - CRA

Jazmin Romero - Assistant CRA

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy

350 Bixel Street, Suite 290

Los Angeles, CA 90017

Phone: (213) 213- 8020

Fax (213) 213-8021

E-mail: Tim.Poe@disabilityrightsca.org,

Jazmin.Romero@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Kathy Mottarella

NORTH BAY REGIONAL CENTER

Yulahlia Hernandez - CRA

Annie Breuer - Assistant CRA

Mailing Address is:

P.O. Box 3360

Napa, CA 94558

Phone: (707)224-2798

Fax: (707)255-1567

E-mail: Yulahlia.Hernandez@disabilityrightsca.org,

Annie.Breuer@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Gail Gresham

NORTH LOS ANGELES COUNTY REGIONAL CENTER

Ibrahim Saab - CRA

Ada Hamer - Assistant CRA

Gloria Flugum - Clerical Support

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy

350 Bixel Street, Suite 290

Los Angeles, CA 90017

Phone: (213) 213- 8020

Fax (213) 213-8021

E-mail: Bebo.Saab@disabilityrightsca.org

Ada.Hamer@disabilityrightsca.org, Gloria.Flugum@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Tim Poe

REDWOOD COAST REGIONAL CENTER - Eureka

Lynne Page - CRA

525 Second Street, Suite 300

Eureka, CA 95501

Phone: (707) 268-1388

Fax: (707) 444-2563

E-mail: Lynne.Page@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Gail Gresham

REDWOOD COAST REGIONAL CENTER - Ukiah

Jim Stoepler - CRA

Trina Saldana – Part-Time Assistant CRA

1116 Airport Park Blvd.

Ukiah, CA 95482

Phone:(707)462-2462, Ext. 235

Fax: (707) 462-2483

E-mail: Jim.Stoepler@disabilityrightsca.org

Trina.Saldana@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Gail Gresham

REGIONAL CENTER OF THE EAST BAY

Arthur Lipscomb - CRA

Celeste Palmer - Associate CRA

Maria Torres – Temp Administrative Assistant (part-time)

1330 Broadway, Suite 500

Oakland, CA 94612

Phone: (510) 267-1280

Fax: (510) 267-1281

E-mail: Arthur.Lipscomb@disabilityrightsca.org

Celeste.Palmer@disabilityrightsca.org

Maria.Torres@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Andy Holcombe

REGIONAL CENTER OF ORANGE COUNTY

Jacqueline Miller - CRA

Cynthia Salomon - Assistant CRA

13272 Garden Grove Blvd.

Garden Grove, CA 92843

Phone: (714) 621-0563

Fax: (714) 621-0550

E-mail: Jacqueline.Miller@disabilityrightsca.org

Cynthia.Salomon@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Irma Wagster

SAN ANDREAS REGIONAL CENTER

Rita Defilippis - CRA

Filomena Alomar - Assistant CRA

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy

C/o San Andreas Regional Center

300 Orchard City Drive, Suite 170

Campbell, CA 95008

Phone: (408) 374-2470

Fax: (408) 374-2956

E-mail: Rita.Defilippis@disabilityrightsca.org,

Filomena.Alomar@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Katie Hornberger

SAN DIEGO REGIONAL CENTER

Megan Chambers - CRA

Alba Gomez - Assistant CRA

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy

1111 Sixth Avenue, Suite 200

San Diego, CA 92101

Phone: (619) 239-7877

Fax: (619) 239-7838

E-mail: Megan.Chambers@disabilityrightsca.org

Alba.Gomez@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Irma Wagster

SAN GABRIEL/POMONA REGIONAL CENTER

Aimee Delgado - CRA

Marisol Cruz - Assistant CRA

3333 Brea Canyon Road, Suite #118

Diamond Bar, CA 91765-3783

Phone: (909)595-4755

Fax: (909)595-4855

E-mail: Aimee.Delgado@disabilityrightsca.org

Marisol.Cruz@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Irma Wagster

SOUTH CENTRAL LA REGIONAL CENTER

Mary Melendrez - CRA

Christine Armand - Associate CRA

4401 S. Crenshaw Boulevard, Suite 316

Los Angeles, CA 90043-1200.

Phone: (323) 292-9907

Fax: (323) 293-4259

E-mail: Mary.Melendrez@disabilityrightsca.org

Christine.Armand@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Kathy Mottarella

TRI-COUNTIES REGIONAL CENTER

Kendra McWright - CRA

Gina Gheno - Assistant CRA

520 East Montecito Street

Santa Barbara, CA 93103

Ph: (805) 884-7297/(805) 884-7218/Toll-Free (800) 322-6994,Ext. 218

Fax: 805-884-7219

E-mail: Gina.Gheno@disabilityrightsca.org

Kendra.McWright@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Kathy Mottarella

VALLEY MOUNTAIN REGIONAL CENTER

Matthew O'Neill -Temp CRA

Leinani Walter – CRA (on leave)

Christine Hager - Assistant CRA

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy

Valley Mountain Regional Center

702 N. Aurora Street

Stockton, CA 95202

Phone: (209) 242-2127/Leinani's dir line (209)242-2129

Fax: (209) 462-7020

E-mail: Matthew.ONeill@disabilityrightsca.org

Leinani.Walter@disabilityrightsca.org,

Christine.Hager@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Gail Gresham

WESTSIDE REGIONAL CENTER

Katie Meyer - CRA

Luisa Delgadillo - Assistant CRA

Mailing Address: (DO NOT INCLUDE "WESTSIDE REGIONAL CENTER"
ON MAILING ADDRESS, OR MAIL WILL NOT BE SENT TO OCRA)

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy

5901 Green Valley Circle, Suite 410

Culver City, CA 90230

Ph:(310)258-4205 (ACRA) (310)258-4206 (CRA)

Fax: (310)338-9716

E-mail: Katie.Meyer@disabilityrightsca.org

Luisa.Delgadillo@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Katie Hornberger

Sacramento OCRA

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy

1831 K Street

Sacramento, CA 95811

Telephone: (916) 504-5820

Toll-Free: (800) 390-7032

Fax: (916) 504-5821/TTY: (877) 669-6023

DIRECT DIAL NUMBER: (916) 504-5820

Los Angeles OCRA

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy

350 Bixel Street Suite 290

Los Angeles, CA 90017

Telephone: (213) 213- 8020

Fax (213) 213-8021/ TTY: (877) 669-6023

DIRECT DIAL NUMBER: (213) 213- 8020

Director:

Jeanne Molineaux Sacramento

Email: Jeanne.Molineaux@disabilityrightsca.org

OCRASAC Office, (916) 504-5942

Supervising Clients' Rights Advocates:

Gail Gresham Sacramento

Email: Gail.Gresham@disabilityrightsca.org

(916) 504-5946

Irma Wagster Garden Grove

Email: Irma.Wagster@disabilityrightsca.org

Regional Center of Orange County Office - (714) 750-0709

Katie Hornberger Cerritos

Email: Katie.Hornberger@disabilityrightsca.org

Harbor Regional Center Office - (562) 623-9911

Kathy Mottarella Santa Barbara

Email: Katherine.Mottarella@disabilityrightsca.org

Tri-Counties Regional Center Office - (805) 884-7205

Support Staff Sacramento:

Alice Ximenez, Office Manager II

(916) 504-5943

Email: Alice.Ximenez@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Jeanne Molineaux

Sacramento

Vanessa Ochoa-Alcaraz, Administrative Assistant I

(916) 504-5941

Email: Vanessa.Ochoa@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Alice Ximenez

Sacramento

Support Staff Los Angeles:

Maria Ortega, Office Manager I

(213) 213- 8020

Email: Maria.Ortega@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Alice Ximenez

Los Angeles

**ALPHABETICAL OCRA STAFF LISTING BY LAST NAME
AND OFFICE LOCATION
(INCLUDING VOLUNTEERS AND TEMPORARY STAFF)**

1.	Alcaraz, Vanessa Ochoa	OCRASAC
2.	Alomar, Filomena	SARC
3.	Armand, Christine	SCLARC
4.	Arreola, Wanda	KRC (Agency Temp)
5.	Atamian, Lorie	FNRC
6.	Breuer, Annie	NBRC
7.	Casas-Sarmiento, Eva	HRC
8.	Cervantes, Veronica	IRC
9.	Chambers, Megan	SDRC
10.	Chiang (Dai), Jackie	ELACRC (on leave)
11.	Cruz, Marisol	SGPRC
12.	Delgadillo, Luisa	WRC
13.	Delgado, Aimee	SGPRC
14.	Defilippis, Rita	SARC
15.	Dumlao, Wendy	ELARC (Agency Temp)
16.	Espinoza, Mario	KRC
17.	Flugum, Gloria	NLACRC
18.	Garcia, Lucy	ELARC
19.	Geary, Valerie	KRC
20.	Gheno, Gina	TCRC
21.	Gomez, Alba	SDRC
22.	Gresham, Gail	OCRASAC
23.	Hager, Christine	VMRC
24.	Hamer, Ada	NLACRC
25.	Hernandez, Yulahlia	NBRC
26.	Holcombe, Andy	FNRC
27.	Hornberger, Katie	HRC
28.	Landeros, Ramona	ACRC
29.	Lee, Esther	ACRC (Volunteer)
30.	Lipscomb, Arthur	RCEB
31.	Lusson, Katy	GGRC
32.	Magdaleno, Maricruz	CVRC (Agency Temp)
33.	McWright, Kendra	TCRC
34.	Melendrez, Mary	SCLARC
34.	Meyer, Katie	WRC
35.	Miller, Jacqueline	RCOC

36.	Molineaux, Jeanne	OCRASAC
37.	Mottarella, Katherine	TCRC
38.	O'Neill, Matthew	ACRC (Agency Temp)
39.	Oppel, Margie	CVRC
40.	Ortega, Maria	OCRALA
41.	Page, Lynne	RCRC-Eureka
42.	Palmer, Celeste	RCEB
43.	Patel, Aruti	GGRC
44.	Poe, Tim	LRC
45.	Reyes, Beatriz	IRC
46.	Romero, Jazmin	LRC
47.	Saab, Ibrahim	NLACRC
48.	Saldana, Trina	RCRC-Ukiah
49.	Salomón, Cynthia	RCOC
50.	Spencer, Kay	CVRC
51.	Stoepler, Jim	RCRC-Ukiah
52.	Torres, Maria	RCEB (Agency Temp)
53.	Wagster, Irma	OCRALA
54.	Walter, Leinani	VMRC (<i>on leave</i>)
55.	Ximenez, Alice	OCRASAC

Updated as of June 30, 2012.

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Semi-Annual Report - July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012
Report by Age Group

AgeRange	ARC	CVRC	ELARC	FNRC	GGRC	HRC	IRC	KRC	LRC	NBRC	NLARC	RCEB	RCOC	RCRC	SARC	SCLARC	SDRC	SGPRC	TCRC	VMRC	WRC	Total
0-3	7	11	20	5	9	25	11	8	23	7	11	18	10	1	10	29	9	22	13	11	33	293
4-17	91	129	186	64	36	109	131	128	103	115	90	136	74	72	142	151	100	109	79	110	157	2312
18-22	47	43	70	37	49	43	66	51	31	67	64	59	30	20	33	42	46	33	47	59	65	1002
23-40	57	40	81	97	66	48	76	62	41	95	63	91	38	60	38	38	66	35	61	110	88	1351
41-50	22	11	22	29	22	10	20	27	6	30	20	20	13	30	11	19	21	13	22	41	42	451
51+	25	17	24	35	47	8	15	20	9	25	20	31	11	33	14	11	14	10	33	56	34	492
Unknown																			2			2
Total	249	251	403	267	229	243	319	296	213	339	268	355	176	216	248	290	256	222	257	387	419	5903

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Semi-Annual Report - July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012
Report by County

	ARC	CVRC	ELARC	FNRC	GGRC	HRC	IRC	KRC	LRC	NBRC	NLARC	RCEB	RCOC	RCRC	SARC	SCLARC	SDRC	SGPRC	TCRC	VMRC	WRC	Total
Alameda	1				7					2		281		1	1							293
Alpine	2																					2
Amador																				10		10
Butte				218																		218
Calaveras																				10		10
Contra Costa	3	1			1					1		224			1							231
Del Norte				1										14								15
El Dorado	6	1																				7
Fresno	1	174			1			1				2										179
Glenn				5																		5
Humboldt	2													91							1	94
Imperial							1										14					15
Inyo								2														2
Kern	1	3						434	1				2		1							442
Kings		23																				23
Lake	1			1										69								71
Lassen		1		5		1																7
Los Angeles	5	2	643			376	5	3	371		396		8			422		385	1		665	3282
Madera		29			1				2													32
Marin	2				168							1								1		172
Mendocino														92								92
Merced	3	30			2																	35
Monterey															23							23
Napa	1	1								92												94
Nevada	2																					2
Orange	1												385			1	1	3				391
Placer	28			1																		29
Plumas				1																		1
Riverside	2						197									3	1	2				205
Sacramento	209									2		1										212

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Semi-Annual Report - July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012
Report by County

