

OCRA ANNUAL REPORT
2009 – 2010

<u>TABLE OF CONTENTS</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES.....	2
A. Services are provided in a manner that maximizes staff and operational resources	2
1) Advocacy Reports.....	3
2) Analysis of Consumers Served	6
3) Outreach/Trainings.....	8
B. Issues and complaints are resolved expeditiously and at the lowest level of appropriate intervention.....	9
C. Collaborative and harmonious working relationships are fostered	9
1) Memorandums of Understanding	10
2) Meeting with Association of Regional Center Agencies (ARCA)	10
D. Consumer Satisfaction.....	10
1) Consumer Satisfaction Survey	10
2) Letters of Appreciation	11
3) Cases will be handled in a timely manner	15
E. Coordination of services with the DDS contract manager, stake holder organizations, and multi-cultural community.....	15
F. Self-Advocacy Trainings.....	16
III. TITLE 17 COMPLAINTS.....	18
IV. DENIAL OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS.....	18
V. CONSUMER GRIEVANCES.....	19

VI. COLLECTION OF ATTORNEYS FEES..... 19

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ENHANCEMENT
OF SERVICES 20

VIII. CONCLUSION..... 21

EXHIBIT LIST

- EXHIBIT A...OCRA Staff Roster
- EXHIBIT B...OCRA Statistics
- EXHIBIT C...Advocacy Report Spring, Advocacy Report Summer
- 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...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 California¹ provides state-wide clients' rights advocacy services for regional center consumers pursuant to a multi-year contract, HD069010, with the Department of Developmental Services (DDS) through the Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy (OCRA). The contract was renewed effective July 1, 2006, for a 5-year period ending June 30, 2011. This is the Annual Report required under the contract, pursuant to Exhibit E, Paragraph 14, for Fiscal Year 2009-2010.

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 9,671 issues for consumers. This is a 9 per cent increase in cases from last fiscal year. OCRA also participated in 566 trainings last fiscal year, presented to approximately 25,555 people. This is an increase of 26 percent in the number of trainings and 27 per cent in the number of attendees from last fiscal year.² The increase in the number of matters handled and the increase in trainings is substantial and was the result of the extensive changes to the Lanterman Act in August, 2009, and the many questions consumers and their families had about those changes.

Disability Rights California is pleased that this year it was able to enter into a collaborative agreement between OCRA and People First of California to provide joint trainings to consumers in large facilities on their right to make choices in their own lives.

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.

¹ Formerly known as Protection and Advocacy, Inc.

² Fiscal Year 2009-2010, OCRA resolved over 8,883 issues for consumers and presented at 18,749 trainings attended by 18,749 people.

Fiscal Year 2008-2009, OCRA resolved over 8,499 issues for consumers and presented at 332 trainings attended by approximately 18,634 people.

Disability Rights California greatly appreciates the support and efforts of DDS and the regional centers in OCRA's performance of this contract. Without support from those agencies serving people with developmental disabilities, OCRA's efforts to ensure the rights of people with developmental disabilities throughout the State of California would not be so successful.

II. PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES

Disability Rights California's contract with DDS requires performance outcomes, as established in Exhibit E, Page 6, Paragraph 3, 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 9,671 issues for regional center consumers during the fiscal year. As briefly discussed above, this is a 9 per cent increase in cases from last fiscal year and is a direct result of the changes made to the Lanterman Act during the fall, 2009. 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.

It is important to note that the substantial increase of 9 per cent in the amount of work performed cannot be sustained over long periods of time with existing resources. OCRA staff met the increased need for advocacy and training resulting from the Lanterman Act changes because of staff's dedication to the work that we performed and the consumers we serve. Staff cannot continue its increased productivity without more resources.

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 summaries for Spring, 2010, and Summer, 2010, 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:

L.A. Awarded Protective Supervision Hours.

L.A. is a young adult with cerebral palsy and an intellectual disability. L.A. applied for IHSS on July 8, 2009. After conducting an assessment, the county authorized 141.2 hours per month of IHSS. Although L.A.'s mother/conservator requested protective supervision hours, the county denied it based on its conclusion that L.A. is not mobile and that L.A.'s mental functioning in the areas of memory, orientation, and judgment is high. At hearing, the CRA provided evidence to the contrary. The ALJ concluded that L.A. is entitled to protective supervision based on the finding that he is able to crawl, lift himself up, and able to move around in a walker. The ALJ also concluded that L.A. is non-self directing, confused, and his mental functions are severely impaired, finding L. A. would be correctly ranked at the highest level of need in the categories of memory, orientation, and judgment. The county was ordered to rescind its denial of protective supervision and authorize 283 IHSS hours per month and provide retroactive benefits effective July 8, 2009.

\$75,000 Social Security Overpayment Waived.

M.M. started working at a home repair store with a supportive employment agency. He was receiving Social Security. M.M. thought the supported employment agency was reporting his wages to the SSA. The agency failed to report the wages. M.M. received a notice stating that he had a \$75,000 overpayment from the SSA.

M.M. contacted OCRA. OCRA investigated the issue and represented M.M. at a hearing. OCRA argued that M.M. was without

fault because the supported employment agency should have been reporting the wages. The ALJ agreed that M.M. was without fault and that repayment of the money would be an undue hardship. The \$75,000 overpayment was waived.

OCRA is now working with the regional center to educate service coordinators on the importance of identifying in the IPP which agency will assist the client in reporting wages to SSA.

L.R. Can Now Communicate with Other People.

L.R. is unable to verbally communicate due to his cerebral palsy, but is able to use a pinky finger to operate a speech generating device. L.R. had an older device that was no longer working, and L.R. was not able to communicate with anyone. L.R. obtained an assessment from a speech expert, and requested the device recommended by the expert. L.R. was denied a communication device from Medi-Cal.

L.R. appealed the denial. OCRA assisted L.R. in preparing for hearing, and worked with the speech expert to provide a position statement and expert testimony. The ALJ ordered the county to provide a speech generating device assessment. A few months later, the county conducted a cognitive assessment. The speech therapist wrote a letter to the county asking why it had conducted a cognitive assessment and had not complied with the ALJ's order to conduct the speech generating device evaluation. The Director of Medi-Cal reviewed the case and approved the speech generating device. L.R. has his new device and is able to communicate.

Discharge Plan from a Nursing Facility to Community Placement Is Secured.

S.H. is a non-conserved adult with cerebral palsy who uses a wheelchair and uses sign language to communicate "yes" and "no". He is able to communicate his wants and needs when asked.

S.H.'s mother contacted OCRA on S.H.'s behalf, due to concerns she had regarding him living in a nursing facility. When the CRA met with S.H. he communicated that he wanted to live with people his own age. OCRA contacted the regional center, S.H.'s parents and the nursing facility administration and requested a meeting to draft a

discharge plan. OCRA advocated for a discharge plan with objectives that would move S.H. into a less restrictive environment. The ultimate objective of the discharge plan is to transition S.H. into an ICF-DDN and then into a small group home that has intermittent nursing care.

Purchase of Diapers Results in Overdraft.

M.C. is a young woman with developmental disabilities. She has a young child. As a result of budget cuts, she was no longer receiving diapers for her baby. M.C. went to the bank and took out money that was not sufficiently covered. She thought it was a "loan" and that she could pay it back when she had the money. She did this several times over a few months. She then began receiving notices from the bank, with fines added. Her account was frozen. M.C.'s regional center social worker had been working with the bank but had not been able to resolve the issue.

OCRA went to the bank with M.C. and the social worker and spoke with the bank manager, documenting that M.C. was a regional center consumer. M.C. agreed to allow her Independent Living skills worker to go over her finances and bank statements with her. The bank agreed to forgive the debt and not to take any legal action against M.C.

Section 8 Benefits Restored and New Informal Dispute Resolution Process Established.

B.S. was living in privately owned subsidized housing through the federal Section 8 Voucher program. The owner of the apartment complex where B.S. lived gave a cause to evict notice due to relatives of B.S. who were living there without permission, and due to alleged improper or illegal conduct of other family members living with B.S.

B.S. was referred to OCRA after the Housing Authority had already held an administrative hearing to determine if the participating landlord had cause to evict, and to determine if the Section 8 Voucher assistance should also be terminated. The Housing Authority had concluded there was cause to evict, but had not yet ruled on discontinuing the Section 8 Voucher assistance.