	ARC	CVRC	ELARC	FNRC	GGRC	HRC	IRC	KRC	LRC	NBRC	NLARC	RCEB	RCOC	RCRC	SARC	SCLARC	SDRC	SGPRC	TCRC	VMRC	WRC	Total
San Benito															1							1
San Bernardino			2		1		230	1	2							3	4	5	3			251
San Diego									1							1	337					339
San Francisco	1				109																	110
San Joaquin	2											2									305	309
San Luis Obispo																			16			16
San Mateo					124																	124
Santa Barbara																			146			146
Santa Clara					8					1			2		264							275
Santa Cruz		1													27							28
Shasta				100											1							101
Siskiyou				6																		6
Solano	3				1					234											1	239
Sonoma	2	4			2					231		1										240
Stanislaus	2	3										1									165	171
Sutter	3																					3
Tehama				40																		40
Trinity				3																		3
Tulare	2	82			1																	85
Tuolumne		1																			22	23
Unknown	2						2														1	5
Ventura	1								1							3			224			229
Yolo	15								2	1												18
Yuba	14																					14
Grand Total	317	356	645	381	426	377	435	441	380	564	396	513	397	267	319	433	357	395	391	513	667	8970

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Semi-Annual Report - July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012
Report by Disability

	ARC	CVRC	ELARC	FNRC	GGRC	HRC	IRC	KRC	LRC	NBRC	NLARC	RCEB	RCOC	RCRC	SARC	SCLARC	SDRC	SGPRC	TCRC	VMRC	WRC	Total
5th Category	34	13	10	27	63	9	15	16	14	37	10	27	16	9	8	8	6	2	19	11	26	380
Autism	70	89	190	50	41	95	131	84	102	85	87	134	78	39	113	112	84	88	71	97	183	2023
Cerebral Palsy	25	18	31	28	19	22	34	13	14	49	28	54	19	16	22	23	39	22	34	82	47	639
Dual Diagnosis - 5th Category	9	1		2	1	1	4		3	5		3	1	2			1		3	1	1	38
Dual Diagnosis - Autism	2	1	3	3	4		8	1	2	5	3	2		3	2	1	3		2	4	6	55
Dual Diagnosis - Cerebral Palsy	3			1	2	3	1	2	1	2	5	1	2	1	2		3				3	32
Dual Diagnosis - Epilepsy				3	2			2		2	2			2	2		1	2	3	2		23
Dual Diagnosis - Mental Retardation	9	6	4	11	14	6	6	9	5	15	24	9	3	10	4	4	8	5	8	14	13	187
Early Start	3		9		1	23	7	2	17	5	7	12			3	11	1	21	6	1	22	151
Epilepsy	11	19	10	24	7	2	31	6	5	9	7	13	9	9	12	13	21	10	18	81	26	343
Mental Retardation	92	105	141	139	99	86	130	175	53	159	104	144	32	116	90	114	127	74	124	250	160	2514
Unknown	34	33	60	8	8	23	36	20	23	1	17	11	38	34	36	52	14	40	36	10	10	544
Grand Total	292	285	458	296	261	270	403	330	239	374	294	410	198	241	294	338	308	264	324	556	494	6929

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Semi-Annual Report - July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012
Report by Ethnicity

Ethnicity	ARC	CVRC	ELARC	FNRC	GGRC	HRC	IRC	KRC	LRC	NBRC	NLARC	RCEB	RCOC	RCRC	SARC	SCLARC	SDRC	SGPRC	TCRC	VMRC	WRC	Grand Total
American Indian	3	2		10	1	1	1	2	1	3		1		2	3				2	3		35
Asian	10	4	39	6	16	13	5	6	10	4	5	25	23	3	34	3	2	16	1	11	8	244
Black or African American	30	18	5	8	27	28	27	15	10	41	20	71	4	4	7	76	23	18	3	41	77	553
Hispanic / Latino	34	111	257	18	45	98	140	132	96	100	86	84	39	29	78	186	98	120	85	98	142	2076
Multiracial	8	15	26	10	11	14	20	6	12	3	11	17	2	2	13	8	3	23	10	18	22	254
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Island	5	1	8		6	8	4		3	5	6	12	1		8	1	9	1	4	11	8	101
Unknown	8	2	12		7	4	15		31	2	32	5	9	8		2	2	2	25		9	175
White	151	98	56	215	116	77	107	135	50	181	108	140	98	168	105	14	119	42	127	205	153	2465
Grand Total	249	251	403	267	229	243	319	296	213	339	268	355	176	216	248	290	256	222	257	387	419	5903

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Semi-Annual Report - July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012
Report by Gender

	ARC	CVRC	ELARC	FNRC	GGRC	HRC	IRC	KRC	LRC	NBRC	NLARC	RCEB	RCOC	RCRC	SARC	SCLARC	SDRC	SGPRC	TCRC	VMRC	WRC	Grand Total
Female	98	72	144	102	79	64	113	104	58	119	100	128	55	90	76	90	81	76	97	162	150	2058
Male	150	178	248	165	150	179	206	191	153	219	168	227	120	125	171	200	174	146	160	224	267	3821
Unknown	1	1	11					1	2	1			1	1	1		1			1	2	24
Grand Total	249	251	403	267	229	243	319	296	213	339	268	355	176	216	248	290	256	222	257	387	419	5903

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Semi-Annual Report - July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012
Report by Living Arrangement

	ARC	CVRC	ELARC	FNRC	GGRC	HRC	IRC	KRC	LRC	NBRC	NLARC	RCEB	RCOC	RCRC	SARC	SCLARC	SDRC	SGPFC	TCRC	VMRC	WRC	Total
Adult Residential Facility	4	3	2	12	1		16	3	7	1	5	39	6	2	5	3	13	1	5	63	7	198
Board and Care	8	1		1	3		14				2	3				1	5		1	12		51
Childrens Group Home	1		1	2							2	2	3			1			1	12		25
Community Residential Home	3				3			2	2	5	3				2					9	3	32
Detention Center					1		6															7
Developmental Center	3	1				3				1	4		2				2	1				17
Foster Care	3	1		1		1	2	1			4	1		3		2		1		2	1	23
Foster Family Home	2	1			3		1			7	1		1	2		1	3		1	4		27
Halfway House				1																		1
Homeless		1	1	5	10		5	1	1	7		2		3		1	5		2	1	4	49
ICF DD					3		1										2		2		1	9
ICF DD-H					5					4	1	1	1		1		2	1	1	16	3	36
ICF DD-N		2								1	1	3			1				1	19		28
ICF/MR/Nursing Home			1	1	1					2				1					1			7
Independent Housing	60	32	32	149	49	4	31	108	16	81	48	53	40	60	39	31	33	27	71	66	99	1129
Intermediate Care Facility/Nursing Home					3												3		1		1	8
Jail	1		2		4	2	1		1	8	1	2				10	1		2		1	36
Large Group Home (more than 3 beds)	19	13	7	12	36	17	1	18	5	46	9	8	16	8	7	2	14	10	8	1	4	261
Legal Detention			1	1				1														3
Municipal Detention Facility/Jail				1	2			1						1	1							6
Nursing Home		1			1			1				2		1					3		1	10
Other	4	6	3		8	12	1	4	2	1		4	4	1			8	2	2	2		64
Other Federal Facility	2					2										2	1				1	8
Parental or Other Family Home	190	280	580	172	202	327	350	278	332	376	302	350	309	142	261	367	257	344	256	297	514	6486
Prison	1	1							1							2				1	3	9
Private General Hospital Emergency Rooms											1					1						2
Private Institutional Hospital/Treatment Facility	1		1		9		1	4	1										6			23
Private Institutional Living Arrangement								2	2					3			4				1	12
Private Institutional School		4								1		1				2						8
Psychiatric Wards of Private General Hospitals	1									2												3
Psychiatric Wards of Public General Hospitals	1				1	2										1						5
Public Institutional Hospital/Treatment Facility		1			2	1	1	2		1		1			1	1			1			12
Public Institutional Living Arrangement	2					1					2			1								6
Public Residential School					1		1					1									1	4
Semi-independent Home or Apartment	3	4	1	1	52			4	2	8		4	11	9	1		1		3	5	13	122
Small Group Home (3 beds or less)	1		1	7	9	5		6	2	8	4	3	1	4		1		8	8		1	69
Specialized Nursing Facility/Nursing Home		1					1	1	1	2		2					3		3	1	2	17
Supervised Apartment	5		1	15	17			2	3	2	2	25	3	14					10		5	104
Unknown	2	3	11				2	2	2		4	6		12		4				2	2	53
Grand Total	317	356	645	381	426	377	435	441	380	564	396	513	397	267	319	433	357	395	391	513	667	8970

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Semi-Annual Report - July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012
Report by Problem Codes

		ARC	CVRC	ELARC	FNRC	GGRC	HRC	IFC	KRC	LRC	NBRC	NLARC	RCEB	RCOC	RCRC	SARC	SCLARC	SDRC	SGPRC	TCRC	VMRC	WRC	Total		
4731 Complaint	4731 - Regional Center 4731 - Service Provider	5 1	1				1	1	2	5	4	6						3			1	1	1	31	
4731 Complaint Total		6	1				1	3	11	6	4	6					2	3		2	2	2	2	55	
Abuse	Emotional / Psychological Abuse Exploitation / Coercion Financial Abuse Inappropriate Medical Treatment Other Abuse Physical Assault Physical Neglect Physical Restraint / Seclusion Sexual Assault Verbal Abuse					2		2								1	1							6	
						1						1												5	
		2	4		1	3		1	2		9		4	1	6	2		3			3	2	2	45	
								1				2				1								4	
		1		1	1	1	1		2	1		1	3	2							3		2	19	
		3	2		1	3			3		2	1	1			3		1			3			21	
		1		1		1			1		2	1	1			2		3					1	14	
		1										2	1			1		1					1	4	
					2	3			2		5	2		1		1		1			1		1	15	
											2													4	
Abuse Total		8	6	2	5	14	1	4	10	1	20	7	9	4	7	10	1	8			12	2	6	137	
Assistive Technology	Assistive Technology - California Children's Services (CCS) Assistive Technology - Medi-Cal Assistive Technology - Medicare Assistive Technology - Other AT Assistive Technology - Regional Center Assistive Technology - Vocational Rehabilitation	1 1 1 1 1				2 1						1											1	5	
																						1		2	
					1											1								1	
										3													5	3	
				1							3								1		2			12	
		1																				5		1	
Assistive Technology Total		3		1	1	3				3		1			1				1		2	7	1	24	
Consent	Capacity / Incapacity of Client Informed Consent Other Consent Substituted Decision Making (Ex. DPAHC) Withhold Consent							2				1	2	1	1									8	
												1			1			1						5	
					2							1	2									3		8	
											1	2			1									6	
																								1	
Consent Total					2			2			3	4	1		3			3			1	3	6	28	
Conservatorship	Alternatives to Conservatorship Change Conservatorship Conservatee's Rights Conservator's Duties LPS Conservatorship Opposition to Petition Petition Termination of Conservatorship	1 1 3 2 3 2 3	4 1 1 1 1 1 1	6 1 1 1 1	2 1 4 6 1	10 3 2 1 1	2 1 1 1 1	7 1 1 1 3	26 1 3 1 1	5 1 1 1 1	19 3 1 1 1	3 7 40 3 2	7 2 2 3 1	3 3 2 1 1	11 3 2 2 1	1 3 1 1 1	3 8 1 1 1	14 14 3 1 1	16 16 1 1 1	29 29 1 1 1	32 32 7 3 4	23 23 1 1 2	6 17 17 12 15 37 13	350	
Conservatorship Total		10	7	20	14	17	4	10	31	5	22	47	17	5	17	3	7	14	16	29	32	23	7		
Criminal Justice / Forensic Mental	Competency Criminal Justice Issues - Rights Criminal Matter Representation – Not IOLTA eligible - OCRA Diversion Jail Juvenile (Detention and Probation) Other Criminal Justice Probation	1 1 3 2 1 1 1	1 1 1 2 1 1 1	1 1 1 1 1 1	1 6 3 1 1 9 1	2 2 1 1 1 1 1	1 2 1 1 1 1 1	3 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 1 1 1 1 3 1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 1 40 1 2 2 1	1 1 2 1 3 1 1	3 3 2 1 1 1 1	1 1 2 1 1 1 1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 2 3 1 1 1 1	16 16 1 1 1 1 1	29 29 1 1 1 1 1	32 32 7 3 4 3 1	23 23 1 1 2 1 1	7 28 1 11 10 3 20 1			
Criminal Justice / Forensic Mental	Health Issues Total	4	1	5	1	22	6	5	8	2	2	3	2	4	2	1	2	3			4	3	1	81	
Discrimination (Other than Employment)	Civil Rights (Race, Religion, Sexual Orientation) Higher Education (Public and Private) Insurance Discrimination Other Discrimination Public Accommodations (Hotels, Restaurants, Etc.) Transportation (Public and Private)	1 1 1 1 1			1			1		1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1					1	6	
																								5	
						2																		2	
				1	1			2	1	1	1			1	12	1		2						23	
		1	1		1	1	2			2			1		1									11	
			1		1	1				2				1										8	
Discrimination (Other than Employment) Total		2	2	1	3	4	3	3	1	4	3	1	2	3	13	1	1	3			1	1	3	55	
Education	Education - Adult Education Programs Education - After School Programs Education - Assessment Education - Assistive Technology Education - Behavioral Intervention, Services and Supports Education - Bullying Education - Charter Schools Education - Compliance Complaint Education - Discipline (Suspension / Expulsion / Other) Education - Discrimination Education - Due Process Appeals Education - Early Intervention (Part B / Over Age 3) Education - Eligibility	5 1 3 1 5 1 1 1 5 1 3	12 1 8 2 10 1 4 6 3 2 3	1 1 8 2 7 1 5 2 1 12	3 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 1 2 1 4 1 2 1 1 1 1	1 1 1 1 4 4 1 1 1 1 2	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 1 1 1 3 3 1 1 1 1 2	2 1 3 1 5 1 7 5 7 2	1 1 1 1 5 1 10 5 10 7	1 1 4 1 5 4 3 1 3 2	1 1 1 1 7 1 13 6 3 1	1 1 4 4 2 1 1 1 1 1 3	1 1 1 1 17 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 1 4 2 3 1 8 5 1 1 1	1 1 4 3 2 1 2 1 3 4 1	3 3 2 3 2 2 1 1 1 1 1					1 2 3 2 2 1 1 1 4 1	1 1 3 1 6 1 5 2 1 1 1	1 6 55 14 108 4 3 93 56 7 69 7 33