OCRA intervened and convinced the Housing Authority to hold a comprehensive informal meeting with B.S., the CRA, the regional center service coordinator, an ILS program representative, B.S.' ILS worker, and supportive family members. It was established that the problematic family members who had moved in did so against B.S.'s will, and were taking advantage of him. Accordingly, B.S. should not be held responsible for them or their misconduct. In order to resolve the problems posed by the unwanted family members, B. S. agreed to move, and was given additional time to do so. His Section 8 Voucher assistance was to continue.

Additional collateral benefit was that the Housing Authority decided to implement or offer an informal but comprehensive problem solving meeting in tenancies with tenants with disabilities, if they asked for it. Further, with tenant agreement, copies of any notices would routinely be sent to the representative of their choice (e.g. service coordinator), so that corrective action could be taken, and additional services provided, to help prevent minor issues from escalating into potential cause to evict or termination of benefits.

School District Agrees to Provide Autism Services to A.R.

The school district refused to give special education services to A.R. under the eligibility criteria of autism. A.R. is a consumer of the regional center with a diagnosis of autism. The school district agreed he was eligible for special education, however, refused to allow him entrance into its special preschool for children with autism. Instead, the district offered A.R. half an hour of speech and language services two times per week. A.R.'s mother contacted OCRA for help. The school district performed new assessments and an IEP meeting was scheduled. OCRA attended the IEP meeting and the school district agreed to extend eligibility to A.R. under the autism criteria and allowed him entrance into its autism pre-school class.

2) Analysis of Consumers Served.

OCRA handled a total of 9,671 cases from July 1, 2009, through June 30, 2010. This represents a 9 percent increase in advocacy service over last fiscal year and is a substantial amount of work. 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, 2,616 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 1,286 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 63 percent of the consumers served being male and 37 percent being female. This roughly corresponds to the percentage of regional center consumers who are male versus female. As of January, 2008, 61.30 percent of all regional center consumers were male and 38.70 percent female.

The percentage of consumers residing in the parental or other family home remains by far the largest number of consumers served with 7,306 consumers in the family home or 76 percent of the cases handled. The next largest group served is those living independently, with OCRA serving 1,062 people or 11 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. The percentage of consumers from various ethnicities served by OCRA was:

Ethnicity	Percent OCRA Clients 7/1/08 - 6/30/09	Percent RC Clients 1/ 2008
Afro-American	9	10
Latino	35	32
American-Indian or	1	0.4

Alaskan Indian		
Asian	4	6
Pacific Islander	1	3
White	44	42
Multicultural (Self-Identify)	1	Not listed
Refused to State/Other	1	7

OCRA's statistics show that OCRA's service to various ethnic groups is close to parity with the number of consumers of each ethnicity served by the regional centers.³ OCRA's statistics remain fairly consistent with last year's.

The vast majority of cases handled by OCRA assist consumers in accessing services or benefits from generic agencies. This year, OCRA handled 5,613 cases involving generic services.⁴ In addition to assistance with access to generic services, OCRA handled 3,794 regional center matters. The increase in regional center matters is a result of the changes to the Lanterman Act that were implemented by the legislature and the Department of Developmental Services in August, 2009, and reflects the many questions that consumers and their families had about those changes..

3) Outreach/Trainings.

During the last fiscal year, OCRA presented at 566 trainings with a total attendance of approximately 25,555 people at the various trainings. This represents a 26 percent increase in the number of trainings and a 27 percent increase in the number of attendees from last fiscal year and is an outstanding performance by OCRA staff.

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,

³ The latest statistics posted on DDS' website are dated January 7, 2008.

⁴ Last fiscal year, OCRA handled 6,132 cases involving generic services.

consumers' rights, abuse and neglect issues, special education, voting rights, SSI, and conservatorships, among other topics.

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 Anastasia Bacigalupo as the Statewide Outreach Coordinator. The coordinator advises 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. A detailed report on target outreach and training is included as Exhibit D.

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

From July 1, 2009, through June 30, 2010, OCRA resolved 9,671 issues for consumers. Of those served, all but 131 were resolved informally. This means that 99 percent of all the matters that OCRA handled were resolved informally. Data showing this is attached as Exhibit E.

C. 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. As part of the implementation of the current contract, the director of OCRA met by telephone or in person with each of the regional center executive directors or designees, to revise the existing MOUs. 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, Bob Baldo, Executive Director of the Association of Regional Center Directors, and Jeanne Molineaux, Director, OCRA, meet in December, 2009 and July, 2010, 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.

D. 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.

1) 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.

Eleven hundred and sixty-two surveys were mailed out. Two hundred and thirty-one people returned the survey. This represents a 19 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, 96 percent understood the information they were provided, 96 percent believed their CRA listened to them, 88 percent believed they were helped by the CRA, and 92 percent would ask for help from OCRA again. See Exhibit G, which discusses the results of OCRA's survey.

2) Letters of Appreciation.⁵

- Una nota de gratitud: En este mundo tan agitado, a veces olvidamos que aun existen personal generosas que hacen el bien sin esperar nada a cambio Anastasia Baciagalupa. Gracias por ser una de ellas ! Dios la bendiga nadie mejor que usted para defender los derechos de nuestro hijo se lo bamos a agradecer toda la vida. De todo Corazon. (A note of gratitude: In this world that is so hectic we some times forget that people who are generous that do "good" and do not expect anything in return exist. Anastasia Baciagalupa. Thank you for being one of those people! May god bless you. No one better than you has defended my son's rights. We will be grateful to you for the rest of our lives. From the bottom of our hearts, Thank you.)
- Thank you for telling us about "my choice" It was great information that you gave us. I learned from the DVD that there are different ways if making a choice. I remember that you guys told us that there's places called developmental center where special people live in an area together in that center. I also recall that you guys said that some people live with a friend in apartment or houses. Once more thank you for telling us about choices and thanks for the books you gave us.

⁵ OCRA is providing the letters of appreciation with the wording from the originals unless otherwise indicated.

- Thank you for the presentation on Thursday I learned that I get to make my own choices. I will take this booklet to my next IEP meeting. From me to you.
- Thank you. Thanks, Wendy for your very kind heart towards our family and thanks for all the good info provided to us.
- I was only able to peek in a couple times but everything looked great and our participants were engaged and appeared to be having a wonderful time. I'm sure that they all left your presentation with something that they had not known or were not aware of previously.
- I can't believe all the work and support Jackie Coleman does for my son, _____ and me. It's so wonderful to have someone on our side. There must be a so many out there who need help.
- I just wanted to say how grateful I am that you were able to support both myself and _____ at the bank last week. Thank you for stepping in and offering such outstanding help. I will keep a look out for your letter. Hope you had a nice weekend.
- Thank you so much for returning so promptly my SOS call. I have no way today to go and have this letter copied. So I send them all to you and you may be so kind and copy them. And at all times my deepest gratitude for all your help.
- I was very pleased to receive the attached. Although I've been focused on other things, I was relieved and a little teary to see it resolved and that your efforts and mine together got a good result. With Gratitude _____.
- We highly recommend Mrs. Hornberger, she is a superstar and an extremely competent and caring person filling in at the front lines as parents struggle to navigate the disability system. It provides great comfort to parents to have someone like Mrs. Hornberger. In the sometimes confusing and complicated world of disability advocacy and rights, Mrs. Hornberger was truly a guiding light for us. Mrs. Hornberger made a difference in our sons life and we wouldn't have done it without her we need more representatives like her.
- Thanks for coming to my class and giving us such a wonderful and powerful presentation. We did the workbook in class the following day and I had the opportunity to recently witness it in action at Luz' IEP yesterday. The format made it very easy for her to present her own choices. It was a beautiful self

advocating moment to see! I know you both would have loved it. Thanks again and again!