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Semi-Annual Report - July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012
Report by Problem Codes

		ARC	CVRC	ELARC	FNRC	GGRC	HRC	IFC	KRC	LRC	NBRC	NLARC	RCEB	RCOC	RCRC	SARC	SCLARC	SDRC	SGPRC	TCRC	VMRC	WRC	Total	
	Other Immigration	1		3			1			1		3				1	2			1	2	1	16	
	Public Charge										1	1								1			3	
	Immigration Total	1		6			3	1		2	5	4	1			1	3	1		3	2	5	38	
	Income Maintenance					1	1	2										1		2			7	
	AAP					1	1	2										1		2			7	
	IHSS Eligibility	7	3	16	2	3	11	12	4	23	14	8	14	15		4	12	28	14	8	7	20	225	
	IHSS Hours	13	7	25	9	5	12	22	4	15	4	6	12	17	4	3	20	13	8	5	6	23	233	
	IHSS Protective Supervision	10	3	20	16	2	11	16	2	18	5	26	6	9	4	4	2	15	5	2	1	17	194	
	IHSS Share of Cost	1		1							1	2	1					1		1		1	9	
	Other Income Programs				3	2	1		3	1	6		3	1	1	1		4		2		2	31	
	SSA - Child Benefits	1		1						12								1			1	1	18	
	SSA - DAC			4	3					2		1	2		1		2					15	32	
	SSA - SSDI			1		6	1	2		1	4	1	1							7		10	35	
	SSI - Eligibility	9	29	25	12	28	8	14	11	6	60	19	24	13	3	6	21	12	10	22	29	43	404	
	SSI - Hearing			1		2							1				2		1				7	
	SSI - Other	3	5	17	6	18	5	5	14	1	1	3	4	7	4	1	9	7	1	18	8	42	179	
	SSI - Overpayment	7	10	15	6	39	10	10	7	9	8	9	13	7	2	6	9	5	5	15	15	38	245	
	SSI - Representative Payee		1	2	5	4					9	1			1	1	1	3	2	1	8	2	41	
	State Disability Benefits								1		1									1			5	
	Income Maintenance Total	51	59	129	63	110	60	84	46	88	113	75	81	72	20	25	78	90	46	86	75	214	1665	
	Legal Referral	3			11	1	2	3	6	3	10	4	4		8	1	4		4		4	5	73	
	Civil (General)			4	2		1				4	3		1	5	1			3	1	1		27	
	Criminal (General) - Rights																						4	
	Juvenile Dependency											1										3	4	
	Personal Injury		2	1	4	5	3	4	1	1	4	2	4		1	1	6	2	5		3	2	51	
	Public Defender				3								1	1	1							1	7	
	Small Claims			2					1	1		1		1	1							1	10	
	Worker's Compensation								1			1							1				3	
	Legal Referral Total	3	2	7	20	6	6	7	9	6	18	12	9	3	16	3	10	2	13	1	13	9	175	
	Mental Health Issues	2										1					1					1	4	
	Mental Health - Complaint											1											2	
	Mental Health - Eligibility					1										1							5	
	Mental Health - Involuntary Commitment	2					2				1												2	
	Mental Health - Service, Supports and Treatment	5		1	2	1	2		2	1	2			2	1	2				3			24	
	Mental Health Issues Total	9	1	2	2	4	2	1	4	2	4			2	1	3				3	1		35	
	Placement					1	1		1				2										5	
	Discharge Planning					1	1		1				2										4	
	Facility Conditions	1	1			1		1														4	7	
	Facility Evictions																	1			2		3	
	Health Facilities															1	1				1		19	
	Move from Institution to Community	2	2			2	1		2	1	1	1	2		2			2				2	22	
	Support Services Needed for Placement	3	4			4	1		2				1		3	1	1						1	
	Transitional Housing					1																	1	
	Unit / Facility / Institution Transfer	6			3	2	1	8	1			1					2	2		1		2	29	
	Placement Total	12	7			12	5	2	13	2	1	1	6		5	2	4	5		5	2	6	90	
	Privacy/Personal Autonomy / Choices	1		1	2	2	1				1		1	1	5			4				1	1	21
	Community Activities			1	2	2	1				1		1	1	5			4				1	1	21
	Least Restrictive Environment			1	5		3	1					3	1	4			2		2	3	1	26	
	Mail			1	1																		2	
	Other Privacy / Personal Autonomy / Choices	4		15	2	14	7	9	7	1	9	1	6		6	9		8		7	39	3	147	
	Personal Property	1		1		3	1	2	2		1		1	1	1	1	1	1			4		21	
	Privacy		1		2		1	1				1	1		2	1		2			1	2	15	
	Religion					1							1									1	3	
	Sexuality					1					4		1		1	2				1	2	2	14	
	Telephone				1			1			1		1		1								5	
	Privacy/Personal Autonomy / Choices Total	6	1	19	8	26	10	16	10	1	16	2	15	3	20	13	1	17		11	52	7	254	
	Records				1		1					1	4					1					7	
	Breach of Confidentiality				1		1					1	4										4	
	Denial of Access	2										1											2	
	Erroneous Information			1														1			1		4	
	Records Total	2		1	1		1					2	4					1			1		13	
	Regional Center Services					1			2														7	
	Regional Center - 6500					1			2														7	
	Regional Center - Assessment of Needs	5		5	1	3	18	4	2	3		2	5	1	6	6	2	2		1	11	4	81	
	Regional Center - Behavioral Services	7	14	15	1	1	19	15	7	14	5	3	15	28	2	6	19	9	2	12	15	7	216	
	Regional Center - Case Management	3	5	33	16	1	9	14	38	6	25	19	25	2	2	5	23	8	12	5	8	13	272	
	Regional Center - Child Care/Day Care Issues	1		1									3	3									8	
	Regional Center - Coordination with County Mental Health			1		1											1						3	
	Regional Center - Crisis Services			1	1							2	2	2		1				1		1	11	
	Regional Center - Day Program, Training and Activity	5	2	4	7	6	15	8	5	4	21	6	9	1	5	6	8	8	2	3	77	1	203	
	Regional Center - DDS Policies / Procedures	2		2		2		4	1	3	1	2	3				6					2	29	
	Regional Center - Early Start (Part C / Under Age 3)		1	4		2	8	5	1	12	4		8	1	2	2	10	3	10	3	2	15	93	

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
 Semi-Annual Report - July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012
 Report by Problem Codes

	ARC	CVRC	ELARC	FNRC	GGRC	HRC	IPC	KRC	LRC	NBRC	NLARC	RCEB	RCOC	RCRC	SARC	SCLARC	SDRC	SGPRC	TCRC	VMFC	WRC	Total
Regional Center - Eligibility for Regional Center services	26	34	22	26	25	22	91	23	29	39	31	25	55	10	23	51	28	37	27	13	34	671
Regional Center - Fair Hearing Procedures (Information only; n	1	3	33	1	10	8	6	3	20	19	8	4	26	1	3	12	2	50	9		8	227
Regional Center - Independent Living Services	4	4	10		6	1	1	2	6	3	1	3	4	2	4	2		7	2			68
Regional Center - IPP (Development / Meeting / Compliance)	5	7	8	13	2	21	14	10	19	18	14	18	4	10	4	11	10	20	20	2	6	236
Regional Center - Least Restrictive Environment							1						1		2					1		5
Regional Center - Nursing Services													2									2
Regional Center - Other Regional Center Services	13	11	27	1	12	10	9	36	12	16	16	20	34	7	7	5	18	9	10	24	12	309
Regional Center - Prevention Services	1		1	1			2		1				1			2				1		10
Regional Center - Respite	7	3	23	3	3	15	11	5	9	12	7	9	10	6	3	4	34	7	6	5	12	194
Regional Center - Supported Employment	1	1		2		1	3	1	1	2			3			1	1		1	1	3	22
Regional Center - Supported Living	5	4	1	6	19	1	3	19	3	10	1	14	16	5	5		14	2	11	7	10	156
Regional Center - Transportation	2	2	4	6	4	7	3	3	5	10		3	3	2		9	3	1		3		70
Regional Center - Waiver			1				1	1	7	5	1	1	3				3				5	28
Regional Center - Waiver / HCBS													1									1
Regional Center Services Total	88	91	196	86	97	155	195	159	154	190	113	167	201	60	77	166	143	159	116	171	138	2922
Transportation													2								1	3
Transportation - Appeal Procedure																					1	1
Transportation - Eligibility																					2	4
Transportation Total													2								2	4
Grand Total	317	356	645	381	426	377	435	441	380	564	396	513	397	267	319	433	357	395	391	513	667	8970

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Semi-Annual Report - July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012
Report by Service Level

	ARC	CVRC	ELARC	FNRC	GGRC	HRC	IRC	KRC	LRC	NBRC	NLARC	RCEB	RCOC	RCRC	SARC	SCLARC	SDRC	SGPRC	TCRC	VMRC	WRC	Total
0 - Pending										1				2								3
1 - Information/Referral	41	34	268	39	186	163	101	61	49	99	45	99	68	107	118	229	34	96	38	174	278	2327
2 - Rights Information/Consultation (RC/Generic)	224	89	233	51	46	68	309	143	145	329	228	129	219	112	34	168	176	289	224	135	261	3612
3 - Rights Information/Consultation (Other)	21	211	91	204	19	98	1	188	175	32	84	118	28	12	80	20	114	1	111	167	18	1793
4 - Abuse/Neglect Investigation	1			3		1		5		1	1	2		1	4	1	1		3		1	25
5 - Special Education Compliance Complaint	2	1						1				3		1	1	1	1				5	16
6 - IEP		5	3	9	4	6		9	1	4	12	18	4	3	33	4	1			19	4	139
7 - IPP/IDT	1					10	2	4		6	3	2	2	1	4	1	3	1	2		3	45
8 - W&I 4731						1		2	1		3						1			3	2	13
9 - Technical Assistance	11	7	21	9	28	8	2	12	2	9	1	3	51	10	5	2	2	5	3	4	4	199
10 - Evaluation and Assessment	14	5	9	51	90	16	8	8	4	70	11	80	22	11	9	6	12		7	6	19	458
11 - Informal Regional Center / Provider Problem Resolution	1		7	3	20	1	7	5	1	5		25	1	2	14		5				13	110
12 - Informal Generic Service Agency Problem Resolution		2	7	7	27	2	3	1	1	4	3	28		3	17		3		1		47	156
13 - Case Settlement Prior to Informal Meeting, Mediation or Hearing		1	3				1			1	2			1				2			3	14
14 - Direct Representation in RC "Voluntary Informal Meeting"	1			3								2										6
15 - Direct Representation in Mediation / RC Fair Hearing			1		1	1					1		2			1	1	1			4	13
16 - Direct Representation in an Appeal for Generic Services			2	2	5	2	1	1		2	4	4		1			3		2		10	39
17 - Court Litigation		1						1														2
Grand Total	317	356	645	381	426	377	435	441	380	564	396	513	397	267	319	433	357	395	391	513	667	8970

ADVOCACY REPORT

OFFICE OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS ADVOCACY

January--June, 2012

BENEFITS

IN HOME SUPPORT SERVICES (IHSS)

L.A. Recovers His Full IHSS Benefits.

For years, L.A. has received 283 hours of IHSS because of his severe impairment. Due to a reassessment administrative error, the hours that were supposed to be allocated for protective supervision were allocated for paramedical services. When these hours were reviewed by the county, a decision was made that L.A. did not require that many paramedical hours and reduced his hours to 195. L.A.'s mother appealed the decision in time to qualify for aid-paid-pending (APP); however, it was never awarded. L.A.'s mother tried to explain the error to the County hearing specialist and inquire about APP, but was unable to resolve the issue.

The Associate CRA contacted the hearing specialist and discussed the County's non-compliance regarding APP and the error in awarding a maximum of 195 hours to a severely impaired recipient. The hearing specialist agreed that L.A. is severely impaired but stated he did not have the authority to resolve the issue. That same day, the Associate CRA and L.A.'s mother met with the hearing specialist. After the Associate CRA informed the hearing specialist of L.S.'s right to resolve the issue by means of a conditional withdrawal, the hearing specialist reinstated L.A.'s hours to 283 retroactive to the initial date of reduction to assure payment for APP. Veronica Cervantes, CRA, Beatriz Reyes, Associate CRA, Katie Hornberger, Supervising CRA, Inland Regional Center.