- Thank you for your very nice e-mail. We really truly appreciate all that you do for our families and the time you take to come talk to us. You are one of a kind and the wisdom you pass on to us is priceless.
- You were wonderful! I am so thankful for your help. ☺ Now, I know that I have done my best. My girls and I thank you. We couldn't have done it without you. Tonight before I fall asleep I will thank god and wish you many blessings because you are a blessing to me.
- I wanted to take this opportunity to share with you how much Ms. Jackie Chiang has helped me with my case....As a parent (especially being a single parent) it is very overwhelming and emotionally draining having to continuously fight for services that my daughter needs....She is incredibly supportive, informative and highly knowledgeable in her field, in addition, she is very understanding of needs and frustrations while maintaining a professional and very pleasant manner. I feel that Ms. Chiang went above and beyond her job description and spent so much time with me and my daughter's case.
- Before we get the answer I wanted you to know something, either way (though I'm feeling pretty good right now that you won this one) I am REALLY grateful to you for taking our case and putting so much effort and belief into it. You are a very gifted lawyer and we are lucky to have you. Just wanted to be able to say that to you now!
- Thank you for all your help. We won!
- I received your telephone call near the end of last school year, while _____ was supposed to be in 6th grade. For 6th grade, my son was alone in a preschool staff lounge, with a one on one aide. After speaking with me, you contacted the school district Director of Special Education, and called an IEP to discuss 7th grade placement. The district agreed to place _____ in a special day classroom with a teacher who was experienced in Autism, and who would allow accommodations for _____ to succeed. This year, for the first time EVER _____'s teacher, and principal, are supportive of necessary accommodations and not just in words but in Actions! _____ is succeeding at school for the first time in his entire life. The improvement is absolutely

phenomenal. I attribute this change *entirely* to the pressure that you, with your skill and your title, brought to bear upon the school district.....Ms. Defilippis, for eight years I have struggles fruitlessly with the school system. I had a 13 year old son who had NEVER tasted success in a school setting, who was miserable in school that he wanted to die, who thought nobody wanted him and that he didn't belong anywhere in the world. Giving him an appropriate setting has changed everything! I can not express to you the gratitude the immense relief that I feel towards what you have accomplished on____'s behalf.

- With warm appreciation for all you've given of your time your energy and yourself. (greeting) Especialmente todo su conocimiento en el area de defensa de los derechos. Muchisimas Gracias. (Especially, in the area of knowledge of defending rights. Thank you very much.)
- Thank you for the kindness and thoughtfulness you showed me. You treated me and helped me out. As if I was a member of your immediate family. I want to thank you for all the help you displayed to me and my matter you truly are one of gods walking angels. You and your staff are blessing.
- Thank you so much for your presentation at the____ meeting last Saturday. Your presentation helped parents as well as professional members in many ways. We could learn so many things from you, Katie and Mary it was interesting for me to see that some parents were overwhelmed by the fact that there were still so many things that they did not know: that some parents were motivated to learn more: that some parents were comfortable following thoroughly.
- On behalf of the entire executive team, I would like to express our heartfelt appreciation for your participation in the Opportunity Fair that was held June 3, 2010 at _____. How wonderful it is to see so many vendors sharing in a common goal of providing for the hopes and dreams of people with developmental disabilities. I sincerely thank you for your willingness to spend the day with us at _____ and I hope you enjoyed the day sharing information about your services and opportunities with our residents and staff.
- Thank you from the bottom of my heart for all your effort and success on my daughter's case for disability medical. We really appreciate the peace of mind you have given us by finding the

way that she could remain insured. You are a valuable asset to the disabled community.

- Thank you for providing the website links. The information provided was useful in guiding us through portions of our meeting. Katie Meyer was invaluable when she assisted us in the early months of this year. She helped us achieve independence goals for _____, agreed upon by IEP team, and not initially implemented by our school district, while we hope not to be in a position to call OCRA counsel again we certainly benefited from _____ advice and will keep your office in mind if other issues arise.

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 87 percent of all callers to OCRA received a call back within two days during the fiscal year. This level of performance provides 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.

E. 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, 2010.

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 11, 2009, were provided with the Semi Annual Report and minutes for the meeting held on March 5, 2010, are attached as Exhibit H.

Additionally, two OCRA Advisory Committee Board Members were chosen to make presentations at the statewide ADA Celebration held on July 26, on the steps of the California State Capital Building. The committee members, Billy Hall and Eric Ybarra, were eloquent in discussing what the ADA means to them.

DDS staff is invited and encouraged to participate in the next meeting, which is set for September 24, 2009, in the Bay Area.