6-Year Old Receives Protective Supervision.

M.H. is 6-years old and is a person with autism. The county social worker determined that, “all six year old (*sic*) children require constant supervision and that this child’s need for supervision was comparable to that of a normal child his age.” Protective supervision was denied. OCRA provided technical assistance. At the hearing, the evidence established that the child was at risk for self-injury and could not recognize potential dangers. The Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) noted, “A minor must not be denied protective supervision based solely on age or solely because the minor has had no injuries at home due to mental impairment, as long as the minor has the potential for injury.” Jim Stoepler, CRA, Gail Gresham, Supervising CRA, Redwood Coast Regional Center, Ukiah.

M.G. Obtains 195 Hours of IHSS.

M.G.’s mother contacted OCRA seeking assistance with obtaining protective supervision through the IHSS program. OCRA agreed to provide direct representation at an administrative hearing to challenge the County’s determination that M.G. was ineligible to receive protective supervision services. Following the hearing, the ALJ ordered that M.G. receive IHSS in the amount of 195 hours per month because M.G. requires protective supervision to remain safely at home. Ibrahim Saab, CRA, Ada Hamer, Associate CRA, Timothy Poe, Supervising CRA, North Los Angeles County Regional Center.

Services Reinstated.

G.F. had been found eligible to receive IHSS for two years, but following an annual review his eligibility was terminated due to incorrectly completed forms submitted by his doctor. G.F.’s mother contacted OCRA for assistance. OCRA advised G.F.’s mother to appeal and resubmit requested forms to both the county worker and appeals specialist. Though G.F.’s mother timely appealed, aid paid pending the hearing was not provided. OCRA provided ongoing technical assistance to G.F.’s mother while G.F.’s mother communicated with the appeals specialist. The appeals specialist offered a conditional withdrawal but G.F.’s mother decided to go forward with the scheduled hearing. The CRA met with G.F.’s mother

to prepare her for hearing. At the hearing, a re-evaluation was ordered to take place within 30 days. Following the hearing, G.F.'s mother received a revised notice of action reinstating eligibility along with retroactive payment. Aimee Delgado, CRA, Marisol Cruz, Assistant CRA, Irma Wagster, Supervising CRA, San Gabriel/Pomona Regional Center.

J.G.'s Mother Receives Documents in the Correct Language.

After several unsuccessful attempts to contact IHSS, J.G.'s mother contacted OCRA for assistance with obtaining IHSS documents in Spanish. The County kept sending documents in Vietnamese. J.G.'s mother called the social worker and the IHSS office to resolve this issue several times. OCRA contacted a supervisor at IHSS to assist the parent in obtaining the correct documents so that she could submit her timesheets for 3 months. J.G.'s mother confirmed that she received the correct documents and received payment for service hours. Jacqueline Miller, CRA, Cynthia Salomon, Assistant CRA, Irma Wagster, Supervising CRA, Regional Center of Orange County.

Parent Prevails after 3 Year Effort.

H.F.'s mother filed an appeal based on a December, 2009, annual reassessment that authorized 14 hours per month of IHSS services. H.F.'s mother believed there was a need for over 100 hours. OCRA worked with the county appeals specialist who agreed to do a reassessment. The second reassessment in 2010 authorized an increase from 14 to 43.4 hours. H.F.'s mother disagreed and filed another appeal. OCRA again worked with the appeals specialist who agreed to a conditional withdrawal in exchange for another reassessment. At the third reassessment in early 2011, the hours were increased to 66.2 per month. H.F.'s mother continued to disagree and filed yet another appeal. OCRA contacted the appeals specialist, who agreed to another conditional withdrawal in exchange for a fourth reassessment. In April, 2011, a new IHSS social worker and nurse conducted an assessment and authorized an increase from 66.2 to 110 hours per month. H.F.'s mother was also awarded \$12,640 in retroactive pay. Mary Melendrez, CRA, Christine Armand, Associate CRA, Katherine Mottarella, Supervising CRA, South Central Los Angeles Regional Center.

Hours Increased from 41 to 195 Hours per Month.

J.G. is a 15-year-old with autism and an intellectual disability. His mother contacted OCRA in December, 2011, about a notice of action regarding J.G.'s IHSS hours. Despite the fact that J.G.'s mother requested a reassessment, the social worker increased J.G.'s IHSS hours slightly for a total of 41 hours per month. OCRA assisted the mother with requesting records from the regional center and discovered in reviewing J.G.'s records that J.G. should qualify for protective supervision.

OCRA agreed to represent J.G. at a hearing and provided the parents with the self-assessment log. The Assistant CRA met with the parents and assisted them with filling out a detailed log.

Prior to the hearing, J.G.'s IHSS social worker contacted J.G.'s mother to offer 195 hours of IHSS, including protective supervision retroactive to the date of application. Jackie Dai, CRA, Lucy Garcia, Assistant CRA, Irma Wagster, Supervising CRA, Eastern Los Angeles Regional Center.

MEDI-CAL

Speech Therapy Reinstated for 7 Youngsters.

Seven young people received Notices of Action from the new Medi-Cal managed care provider in their county. The managed care provider terminated speech therapy services on the basis that the school was the primary speech therapy provider and that speech therapy was not medically necessary. Each client had benefited significantly from speech therapy. Some consumers had begun to speak as a result of intensive speech therapy intervention. Other consumers became less frustrated when they learned how to use assistive communication devices.

The problems with the managed care provider appeared to be systemic. OCRA worked with Disability Rights California regional office staff (DRC) in order to comprehensively address the problems being faced by multiple consumers. OCRA and regional office staff

negotiated with the managed health care plan and convinced the health plan to rescind the defective notices and to recognize that the primary source of speech therapy was the managed health care plan. The speech therapy services for all 7 people were reinstated. Jim Stoepler, CRA, Gail Gresham, Supervising CRA, Redwood Coast Regional Center, Ukiah.

Medi-Cal and IHSS Services Are Reinstated.

S.Z. is a 5-year-old girl with Down syndrome. She has Medi-Cal through the Developmental Disabilities Waiver. S.Z. receives IHSS since she has extensive care needs. S.Z.'s mother is her IHSS provider. Last November, S.Z.'s mother stopped getting paid for performing IHSS for S.Z., despite completing and submitting timesheets. The County then stopped mailing timesheets to her. The mother called the IHSS social worker, who told her S.Z.'s Medi-Cal had been terminated so she was ineligible for IHSS. S.Z.'s mother called the Medi-Cal worker, who said the daughter must reapply for Medi-Cal. S.Z. received no written notice of termination or information about appeal rights. S.Z.'s mother called OCRA for help.

OCRA contacted the County in an effort to get S.Z.'s Medi-Cal and IHSS reinstated without having to file for hearing. OCRA asserted that S.Z. should have been placed into Continuous Eligibility for Children (CEC) Medi-Cal upon losing Medi-Cal eligibility under the Waiver. Moreover, since S.Z. did not receive notice of the termination, her appeal was timely and she would be eligible for aid paid pending the hearing. The County agreed it was in error and reinstated the IHSS retroactively. Since the provider certified that she had provided all the IHSS to S.Z. for the time the provider was not paid, S.Z.'s mother will receive timesheets to complete and will be paid. OCRA is still working on getting two months of Medi-Cal reinstated retroactively. Katie Meyer, CRA, Westside Regional Center, Luisa Delgadillo, Assistant CRA, Katie Hornberger, Supervising CRA, Westside Regional Center.

N.R. Obtains Durable Medical Equipment.

N.R.'s mother contacted OCRA seeking assistance with obtaining a wheelchair for her daughter. N.R.'s mother indicated that both Medi-

Cal and California Children's Services (CCS) had refused to fund a wheelchair that met her daughter's specific needs. OCRA worked with a new vendor to reassess N.R. and submit a revised Treatment Authorization Request (TAR) to Medi-Cal for the needed equipment. After a comprehensive assessment, a new TAR was submitted along with additional documentation for a specialized wheelchair and bath chair. Based upon the updated information, Medi-Cal agreed to fund the requested equipment. Ibrahim Saab, CRA, Ada Hamer, Associate CRA, Timothy Poe, Supervising CRA, North Los Angeles County Regional Center.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Collaboration Is Successful for SSI Eligibility Reconsideration.

A.V. contacted OCRA shortly after he turned eighteen. A.V. had been referred to OCRA by his service coordinator after his application for SSI as an adult had been denied.

A.V. was eligible for regional center services on the basis of autism. Although he had graduated from high school, A.V. had never worked until he began working in an assisted employment program for consumers with autism. A.V. also had mental health impairments. The SSA denied SSI for A.V. on the basis that his disabilities did not prevent him from working.

The CRA helped A.V. file for reconsideration. Working in conjunction with A.V.'s service coordinator and supportive employment program, OCRA arranged to have a performance and productivity assessment of A.V.'s work at his supported employment program. That report confirmed that A.V. needed prompting 90% of the time to stay on task, and that due to stress and anxiety issues he was only able to handle working two days per week.

OCRA assisted A.V. with submitting the additional supporting information to the SSA. The SSA reversed its denial and granted eligibility on the record at the case review stage. Andy Holcombe, CRA, Lorie Atamian, Associate CRA, Jeanne Molineaux, Director, Far Northern Regional Center.

Overpayment and SSI Reinstatement Success.

A.V. is an 11-year-old child with autism who was receiving SSI. A.V.'s mother had been using part of the SSI as intended by the SSA and was saving the other part of the SSI money in a bank account for A.V.'s future needs. As a result, A.V. mother incurred an overpayment of \$5,161 and SSI for A.V. was terminated. A.V.'s mother filed a request for reconsideration in September, 2010. The reconsideration was denied in June, 2011. A.V.'s mother still had \$4,220 in the bank account and was told by the SSA staff that she would have to spend down that money and show receipts in order to reinstate SSI benefits for A.V. A.V.'s mother did as instructed and turned in the receipts to the SSA office twice. A.V.'s mother did not receive a response, nor would the SSA staff return her phone calls.

A.V.'s mother contacted OCRA in August, 2011. OCRA assisted A.V. and met with the SSA on several occasions. The SSA agreed to do an accounting of the case including money collected for the overpayment, money owed to A.V. in retroactive payments, and to reinstate SSI. SSI was reinstated in January, 2012. The overpayment amount was covered by retroactive money and A.V. received \$5,899, which was the remainder of the retroactive SSI. Jackie Dai, CRA, Lucy Garcia, Assistant CRA, Irma Wagster, Supervising CRA, Eastern Los Angeles Regional Center

SSI Reinstated and Overpayment Waived.

M.B. has a PASS Plan for Social Security which allows her to save money for the microenterprise she runs. Over the years, she has repeatedly received overpayment notices from the SSA. Most recently, she received a notice for an overpayment of \$4,000.

OCRA made repeated visits to the SSA and involved the PASS Cadre. Appeal and waiver requests were filed. Relevant documents were submitted and a meeting was held with the SSA supervisors and their technical expert. Finally, the waiver was granted, SSI was reinstated, and a retroactive check was sent to M.B. Katy Lusson, CRA, Gail Gresham, Supervising CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

Social Security Sets Aside C.G.'s SSI Overpayment.

In October, 2011, C.G. received a notice of SSI overpayment in the amount of \$4,424. He also received a notice that his SSI monthly payments would stop effective November, 2011. The overpayment resulted from C.G.'s father holding \$2,500 for his older daughter in his checking account, not realizing that the money would count as a resource that was available to him, and be deemed a resource for C.G.

The father had borrowed a portion of the \$2,500, intending to pay it back when he received his income tax refund. In May, 2011, C.G.'s father deposited his income tax refund into his checking account. Tax returns are not considered as resources or income for SSI purposes. As a result of having these funds, C.G. was determined to be ineligible for SSI due to the family being over the resource limit.

C.G.'s father filed a request for reconsideration on the ineligibility determination and request for waiver of the overpayment. The local SSA office claimed never to have received C.G.'s request for reconsideration and waiver despite C.G. having proof of filing. OCRA helped the family by submitting a complaint to the local SSA office representative who investigated the matter and re-opened the reconsideration process. OCRA represented C.G. at his reconsideration meeting and presented evidence showing that the excess resource funds were due to the income tax refund. SSA set aside the overpayment, reinstated C.G.'s SSI eligibility, and issued a \$6,043 retroactive SSI payment. Eva Casas-Sarmiento, CRA, Katie Hornberger, Supervising CRA, Harbor Regional Center.

A.S. Gets \$42,000 Social Security Overpayment Waived.

A.S. receives supported employment services that enable him to work in the community. OCRA received a call from A.S.'s sister indicating that the SSA had sent A.S. a notice stating that he was overpaid \$42,000 in Supplemental Security Disability Insurance benefits. The notice said that A.S. was at fault and needed to pay the money back. Although A.S. had already filed an appeal, he needed representation at his hearing.

OCRA met with A.S. and reviewed his SSA and employment records. Through OCRA's investigation, it became clear that A.S. was not at fault for the overpayment. OCRA represented A.S. at his Social Security appeal and explained why A.S. was not at fault. A few weeks later, A.S. received a favorable decision from the SSA stating that A.S. was not at fault. The entire \$42,000 overpayment was waived. Yulahlia Hernandez, CRA, Annie Breuer, Assistant CRA, Gail Gresham, Supervising CRA, North Bay Regional Center.

A.C.'s SSI Overpayment Reduced by \$11,000.

A.C. is an adult with an intellectual disability who received an SSI overpayment notice that he must repay the SSA over \$11,000 based on the SSA's assumption that A.C.'s current job was not supported employment. With A.C.'s permission, OCRA agreed to provide A.C.'s Independent Living Agency with extensive assistance in preparing for a reconsideration meeting with the SSA. At the reconsideration meeting, it was explained that A.C. worked in supported employment due to his working at a work activity center. The SSA agreed that the overpayment amount was in error and reduced the amount owed by \$11,000. Ramona Landeros, Assistant CRA, Timothy Poe, Supervising CRA, Alta California Regional Center.

Increase in SSI Payment Amount.

P.S. contacted OCRA because she was only receiving \$608 per month in SSI benefits. She felt that the SSA made an error in calculating her SSI payments.

After reviewing P.S.'s documents, the Associate CRA realized the reason P.S.'s benefits were so low had to do with the way she had filled out her original application. The Associate CRA set up an informal conference with the SSA to discuss P.S.'s monthly benefits. As a result of that informal conference, P.S.'s SSI checks were recalculated and she is now receiving an additional \$250 per month in SSI benefits. Andy Holcombe, CRA, Lorie Atamian, Associate CRA, Far Northern Regional Center.

J.B.'s Disabled Adult Child Benefits Are Reinstated!

J.B. is a 44-year-old with an intellectual disability. He had been receiving SSA benefits as a Disabled Adult Child (DAC) since his father passed away. J.B.'s DAC benefits were suddenly terminated when J.B. did not respond to a notice from the SSA asking for information. J.B.'s mother, who sometimes helps him but is not his representative payee, did not realize the SSA needed information. Neither J.B. nor his mother responded to the notice.

J.B. eventually called OCRA after some time had passed. OCRA filed a request for reopening, alleging that J.B. did not understand the notices due to his intellectual disability. OCRA also assisted J.B. in applying for SSI benefits, which were quickly approved.

When the SSA did not act on the request for reopening, OCRA contacted a SSA supervisor. After another year, the reopening request was granted and a favorable decision was made. J.B.'s DAC benefits have been reinstated retroactively to March, 2009. J.B. received \$14,316 in retroactive benefits. He will receive his regular DAC benefits going forward. His Medicare was also reinstated. Katie Meyer, CRA, Luisa Delgadillo, Assistant CRA, Katie Hornberger, Supervising CRA, Westside Regional Center.

CALIFORNIA CHILDREN'S SERVICES

Consumer Has Specialized Stroller Funded by CCS.

J.P. has an electric wheelchair but it is cumbersome. His family wanted a specialized stroller so that it would be easier to get J.P. in and out of his van and would provide better community access. The stroller cost \$4,500. California Children's Services (CCS) denied the request for the stroller.

OCRA explained that J.S. would have to appeal that decision and that based on the result, might have to go through the same process with Medi-Cal and the regional center. OCRA assisted with the development of documentary evidence. J.P.'s doctor and physical

therapist provided relevant records. OCRA assisted with the preparation of the CCS appeal. CCS rescinded the denial and purchased the stroller. Katy Lusson, CRA, Aruti Patel, Assistant CRA, Gail Gresham, Supervising CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

Regional Center Funds Communication Device with Eye Gaze.

C.G. is 2-years old and diagnosed with spinal muscular atrophy. C.G. communicates with his eyes as he has no ability to move his body. The regional center completed an augmentative communication assessment and found that C.G. had the ability to communicate by using a device with an eye gaze pointer which identifies objects, colors, and pictures with the use of his eyes. The eye gaze device would be required for C.G. to utilize the actual communication device. CCS denied the request to fund the device stating that it is CCS policy to deny funding for communication devices for children less than three years of age if the only means of using the device is with an eye gazing technology.

C.G.'s mother contacted OCRA for advocacy. OCRA recommended advocating for a 30-day trial to demonstrate C.G.'s ability to use the device with the eye gaze. To avoid any further delay in services, OCRA requested that the regional center fund the 30-day trial, based on the IFSP communication goal. OCRA also assisted the parent in requesting Medi-Cal funding under the Acute Facility Waiver. The regional center agreed to fund the trial period use of the device. CCS is now considering funding the purchase of the device based on successful results during the trial period. Leinani Walter, CRA, Christine Hager, Assistant CRA, Gail Gresham, Supervising CRA, Valley Mountain Regional Center.

CCS Approves Nursing Care for Two Clients.

J.K. and C.M. were receiving in-home nursing services through the Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment (EPSDT) program as administered through Medi-Cal. These services enabled the two to live at home with their families instead of in larger care facilities with nursing services. In June, 2011, mandatory enrollment into Medi-Cal managed care was established for seniors and persons

with disabilities in many counties. When this occurred, J.K. and C.M. were threatened with losing their vital in-home nursing services. The county operated health plan applied an incorrect standard of medical necessity, sent out no or defective notices of action, and refused to continue funding nursing services for both clients who were eventually notified of their terminated services by the nursing providers. Their parents contacted OCRA for assistance. OCRA assisted J.K. and C.M. with filing for hearing and requesting APP. OCRA reviewed the position statements, reviewed the regulations and law regarding EPSDT nursing services standards for medical necessity, contacted the Department of Health Care Services and worked with the hearings representative to try to settle these matters. Eventually, it was determined that both children were eligible for CCS and qualified for nursing services. Both J.K. and C.M. were approved for continued nursing services and were able to withdraw their hearings against the Medi-Cal County Operated Health Plan. Kendra McWright, CRA, Gina Gheno, Assistant CRA, Katherine Mottarella, Supervising CRA, Tri-Counties Regional Center.

CONSUMER DEBT

Consumer Debt Forgiven.

R.C. is a young woman with an intellectual disability and a mental health diagnosis. Due to an exacerbation of her psychiatric condition, she was forced to move out of her apartment and in with family members. This resulted in a breach of the lease agreement that R.C. signed for her apartment. The rent for the term of R.C.'s lease was charged and the debt was sent to a collection agency.

OCRA assisted R.C. with the debt collection issue. A letter was written on R.C.'s behalf. After telephone conversations with the collection agency, the debt was forgiven. Katy Lusson, CRA, Gail Gresham, Supervising CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

K.S.' Contract to Purchase a Vacuum Is Voided.

K.S., an adult with an intellectual disability, called the OCRA office distressed that she was receiving demanding phone calls and letters

from a vacuum company claiming that K.S. owed them over \$2,000 for the purchase of a new vacuum. OCRA agreed to call and write both the vacuum company and the debt collection agency to stop the calling to K.S. OCRA informed both companies that the vacuum contract was voidable due to K.S.'s intellectual disability and that her only source of income was Social Security. After numerous phone calls between OCRA and the attorney for the vacuum company, the company agreed to void the contract and stop seeking reimbursement. K.S. agreed to exchange the new vacuum for an older vacuum in good working order. Ramona Landeros, Assistant CRA, Timothy Poe, Supervising CRA, Alta California Regional Center.

HOUSING

H.A. Moves Back to Her Community.

H.A. lived in the same Community Care Facility (CCF) for over 20 years. When she experienced some medical issues, H.A.'s treating physician ordered that she be moved to a Skilled Nursing Facility (SNF), almost a hundred miles from the CCF. The staff at H.A.'s day program contacted OCRA when H.A. was moved to the SNF. Since H.A. has no family and is non-verbal, the day program staff wanted to help H.A. return to the community she knew as her home.

OCRA met with H.A. at the SNF, obtained her medical records, and communicated with the regional center. Through collaboration with the regional center and a thorough review of H.A.'s medical history, it was determined that she would be better served at a less restrictive Intermediate Care Facility (ICF) in her original community.

H.A. soon moved to an ICF in the area where she lived before. She continues to attend the day program that she has been going to for years. Yulahlia Hernandez, CRA, Annie Breuer, Assistant CRA, Gail Gresham, Supervising CRA, North Bay Regional Center.

OCRA Works with Regional Center to Maintain Community Placement.

M.Z. is an individual with autism. He lives in a specialized group home where he has a high level of support and services. M.Z.'s Individual Program Plan (IPP) includes dietary restrictions, supplements, exercise, and several other supports that his group home felt were time-consuming and unnecessary. They were about to ask M.Z. to move.

OCRA attended a meeting with the family, the regional center, and the provider. Both the regional center and OCRA explained that this home was receiving specialized funding to provide these services. They were in M.Z.'s IPP and needed to be implemented. The family and the group home made certain compromises about communication and delivery of services. The inappropriateness of evicting M.Z. was also discussed. At the end of the meeting, the home agreed to comply with the IPP and deliver the services. Katy Lusson, CRA, Aruti Patel, Assistant CRA, Gail Gresham, Supervising CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

PERSONAL AUTONOMY

Probate Court Judge Terminates Conservatorship.

H.S. is 25-years old. She has mild delays and a seizure disorder controlled by medication. H.S. was conserved 7 years ago by her parents. H.S. decided that she no longer wanted to be conserved.

H.S. consulted with OCRA to develop a plan of advocacy to strengthen the petition to terminate her conservatorship. H.S. achieved all of her IPP goals by managing her own medical and neurological care needs, voluntarily participating in counseling, succeeding in independent employment, attending a day program, and by learning public transportation throughout the Modesto and surrounding areas. H.S. demonstrated independence in all aspects of her life.

OCRA wrote a letter to the court supporting the petition to terminate the conservatorship and requested letters of support from various medical professionals, counselors, social workers, supported living service workers, former teachers, and employers. OCRA assisted H.S. by helping her file her petition to terminate the conservatorship. OCRA provided technical assistance to the probate court. At the probate court hearing, the judge ordered the termination of the conservatorship. The judge specifically noted that all constitutional rights had been restored. Leinani Walter, CRA, Christine Hager, Assistant CRA, Gail Gresham, Supervising CRA, Valley Mountain Regional Center.

C.C.'s Transportation Is Reinstated.

Two days prior to the end of the month, C.C. received a letter informing her that her para-transit transportation would be suspended for the following month because she had not appealed a notice of action sent to her five months previously. C.C. was concerned that she would not be able to get to her multiple doctor appointments and receive the treatments she needed. C.C. informed OCRA that she had appealed, and had a copy of the appeal that she mailed. OCRA and C.C.'s service coordinator contacted the transportation company to resolve the issue. The following day, the transportation company apologized for losing C.C.'s appeal paperwork, and resolved the issue by reinstating C.C.'s services. Jacqueline Miller, CRA, Cynthia Salomon, Assistant CRA, Irma Wagster, Supervising CRA, Regional Center of Orange County.

Privacy Rights Protected at Care Home.

Staff from the regional center contacted OCRA regarding the use of the intercom system by the providers at a care home. The concern identified was that the privacy rights of consumers might be impacted or violated. OCRA agreed to do a site visit to investigate. During the site visit, OCRA met with 3 clients and staff. The clients stated that they enjoyed the intercom system because it was easy to make requests to staff through the intercom. OCRA explained to the clients that everything they said could be heard by any of the staff in the main house. Staff expressed that they used the intercom system in

order to “protect” the clients in case something happened to them while they were in the cottage behind the main house.

OCRA met with the administrator at the home and inquired about alternative settings for the intercom system. The administrator stated that the intercom system could be switched to another setting which would allow staff to hear the clients only when they pushed the button and spoke into the intercom. OCRA and the administrator showed the clients how to use the intercom on the new setting. This was reviewed in the Behavior Management Review Committee meeting at the regional center and the new intercom setting was approved. Christine Hager, Assistant CRA, Gail Gresham, Supervising CRA, Valley Mountain Regional Center.

OCRA, Regional Center, Group Home, and Day Program Work Together to Assure Consumer Choice.

D.W. is a regional center consumer who is in declining health. He has lived in the same group home and gone to the same day program for many years. He receives insulin injections several times per day. The dose recently increased which meant that D.W. would need to receive insulin while at the day program.

D.W. agreed to allow the staff at the group home to give him the injection. The day program staff was trained by the regional center nurse as well as the group home nurse. D.W. told the staff at the day program that he wanted the injection but when they tried to administer the insulin, he would move his arm and resist. Staff was not certain if D.W. wanted the medication or if he was trying to refuse it.

OCRA was asked to participate in a combined effort to assure that D.W.’s wishes were being respected. OCRA met with D.W. He said that he did want the day program to give him the insulin injection. He understood that if he did not receive it, he could jeopardize his health. OCRA explained that the day program did not want to give him the injection if he resisted.

A meeting was held with OCRA, the group home, day program, and regional center physician. At D.W.’s request, OCRA represented

D.W. Many suggestions were made at the meeting as to how to reduce D.W.'s anxiety about the injection at the day program. The doctor was also going to check on the possibility of an insulin pump to replace the injections. It was eventually determined that D.W. was receiving his insulin at the day program in a consensual manner. Katy Lusson, CRA, Gail Gresham, Supervising CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

REGIONAL CENTER

L.U. to Maintain Nursing Services.

Nursing services were funded by the regional center to enable L.U. to live safely in his home with his family. L.U.'s nursing hours were not being completely used since his family cared for him at various times. This led the regional center to question whether L.U. continued to need nursing services.