F. 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 mandated number of trainings. Many offices provide more than one training and an advocate may use information from any packet in presenting his or her self-advocacy trainings to consumers.

To date, OCRA has developed five 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 \$\$\$

Being Your Own Boss

Additionally, OCRA agreed to work with DDS on a self-advocacy training developed by DDS for consumers on consumer safety in emergencies and OCRA staff was trained on implementing the training in Sacramento on December 9, 2008. During the past fiscal year, each OCRA office performed at least one Emergency Preparedness self-advocacy training.

OCRA is also starting to provide self-advocacy trainings mandated from the court-approved settlement of Capital People First, a law suit brought by Disability Rights California to encourage the movement of consumers from developmental centers and large facilities to the community. OCRA is utilizing materials developed by DDS in the self-advocacy trainings which are to be given to residents of large facilities. In addition to a DVD developed by DDS, which shows four separate consumers discussing their living arrangements, DDS developed a sticker book called My Own Choice. A copy of the book will be given to almost every participant in the training. The sticker book is a tool used to help individuals express their personal decisions about preferred living options.

Disability Rights California has also entered into a contract with People First of California to hire consumer trainers who will conduct the trainings with OCRA staff. The logistics of the training are still being determined but OCRA is confident that an extremely high quality training will result from the Capital People First agreement. Next fiscal year, all OCRA offices, except those without a large facility in its catchment area, will perform at least one training on consumer living choices with the materials developed by DDS.

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 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. This year, OCRA has randomly selected consumer training satisfaction evaluations from its Emergency Preparedness Self Advocacy Training for inclusion in the first half of the OCRA Self-Advocacy Trainings' Evaluation binder, which is under separate cover. The second part of the Evaluation binder contains sample evaluations from other OCRA trainings. Almost without exception, consumers are pleased with OCRA and DDS' Emergency Preparedness Training and other 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 were two Title 17 Complaints filed during the last fiscal year, both by the same consumer. 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 CRA 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.

Seven grievances were filed by consumers or their families during the past year, six of them during the first 6 months of the fiscal year. This was when, on the average, OCRA offices had an increase of 30 per cent in the number of calls from the same time period last year. The increase was due to the changes in the laws affecting people with developmental disabilities during the fall, 2009. Offices could not directly represent many of the consumers who were requesting such representation.

All actions of OCRA were upheld in the grievances. Information concerning the grievances 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 or Associate Clients' Rights Advocates working 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 was nine percent higher this fiscal year than last. Additionally, OCRA presented at 26 percent more trainings which were attended by an increase of 27 percent attendees for the fiscal year over the previous fiscal year. This increase challenged OCRA staff's ability to provide quality, timely advocacy. We are proud of the fact that OCRA staff were able to respond to the increased need for services. Given the State's fiscal climate, we do not believe it is feasible for the State to provide an increase in funding for OCRA services nor responsible for Disability Rights California to request an increase in funding for services, even for those regional centers that have the highest case loads. We are extremely appreciative of DDS' support of the OCRA program during these difficult economic times.

We also appreciate the opportunity presented by the *Capitol People First* settlement which targeted a portion of OCRA training and outreach efforts to individuals residing in nursing and other large

congregate facilities. This training is providing an opportunity to work collaborative with People First of California and reach consumers who may have a more difficult time accessing Disability Rights California services through other means. We look forward to other opportunities to work with DDS and regional centers to serve individuals with developmental disabilities.

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 9,671 cases the last year, provided 566 trainings to over 25,555 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 office – as of August 24, 2010 - Change is *italicized*.

ALTA CALIFORNIA REGIONAL CENTER

Jackie Coleman - CRA

Jacqueline Gallegos - Assistant CRA

Elizabeth Kennedy – Temp Administrative Assistant

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy

100 Howe Avenue, Ste. 240N

Sacramento, CA 95825

Phone: (916) 575-1615/Fax: (916) 575-1623

Email: Jackie.Coleman@disabilityrightsca.org

Jacqueline.Gallegos@disabilityrightsca.org

Elizabeth.Kennedy@disabilityrightsca.org.