L.U. received a notice of action terminating nursing services until L.U.'s family could provide more documentation supporting the need. L.U.'s family did not receive the notice in a timely manner and appealed after the filing deadline. The regional center refused to forward the request for a hearing to OAH since it was past the deadline date.

OCRA assisted the family in filing the request for hearing directly with OAH, asserting that good cause existed for late filing. OAH calendared the hearing. L.U. and his family gathered additional documentation to support L.U.'s continued need for nursing services.

The regional center agreed prior to the hearing that L.U. continued to need nursing services. OCRA later represented L.U. at his IPP. Yulahlia Hernandez, CRA, Annie Breuer, Assistant CRA, Gail Gresham, Supervising CRA, North Bay Regional Center.

J.K. Achieves Positive Outcome at Informal Meeting.

J.K. is an adult consumer who participated in vocational training as part of his transition plan in school. In addition, J.K. assisted his family in their dry cleaning business. Speech therapy greatly assisted

J.K. in his endeavors. Then the therapy was terminated. OCRA represented at the informal meeting.

The regional center determined at the informal meeting that J.K. had clearly benefited from speech therapy services in the past and that communication skills were a critical component of his employment success. The service coordinator explained at the meeting that adequate speech therapy services were not available to J.K. through generic or other alternative funding sources.

The regional center agreed that J.K. would likely participate in some form of employment in the future and decided to fund speech therapy, and also found that communication skills are critical to an individual's ability to function in social situations and to achieve maximum independence. Jim Stoepler, CRA, Gail Gresham, Supervising CRA, Redwood Coast Regional Center.

C.S. Receives Early Start Intervention Services.

C.S.'s parent contacted OCRA for assistance after C.S. was denied eligibility for Early Start Intervention Services by the regional center. OCRA reviewed C.S.'s medical and regional center records and found medical information that supported the finding of a delay in the area of emotional/behavioral development. OCRA wrote a letter to the parent explaining that, with this additional information, C.S. appeared to be eligible by having developmental delays in at least two areas; emotional/behavioral development and the undisputed area of communication. Following OCRA's advice, the parent met with the regional center and provided it with a copy of the OCRA letter and medical information. At the meeting, the regional center found that C.S. was eligible to receive Early Start Intervention Services. Timothy Poe, CRA, Katherine Mottarella, Supervising CRA, Frank D. Lanterman Regional Center.

////

SPECIAL EDUCATION

OCRA Gets a Non-Public School Placement for a High School Student in Response to Incidents of Bullying.

C.A. was being verbally and physically bullied and assaulted by general education students for months in spite of his mother's numerous requests for help from teachers and school administrators. Finally, after a particularly traumatic bullying incident, C.A. refused to return to school. This time, his mother took pictures of the scratches and bruises the bullies had inflicted on C.A., and brought them to OCRA.

OCRA advocated for a change of placement for C.A. at an IEP meeting, after which the district arranged for C.A., his mother, and the Associate CRA to observe a placement alleged to be the best in the district. After two observations of the district's placement offer, C.A. said he felt nervous and uncomfortable during the observations, and would be afraid to attend the school.

OCRA arranged for an observation at a nearby non-public school (NPS), where the teacher introduced himself to C.A. and facilitated some conversation between C.A. and several other students. C.A. felt good about this experience, and said he would not be afraid to go to school there. After two IEP meetings, C.A. was successfully placed in the NPS. Celeste Palmer, Associate CRA, Andy Holcombe, Supervising CRA, Regional Center of the East Bay.

J.C. Receives Appropriate Related Services.

J.C. is in middle school and has cerebral palsy and an intellectual disability. J.C.'s mother contacted OCRA for assistance with obtaining appropriate related services at school for J.C. J.C. fell frequently at school. After OCRA became involved, the school district offered to fund a visual impairment assessment, an orientation and mobility assessment, an adaptive physical education assessment, and a psycho-educational assessment to determine appropriate related services for J.C. in school. OCRA attended a series of IEP meetings to negotiate for appropriate related services. J.C. will receive a 1:1 aide at school, behavioral consultation, adaptive

physical education, and a visual impairment consultation. Jackie Dai, CRA, Lucy Garcia Assistant CRA, Irma Wagster, Supervising CRA, Eastern Los Angeles Regional Center.

District Agrees to Change of Educational Placement.

J.H. is a 9-year-old student who was attending a special education classroom at a local elementary school. J.H. was doing poorly in this classroom and was not meeting his IEP goals and objectives as the school placement was not appropriate. J.H. had previously requested a change of placement to attend a different elementary school but his request was denied. J.H.'s mother found a different placement for her son in a school closer to J.H.'s home with a more appropriate placement. OCRA represented J.H. at an IEP meeting at which the district approved the requested placement. Mario Espinoza, CRA, Katherine Mottarella, Supervising CRA, Kern Regional Center.

District Creates Program To Address Parents' Concerns.

OCRA received three requests for assistance from Spanish-speaking families living in the same small rural community. All of the callers were opposed to their child's placement in the same classroom for the upcoming school year. They were unhappy with the teacher and the quality of the educational program that was being offered. The other students in the program had a wide range of disabilities and ages. The caller's children were 5-6 years old and diagnosed with autism. The parents and OCRA met with representatives from the school district including the administrator of special education for the county. The parents expressed their concerns about the proposed program. The school district asked for some time to respond. Three weeks later the school district conducted individual IEP meetings to offer placement options. OCRA represented the parents and students at each meeting. The school district stated that it had heard the concerns and based on those concerns had reorganized and made staffing changes. A new teacher and three aides were assigned to a classroom for ten children with autism in grades 1-3. All three parents agreed to the placement. Margaret Oppel, CRA,

Kay Spencer, Assistant CRA, Maricruz Magdaleno, Assistant CRA, Katherine Mottarella, Supervising CRA, Central Valley Regional Center.

OCRA Acquires Additional Speech Services, Assistive Technology and ABA Training for Classroom Staff.

S.H. is a student with autism. S.H. is nonverbal and his parents were concerned that S.H. was not making adequate progress on his communication goals. OCRA represented S.H. at two IEP meetings and secured an Applied Behavioral Analysis (ABA) assessment and an independent speech assessment. As a result of the assessments, the district agreed to purchase assistive technology for home and school, two additional hours of speech services per month, and ABA training for school staff to increase the consistency of methodology throughout the school day. Rita Defilippis, CRA, Katie Hornberger, Supervising CRA, San Andreas Regional Center.

District Agrees to Independent Assessments for Deaf and Hard of Hearing Needs and Appropriate Preschool Placement.

B.V.'s parent called OCRA for assistance in obtaining an appropriate preschool placement for their 3-year-old child who was diagnosed with Charge syndrome. Charge syndrome is a medical condition that includes severe hearing loss, vision impairment and intellectual disability. B.V. also requires feeding through a g-tube and has a heart condition. OCRA reviewed the school district's evaluation in the areas of language and speech, psycho-educational and occupational therapy. The evaluation were found to be incomplete in that it was not performed by evaluators familiar with Charge syndrome nor did the evaluators take into account B.V.'s communication limitations. OCRA represented B.V. at an IEP meeting and advocated for independent education evaluations in these areas and explained why the placement offered by the school district was not appropriate. At the IEP meeting, the school district agreed to fund the independent education evaluations and place B.V. in a modified school day program at a preschool in which a nurse was available and where the curriculum would be individualized for B.V.'s alternative communication needs. Timothy Poe, CRA, Jazmin Romero,

Assistant CRA, Katherine Mottarella, Supervising CRA, Frank D. Lanterman Regional Center.

OCRA Secures Assessments for Student.

T.N. is an elementary school student with autism. T.N.'s parent requested assistance regarding T.N.'s elopement behavior at school and his lack of progress on communication goals. OCRA represented T.N. at two IEP meetings and secured a functional analysis assessment (FAA) to assess why T.N. engaged in unsafe escape behavior and an assessment of augmentative communication (AAC) to determine if augmentative communication devices would assist T.N. to make more progress on his IEP communication goals. The FAA documented that T.N.'s escape behavior was directly related to inappropriately long periods of time that T.N. had to wait for a preferred activity for a child his age. The recommendation was for the teacher to change the design and layout of the classroom and to break students into smaller groups for instruction, thereby reducing the time T.N. had to wait for a preferred activity. The AAC resulted in the district purchasing two communication devices for T.N. to use at school and home. A third device was purchased for the teacher to use with T.N. and other students at school. Rita Defilippis, CRA, Katie Hornberger, Supervising CRA, San Andreas Regional Center.

P.A. Secures Occupational Therapy at School.

P.A. is an 8-year-old child with autism. P.A.'s mother contacted OCRA seeking assistance in preventing the district from terminating occupational therapy (OT) for P.A. P.A.'s mother said that P.A. cannot drink from a cup with a closed mouth, cannot walk down the stairs alternating her feet, and stuffs her mouth. During an IEP meeting, the district informed the mother that the district would be terminating OT services within a week.

OCRA informed P.A.'s mother that the school cannot terminate services without her approval, and that P.A.'s mother should file a compliance complaint with the State Department of Education. OCRA also suggested to P.A.'s mother that she prepare for the upcoming IEP by gathering supportive information from P.A.'s regional center service coordinator, P.A.'s doctors, and other persons that work or assist P.A. and are aware of her need for OT services.

P.A.'s mother called after the follow-up IEP took place and informed OCRA that P.S. had secured 30 minutes every other week of OT services that will remain in effect until P.A. meets her OT goals. Jackie Dai, CRA, Lucy Garcia, Assistant CRA, Irma Wagster, Supervising CRA, Eastern Los Angeles Regional Center.

Mental Health Services Obtained.

N.V. is a student with autism and a severe anxiety disorder. For years, N.V. has been on a minimum school day due to the serious anxiety disorder. OCRA represented N.V. at an IEP meeting to develop a plan to increase N.V.'s special education services to a full school day. It was learned that N.V. had never been referred for mental health services. Intensive behavioral services alone had not resulted in N.V.'s successful transition to a full day. OCRA advised the district and county office of education of their responsibility to provide mental health services to students whose mental health disabilities are preventing them from accessing and benefitting from special education services. The IEP team agreed to fund an independent psychiatric evaluation and an independent neuropsychological evaluation. The team also agreed to consult with the independent evaluators before adjusting the school day. Rita Defilippis, CRA, Katie Hornberger, Supervising CRA, San Andreas Regional Center.

OUTREACH/ TRAINING

OCRA Encourages Participation in Election Process.

OCRA recently held two well-attended self-advocacy outreach events. Consumers attending day programs in Eureka participated. Together, these two events brought information about clients' rights to over 70 people with developmental disabilities.

Each program began with a spirited bingo game. Participants marked their bingo cards by recognizing pictures illustrating rights such as the right to make and receive telephone calls, the right to medical care, the right to make food choices, and the right to have a

family. Those playing the game enjoyed learning about their rights while winning fun prizes.

After the game ended, the OCRA advocates circulated among the attendees to answer questions and take requests for additional information, with an emphasis on voting rights. The next day, 14 information packets were sent to those who requested material. Most requested voting information and were sent a voter registration form, the DRC pamphlet, "Your Vote Is Important," and a cover letter asking them to telephone their CRA if concerned that a judge may have restricted their right to vote in a conservatorship proceeding. Providing this information was extremely important. These clients had never voted despite having reached voting age years or decades earlier. As we approach a major national election, they now know that they have the right to participate in the political process as a citizen of their community and nation. Lynne Page, CRA, Gail Gresham, Supervising CRA, Redwood Coast Regional Center, Eureka.

OCRA Provides Bilingual Presentation about Early Start.

OCRA is increasing its effort to reach all communities in the Mendocino and Lake county areas. Recently, the CRA and the Assistant CRA, who is bilingual, provided a presentation about Early Start, "Todo Que Ver Con Early Start/Everything to Do with Early Start."

OCRA contacted various local community groups to help spread the message about the presentation. OCRA had materials that were written in Spanish and English. Some of the service providers who attended took extra materials to share with the Spanish-speaking families they serve. OCRA is motivated to continue doing more bilingual presentations. Jim Stoepler, CRA, Trina Saldana, Assistant CRA, Gail Gresham, Supervising CRA, Redwood Coast Regional Center, Ukiah.

Self-Advocates Get Ready to Vote.

On April 19, 2012, OCRA conducted interactive self-advocacy training to consumers of North Bay Regional Center (NBRC) at AIM

Higher Day Program in Fairfield. Interactive trainings are a great way to help people learn about their rights. Consumers were very eager to hear about voting rights.

Yulahlia Hernandez and Annie Breuer led a presentation about the right to vote, discussing issues such as who has the right to vote and how to get the support you need to vote. After the presentation on voting, OCRA assisted the consumers in participating in a mock voting activity. OCRA borrowed voting booths and other materials from the Solano County Registrar of Voters office.

Participants from AIM Higher received mock ballots, used voting booths, and made choices on the mock ballots. After voting, self-advocates were given an “I Voted” sticker, just as if they had voted in a real election. OCRA also passed out voter registration cards and assisted some consumers in registering to vote. Participants at the training thoroughly enjoyed learning about their rights and getting more comfortable about voting. One consumer noted that the outreach event “helped me learn new information.” Another participant stated, “I learned that if you need help you can get it.” The participants at AIM Higher Day Program are ready to exercise their right to vote. Yulahlia Hernandez, CRA, Annie Breuer, Assistant CRA, Gail Gresham, Supervising CRA, North Bay Regional Center.

Consumers and Families Learn about Conservatorship and Less Restrictive Alternatives.

OCRA collaborated with San Diego Regional Center (SDRC) to provide a training about conservatorship and less restrictive alternatives to conservatorship for the families of regional center consumers, especially teens and young adults. OCRA developed a training that discusses alternatives to conservatorship for various areas of decision-making including school, healthcare, and financial matters. SDRC provided meeting space and refreshments and publicized the event and took registrations. Approximately 74 individuals attended the training, including many parents of 17-year olds who gain new decision-making authority on their eighteenth birthdays. The people in attendance asked many insightful questions, and a productive, thought-provoking discussion helped families consider alternatives to conservatorship that they may not

have been aware of or did not fully understand. Because of the success of the event, SDRC has invited OCRA to provide a similar training to its case managers. OCRA will also present the same training in Spanish in the future. Special thanks to Judy Borchert, Associate Director, and Sandra Bishop, Public Information, Training, & Volunteer Coordinator, San Diego Regional Center. Megan Chambers, CRA, Irma Wagster, Supervising CRA, San Diego Regional Center.



Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
1831 K Street
Sacramento, CA 95811
Tel: (916) 504-5943
TTY: (877) 669-6023
Toll Free: (800) 390-7032
Fax: (916) 504-5821
www.disabilityrightsca.org

California's protection and advocacy system

MEMORANDUM

TO: Jeanne Molineaux, Director

FROM: Kendra McWright, Outreach Coordinator, North
Beatriz Reyes, Outreach Coordinator, South

RE: Annual OCRA Outreach Report
June 2011 – June 2012

DATE: August 10, 2012

In an effort to respond to the growing demand for information, OCRA presents to consumers, their families, and other interested people, general, targeted, and self-advocacy trainings. Each of these areas is discussed individually in the sections below.

During the 2011-2012 fiscal year, OCRA presented more than 368 trainings to approximately 19,174 consumers and families. The number of individuals reached by OCRA outreach and training this fiscal year exceeds the previous year by more than 1,000 participants. This is a great accomplishment as OCRA has a strong commitment to inform the communities that we serve; an increase of this size shows the importance of outreach to the communities we serve.

Self-Advocacy Trainings

OCRA's contract with the Department of Developmental Services requires OCRA to perform at least two self-advocacy trainings per year. OCRA has set a standard for each of its offices to conduct at least one self-advocacy outreach presentation per year. Many of the offices have gone above the minimum requirements. During this period, OCRA presented

approximately 52 self-advocacy outreach presentations to individuals served by the regional center. These presentations focused on topics such as emergency preparedness, clients' rights, voting rights, money management, and community living options. Below is a description of a few of the presentations provided by OCRA:

Clients' Rights Bingo at Pioneer Valley High School: The special education teacher brought together 3 independent classrooms for a clients' rights training co-presented by OCRA and the DRC Peer Self-Advocacy Unit. A lively bingo game was presented with much active participation by students and teachers. By the end of the presentation, the students had a strong grasp of their rights and OCRA and the DRC Peer Self-Advocacy Unit were invited back to provide substantive legal training on transition planning.

Supported Living Training for Consumers and Vendors of San Andreas Regional Center: OCRA presented a training on supported living services for consumers and vendors. The presentation quickly took on a life of its own and the audience began sharing information and resources with each other. What a wonderful turn of events, for the attendees to become the trainers.

General Outreach Trainings

OCRA is required to conduct at least 160 outreach presentations per contract year. This year, OCRA has surpassed its goal by presenting over 368 trainings. As described above, these 368 presentations are divided into 3 categories, one of which is General Outreach. A description of a few of these presentations follows:

Vote in 2012: Held at the Ukiah Valley Association for Habilitation and Mayacama Industries, Jim Stoepler, of the Ukiah office of OCRA, presented on Voting Rights. Jim used the recent Ukiah Library Tax Election to show how every vote counted in an election to keep the local library open. This seemed to raise the interest on how and why to register to vote. Lots of good questions were raised about voting. A few participants registered to vote on the spot.

OCRA's Office Servicing Harbor Regional Center Consumers Holds Open House: OCRA held an open house to welcome new Clients' Rights

Advocate, Eva Casas-Sarmiento, and show its office location for consumers of Harbor Regional Center services. OCRA had snacks, a raffle, and lots of information for people to take home with them. The open house was attended by vendors, regional center staff, consumers, family members, and local agency representatives. Attendees not only learned about their rights and services but also about the specific services OCRA could provide. It was fun to watch people mingle and meet who might not otherwise connect, despite having a common bond.

Targeted Outreach Trainings

In an effort to stay true to its goals as an organization, OCRA works to connect with traditionally underserved communities. This year marked the start of a new two-year plan, thus each OCRA office compared its previous statistics of consumers served with similar statistics for the regional center served, for the purpose of choosing a targeted community. Once a targeted community is chosen, each office works to focus much of its outreach in that community. Examples below discuss two of these outreach presentations:

Exceptional Parents United Latino Support Group: OCRA collaborated with the regional office of DRC to give a Spanish- language training to a support group of parents and grandparents of children with developmental disabilities aged birth to 5-years old. OCRA explained how to obtain public benefits and how OCRA or the regional office staff could assist. We handed out "Beneficios Publicos Para Personas Con Discapacidades" (Public Benefits for People with Disabilities) and "Servicios de Apoyo En El Hogar, Aspectos Fundamentales" (IHSS Nuts & Bolts). We answered lots of questions about IHSS, SSI, regional center services, and special education. OCRA agreed to come back and do another training in the fall.

Ethiopian Parent Support Group: OCRA attended a meeting of the Ethiopian Parent Support Group at Westside Regional Center. Luisa Delgadillo gave a brief, What Is OCRA?, presentation and explained the types of services OCRA provides. Katie Meyer gave a basic overview of many programs that serve children with developmental disabilities. These included: Regional Center, In Home Supportive Services, Special Education, Social Security, and California Children's Services. The rest of the evening was spent answering questions about these programs. The parents learned a great deal and many have called for follow up advice.

Conclusion

As an organization, OCRA is proud to report the above statistics and report that it has surpassed all of its outreach goals. We look forward to the 2012-2013 outreach plan year.

Thank you for the opportunity to coordinate outreach presentations and trainings for OCRA.

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Semi-Annual Report - July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012
Report by Service Level

	ARC	CVRC	ELARC	FNRC	GGRC	HRC	IRC	KRC	LRC	NBRC	NLARC	RCEB	RCOC	RCRC	SARC	SCLARC	SDRC	SGPRC	TCRC	VMRC	WRC	Total
0 - Pending										1				2								3
1 - Information/Referral	41	34	268	39	186	163	101	61	49	99	45	99	68	107	118	229	34	96	38	174	278	2327
2 - Rights Information/Consultation (RC/Generic)	224	89	233	51	46	68	309	143	145	329	228	129	219	112	34	168	176	289	224	135	261	3612
3 - Rights Information/Consultation (Other)	21	211	91	204	19	98	1	188	175	32	84	118	28	12	80	20	114	1	111	167	18	1793
4 - Abuse/Neglect Investigation	1			3		1		5		1	1	2		1	4	1	1		3		1	25
5 - Special Education Compliance Complaint	2	1						1				3		1	1	1	1				5	16
6 - IEP		5	3	9	4	6		9	1	4	12	18	4	3	33	4	1			19	4	139
7 - IPP/IDT	1					10	2	4		6	3	2	2	1	4	1	3	1	2		3	45
8 - W&I 4731						1		2	1		3						1			3	2	13
9 - Technical Assistance	11	7	21	9	28	8	2	12	2	9	1	3	51	10	5	2	2	5	3	4	4	199
10 - Evaluation and Assessment	14	5	9	51	90	16	8	8	4	70	11	80	22	11	9	6	12		7	6	19	458
11 - Informal Regional Center / Provider Problem Resolution	1		7	3	20	1	7	5	1	5		25	1	2	14		5				13	110
12 - Informal Generic Service Agency Problem Resolution		2	7	7	27	2	3	1	1	4	3	28		3	17		3		1		47	156
13 - Case Settlement Prior to Informal Meeting, Mediation or Hearing		1	3				1			1	2			1				2			3	14
14 - Direct Representation in RC "Voluntary Informal Meeting"	1			3								2										6
15 - Direct Representation in Mediation / RC Fair Hearing			1		1	1					1		2			1	1	1			4	13
16 - Direct Representation in an Appeal for Generic Services			2	2	5	2	1	1		2	4	4		1			3		2		10	39
17 - Court Litigation		1						1														2
Grand Total	317	356	645	381	426	377	435	441	380	564	396	513	397	267	319	433	357	395	391	513	667	8970

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Memorandums of Understanding

REGIONAL CENTER	STATUS OF MOU
Alta	MOU dated 9/17/07.
Central Valley	MOU dated 12/19/06.
East Los Angeles	MOU dated 1/2012.
Far Northern	MOU dated 11/17/06.
Golden Gate	MOU dated 3/07.
Harbor	MOU dated 7/19/07
Inland	MOU dated 4/10/07.
Kern	MOU dated 10/7/11.
Lanternman	Previous MOU adopted 8/17/07.
North Bay	Draft dated 9/30/11.
North Los Angeles	MOU dated 9/1/11.
Redwood Coast	MOU dated 6/2012.
Regional Center of East Bay	MOU dated 8/8/08.
Regional Center of Orange	MOU dated 1/2012.
San Andreas	MOU dated 2/07.
San Diego	MOU dated 10/3/11.
San Gabriel/Pomona	MOU dated 7/30/07.
South Central	MOU dated 10/06.
Tri-Counties	MOU dated 2/2011.
Valley Mountain	MOU dated 11/14/06.
Westside	MOU dated 4/07.

O:\SHARED\ALICE\Annual.MOU chart-jul 1.2011 - 6.30.2012.doc



Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
1831 K Street
Sacramento, CA 95811
Tel: (916) 504-5943
TTY: (877) 669-6023
Toll Free: (800) 390-7032
Fax: (916) 504-5821
www.disabilityrightsca.org

Memo

To: Disability Rights CA Board of Directors
From: Jeanne Molineaux, Director
Date: July 6, 2012
Re: Annual Consumer Satisfaction Survey
July 1, 2011, through June 30, 2012

Attached are the results of the last fiscal year Consumer Satisfaction Survey. The surveys were sent out for the period of July 1, 2011, through June 30, 2012. Every fourth closed case was randomly selected from OCRA's computer intake system to receive a survey, which included a self-addressed stamped envelope.

Two thousand seven hundred sixty-seven surveys were mailed out of which 456 were returned. This represents a 16 percent return rate. Of those responding to the questions, 96 percent of the respondents who answered the questions felt they were treated well by the staff, 93 percent understood the information they were provided, 95 percent believed their CRA listened to them, 93 percent would ask for help from the CRA again, 93 percent were helped by the CRA, and 88 percent received a call back within two days.

OCRA is justly proud of the results of its Consumer Satisfaction Survey.

	<u>Satisfied</u>	<u>Not Satisfied</u>	<u>Did Not Check</u>
	☺	☹	
1. I was treated well by the staff.	516	23	16
2. My call was returned within two (2) days	471	65	19
3. I could understand the information I got.	505	36	13
4. My Clients' Rights Advocate listened to me.	509	27	17
5. I was helped with my question/problem by my Clients' Rights Advocate.	494	40	19
6. I would ask for help from the Clients' Rights Advocate again.	500	35	19

Comments: ¹

- On more than one occasion my CRA assisted my daughter with getting what she's entitled to. Kay Spencer is amazing and we are blessed to have her fighting for our children's rights.
- I was impressed.
- ___ was supposed to be removed from group home because nothing was done to the GH administrator ___ was removed by her conservator the lady who neglected/ refused to help ___ rec'd no consequences where are the rights of the consumer ___ was stranded 11:00pm in unfamiliar area, no buses running business closed she called her GH administrator/ owner refused who refused to pick her up/ Police Dept was called to help.... Your office did not offer much help when I called.
- I always get prompt and helpful answers.

¹ The comments are copied directly from the survey forms, including punctuation and spelling. If an adverse statement was made about a specific person or agency, the name was deleted for purposes of this report.

- Tim Poe was exceptionally nice & helpful. ___ was not helpful, rushed me and said he had no time for my daughter's case. Tim Poe stepped in and was great!
- Personas como yo necesitamos de ayuda porque no conocemos nuestros derechos." (People like us need help because we do not know our rights.)
- I was so impressed. She was such a blessing. I am so happy for this service, I hope this office will grow and be available to even more disabled clients☺
- Es mucha la ayuda que tenemos nosotros los padres para nuestros hijos estoy muy agradecida por su ayuda ahora mi hija tiene algunas de los servicios que antes no tenia. (It was a lot of help that we have as parents of our children we are very grateful for your help now my daughter has services she didn't have before.)
- Me dieron muy buen servicio. (They gave me very good service)
- I would like more information on where how we can get information on resources available for the advocacy of the disabled. I sometimes feel it's like pulling teeth to get info/help from ___ about resources that might keep us at different times. I have asked her if I could attend a class for becoming my sons case worker so that I may also learn what resources/ options are really out there....
- Super! Quede encantada! (Super! I was pleased)
- Very friendly and helpful
- Very helpful
- Gracias por su ayuda (Thanks for your help)
- Mi otra junta de IP la tengo cuando entren a las escuela la tengo cuando entren a la escuela si no aceptan dar las terapias a mi hijo les volvere a llamar. Gracias (My other IP meeting I have when they enter school again. If they don't except to give my son his therapy I will call you again. Thank you)
- They were kind and understanding
- Trina and Katy were great and very helpful Thank you for your support for the ___ evaluation.
- The woman who helped me was fabulous
- They were very helpful
- Apoyo y asistencia y mas apoyo en las audiencias porque solos a veces no entendemos los temas y problemas de los hijos

(Support and assistance and more support in the hearings because alone sometimes we don't understand the topics and problems of our children)

- I want to know if you have special training for advocates
- May I know if your lawyers can defend me in a hearing do you have the best psychologist list?
- Thank you.
- Jazmin helped me.
- I called several of times and I felt the staff (___ was bother because I kept calling her. Honestly I felt uncomfortable.
- Gracias (Thank you)
- Thank you for the support and advocacy provided.
- Thank you!!
- Estoy contenta con todo. (I am happy with everything.)
- Very poor experience for me!
- This Lawyer was very helpful and very good. We wish that God always help all the lawyers. SO they can be able to help other people. Thank you!
- Thank you for helping me out with social security.
- Thank you for your support.
- Very considerate caring, gave me correct info, very professional.
- The staff was not friendly I didn't feel they were on my side at all.
- Very very helpful patient and kind.
- Better response time.
- Love these people. Have gone above and beyond for us. Thank you!
- Lucy Advocated for my child
- We were very pleased. Katie was very helpful in directing us with appropriate information.
- Thanks to all the persons that help me God bless them.
- Excellent service
- Very professional thorough and helpful THANKS!
- I don't know what I would have done without the WRC Thanks.
- Very satisfied.
- Wonderful advocates who truly care for their clients and families Thank you so much!
- I personally and other feedback from friend likes the services of Katie Hornberger is the best. Where she was very accommodating and explains things clearly and willingly.

- I have used CRA often for variety of issues. You're such a great resource . Thanks so much! Always great service.
- He nesecitado dos veces a la oficina de derechos del cliente y las dos veces me han dado un servicio muy satisfactorio.
- (I have needed office of clients rights' advocacy two times. Both of those times I was very satisfied with the services I received.)
- My son has a lot of problems about speech in school and I invited advocacy to have a IEP meeting for my son, the answer was not enough resources, budget nothing help much.
- It was hard to get a call back and hard to get answers to my questions.
- Suggestion: Clients meet with attorneys in person
- More facilitators at outreaches, worker, I need work with my son more actively and productively, I am in extremely need of more respite hours.
- They are really informative and helpful
- Katie Lusson is the best!
- I have been served for my needs-the very best
- They have been very helpful for my son and RC and school issues.
- Thank you☺
- Clients rights advocate did not help at all and would not take time to hear facts.
- It's great that we have this service and we are able to get the help from the Clients Rights' Advocate.
- Thank you for this valuable service on behalf of our son.
- Thank you for showing me how to advocate for my son
- Trina Saldana helped me a lot to resolve my case with SSA.
- I got services from CRA Diamond Bar really really really good.
- My Matter has not been resolved yet RC said that by May my son would be in a group home but it hasn't happened.
- I need help with school placement for my kid.
- My son was raped at school I did not get help.
- I am very thankful that you tok care of the case promptly and quick.
- DRC Always has been helping us. Thank you so much!!
- Aimee thoughtful & excellent
- Thank you for giving ____ a "voice". Leinani is such a wonderful advocate for people like my daughter I will always be grateful for her getting back in her day program-which she loves id if the need arises

again when I track her down in October I will put her on speed dial.
Thank you, thank you, thank you.

- Thank you for the services that we could not afford otherwise for the children on the spectrum.
- Thank you for being available
- Always leave message and delay call back/have never gotten assistance in an IEP meeting
- Atty Bebo is wonderful compassionate and knowledgeable lawyer excellent lawyer.
- Jacqueline miller is amazing!
- Wonderful service Leinani was great!
- I think clients would like to receive periodic updates on the progress of their case.
- Bebo and his associates were wonderful!
- I think that this service should be better shared. I could have used it a long time ago.
- Thank you for being there for families. It put my mind to ease to have her support and it is a gift to feel its confidential Thank you so greatly for your kindness.
- Thank you and god bless you.
- She is very nice and helpful.
- Thank you for the always quick response and terrific information.
- Aimee is excellent thoughtful working hard and love Disability people by her heart. Also spend alots times prepare documents for parent like me able to stand for my sons rights Thank you very very much I hope even with the economy please do not cut this program It needs for all resources school, IHSS Are taking advantaged of parents families these disability children need help should not let them suffering untreated right.
- This program is very important for us
- A big thank you for the help.
- Advocacy I received was awesome thorough and caring I was given a follow up call 2 months later.
- Thank You!!
- Gracias por su interes en ayudar y la paciencia para todas las preguntas. (Thank you for your interest in helping and your patience with all the questions.)
- I wish someone was available for immediate questions as opposed to having someone call back in two days to them wait another week or

so for an appointment to discuss the matter but very helpful otherwise.

- Thank you for your time to listen and help us with our concern to our children.
- Thank you!
- No hay nada solo gracias. (There is nothing. Just thank you.)
- I was attacked at school in my ROP class the school did very little to help me and tried to get me to quit.
- Muchas Gracias!! (Thank you very much)
- Disappointed that the OCRA attorney could not follow us to fair hearings. The attorney said he/she couldn't help because of shorthand with staff The letter sent to me never stated the real reason why the OCRA attorneys wouldn't help us or follow up on case.
- Amazing service for the last 13 years.
- It seems that every time I call I am told how much their workload is and they cannot represent me in an IEP meeting mediation or due process for this reason stated.
- Gracias por tener este grupo para que nos ayude y apoyen en las necesidades de nuestros hijos defendiendo sus derechos. (Thank you for this group so they can help and support our needs of defending our children's rights.)
- They are the best. Period.
- We are so pleased with our advocate who is so very helpful pleasant we can't say enough.
- Yulahlia Hernandez is very helpful & professional.
- Office personnel of CRA Annie/others. They have provided me with a excellent services they are all very professional and pleasant at all times, my family and I are grateful for all they do.
- Compassionate and bright! You are fortunate to have Mr. Poe on board- his heart is as big as his brain. A wonderful combination.
- Very disappointed when Jacqueline Miller told me she couldn't help me anymore I cried and asked her for help filing the complaint. CRA has very limited influences w/ ___ which greatly limits their help in conflicts w/ ____.
- MY CRA is very responsible patience and helpful. I like her very much.
- Very informative.
- I have been telling my friends that I really appreciate your help I tell them to talk to you. Thank you.

- I wish I knew about Office of Clients rights sooner.
- I'm so thankful for the OCRA!!
- I really grateful for your service, Thank you so much.
- I be grateful for the positive service I received from Katy Lusson San Rafael Office She is always available when I need help. So thank you so much for all of your help.
- ____ took the district school side without hearing my side/ Terrible!!
- We appreciate you have been helping us so hard.
- Very friendly gave information that I didn't know.
- Katy is Awesome!
- Excellent!
- The advocate was very knowledgeable.
- This was a excellent staff in Napa I was giving so much help with a lot of problems that we had had for a long time and got everything solved thank you so much.
- The CRA did a great job and listened to me.
- She was great! Got me an excellent result in negotiating with the regional center.
- Good experience-
- If it were not for CRA, my son would have lost valuable services! Thank you!
- Celeste Palmer she is one the grates person ever I really love her job and the way she help people in many ways God Bless yo Celeste
- DON'T KNOW WHAT I WOULD HAVE DONE WITHOUT YOUR HELP THANK YOU.
- It was a challenge to get assistance and protections for my son thanks for asking
- I was helped when I needed and much appreciated the help from OCRA Orange County.
- Thank you so much!
- Was given a website link. I needed actual help.
- Services are so limited they are ineffective. A waste.
- Would have appreciated having representation at the hearing. The judge was extremely concerned I was having to represent myself.
- More parents and clients should know these advocates exist.
- You're an excellent resource! Thank you for ALWAYS helping!
- Amazing group! Always answer questions.

DISABILITY RIGHTS CALIFORNIA
OCRA ADVISORY COMMITTEE
June 30, 2012

Committee Members:

Billy Hall	(Glendale)
Jean Townsend	(El Cajon)
Lakisha Burke	(Sacramento)
Lily Lambert	(Lincoln)
Amy Kalivas	(San Diego)

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Annual Self-Advocacy Trainings
July 1, 2011 – June 30, 2012

Self-Advocacy Trainings held:

Alta California RC	January 17, 2012
Central Valley RC	July 14, 2011 August 24, 2011
East LA RC	March 20, 2012 June 4, 2012
Far Northern RC	May 9, 2012 May 14, 2012
Golden Gate RC	September 21, 2011 February 9, 2012
Harbor RC	September 29, 2011 March 9, 2012
Inland RC	May 18, 2012
Kern RC	September 22, 2011 June 15, 2012
Lanternman RC	April 25, 2012
North Bay RC	December 2, 2011 February 17, 2012 March 19, 2012 April 19, 2012
North LA RC	October 19, 2011(2) March 21, 2012
Redwood Coast RC	August 19, 2011 August 26, 2011 November 30, 2011 December 28, 2011 December 29, 2011 June 11, 2012(2)
RC of East Bay	March 26, 2012
RC of Orange	March 20, 2012 March 14, 2012
San Andreas RC	May 17, 2012
San Diego RC	July 25, 2011
San Gabriel/Pomona RC	May 16, 2012
South Central LA RC	November 4, 2011

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Annual Self-Advocacy Trainings
July 1, 2011 – June 30, 2012
Page Two

Tri-Counties RC	October 14, 2011 June 15, 2012
Valley Mountain RC	August 5, 2011 September 16, 2011 September 19, 2011 November 2, 2011(2) December 12, 2011(2) April 13, 2012(2) May 3, 2012 May 4, 2012
Westside RC	July 7, 2011

**OFFICE OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS ADVOCACY
ANNUAL REPORT
JULY 1, 2011 – JUNE 30, 2012**

TITLE 17 REPORT

TITLE 17 LETTER	REGIONAL CENTER	COMPLAINT (INITIALS)	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	STATUS	OUTCOME
9/20/11	Regional Center of Orange County	K. P.	Misuse of P & I money	Closed	SIR filed 9/7/11

**OFFICE OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS ADVOCACY
ANNUAL REPORT
(July 1, 2011 – June 30, 2012)**

DENIAL OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS

Regional Center	Good Cause	Right(s) Denied	Date Denial Began	Date of Review	Date of Restoration
HRC12-08	I, O	V, T	1/6/12	2/6/12	Ongoing Review
HRC12-08	I, O	V, T	1/6/12	3/7/12	3/7/12
IRC12-01	I	C, P	2/21/12	3/26/12	Ongoing Review
IRC12-01	I	C, P	2/21/12	4/23/12	Ongoing Review
IRC12-01	I	C, P	2/21/12	5/21/12	6/1/2012

Clients' Rights:

- M To keep and be allowed to spend one's own *money* for personal and incidental needs.
- V To see *visitors* each day.
- C To keep and wear one's own *clothes*.
- T To have reasonable access to *telephones*, both to make and receive confidential calls, and to have calls made for one upon request.
- L To mail and receive unopened correspondence and to have ready access to *letter* writing materials, including sufficient postage.
- P To keep and use one's own personal *possessions*, including toilet articles.
- S To have access to individual *storage* space for one's private use.

**OFFICE OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS ADVOCACY
ANNUAL REPORT
JULY 1, 2011 – June 30, 2012**

CONSUMER GRIEVANCES WITH CONTRACTOR

DATE OF RESOLUTION LETTER	COMPLAINT (INITIALS)	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	STATUS	OUTCOME
7/21/11 (1 st level)	L. P.	Failure to Represent	Closed	Upheld staff's actions
8/22/11 (1 st level)	K. S.	Failure to Represent	Closed	Upheld staff's actions
8/24/11 (2nd level)	K. B.	Failure to Represent	Closed	Upheld staff's actions
9/13/11 (1 st level)	S. G.	Failure to Represent	Closed	Upheld staff's actions
10/13/11 (1st level)	M. H.	Inappropriate action by staff	Closed	Upheld Claimant's Grievance
10/28/11 (2 nd level)	S. G.	Failure to Represent	Closed	Upheld staff's actions
12/9/11 (2nd level)	O. K.	Failure to Represent	Closed	Upheld staff's actions
6/26/12 (1st level)	J.D.	Inappropriate action by staff	Closed	Upheld staff's actions

**OCRA Attorney's Fees
Fiscal Year
July 1, 2011 – June 30, 2012**

Date:	From:	Subject:	Case #:	Amount:
December 2011	Clovis USD	Special Education	906386	\$ 2,727.33
December 2011	Alliance of Schools Coop Insurance	Special Education	906386	\$ 21,538.86
	Total For FY 2011 - 12			<u>\$ 24,266.19</u>