Supervised by Jeanne Molineaux

CENTRAL VALLEY REGIONAL CENTER

Arthur Lipscomb - CRA

Kay Spencer- Assistant CRA (part-time)

567 W. Shaw Avenue

Fresno, CA 93704

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

E-mail: Arthur.Lipscomb@disabilityrightsca.org

Kay.Spencer@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Gail Gresham

EASTERN LOS ANGELES REGIONAL CENTER

Matthew Pope - CRA

Lucy Garcia - Assistant CRA

James Takhar – Volunteer

1000 S. Fremont Avenue/P.O. Box 7916

Alhambra, CA 91802

NOTE: When shipping items through UPS/FED EX please add ELARC Reception info: Bldg. A2 Room #3128. We ask that all items that are not mail be directed to the ELARC reception area and not our offices."

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

Matthew.Pope@disabilityrightsca.org,

Lucy.Garcia@disabilityrightsca.org,
James.Takhar@disabilityrightsca.org
Supervised by Katie Hornberger

FAR NORTHERN REGIONAL CENTER

Andy Holcombe - CRA

Lorie Atamian – Assistant CRA (part-time)

Diana Rabut - VOLUNTEER

1280 East 9th Street, Unit E

Chico, CA 95928

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

E-mail: Andy.Holcombe@disabilityrightsca.org

Lorie.Atamian@disabilityrightsca.org, Diana.Rabut@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Jackie Coleman

GOLDEN GATE REGIONAL CENTER

Katy Lusson - CRA

Trina Saldana - 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,

Trina.Saldana@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Gail Gresham

***HARBOR REGIONAL CENTER**

Tim Poe – CRA

Abigail Perez - Assistant CRA (part-time)

Anabel Lopez – Volunteer

Sanna Khan - Volunteer

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy

13005 Artesia Blvd., Suite A214

Cerritos, CA 90703

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

E-mail: Tim.Poe@disabilityrightsca.org

Abigail.Perez@disabilityrightsca.org

Anabel.Lopez@disabilityrightsca.org

Sanna.Khan@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 Jacqueline Miller

KERN REGIONAL CENTER

Mario Espinoza - CRA

Valerie Geary - Assistant CRA

Ana Pelayo - 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

Ana.Pelayo@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Gail Gresham

FRANK D. LANTERMAN REGIONAL CENTER

Jackie Chiang - CRA

Jazmin Romero – ACRA

Jordan Arciaga - Volunteer

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy

3580 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 925

Los Angeles, CA 90010

Phone: (213)427-8761, Extensión 3673

Fax: (213)427-8772

E-mail: Jackie.Chiang@disabilityrightsca.org,

Jazmin.Romero@disabilityrightsca.org,

Jordan.Arciaga@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Katie Meyer

NORTH BAY REGIONAL CENTER

Yulahlia Hernandez - CRA

Annie Breuer - Assistant CRA

Victor Hurtado - Volunteer

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,

Victor.Hurtado@disabilityrightsca.org

Physical Address is:

25 Executive Court

Napa, CA 94558

Supervised by Gail Gresham

NORTH LOS ANGELES COUNTY REGIONAL CENTER

Ibrahim Saab - CRA

Ada Hamer - Assistant CRA

Gloria Flugum – Temp Clerical Support

15400 Sherman Way, Ste. 300

Van Nuys, CA 91406

Phone: (818) 756-6290

Fax: (818) 756-6175

E-mail: Bebo.Saab@disabilityrightsca.org

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

Supervised by Irma Wagster

REDWOOD COAST REGIONAL CENTER

Jim Stoepler - CRA

525 Second Street, Suite 300

Eureka, CA 95501

Phone: (707) 445-0893, Ext. 361

Fax: (707) 444-2563

Reg workweek: Thurs/Fri

E-mail: Jim.Stoepler@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Katie Hornberger

1116 Airport Park Blvd.

Ukiah, CA 95482

Phone:(707)462-3832, Ext. 235

Fax: (707) 462-3314

Reg workweek: Mon/Tues/Wed

***REGIONAL CENTER OF THE EAST BAY**

VACANT - CRA

Celeste Palmer - Associate CRA

1330 Broadway, Suite 500

Oakland, CA 94612

Phone: (510) 267-1280

Fax: (510) 267-1281

E-mail: Celeste.Palmer@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Andrew 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

VACANT - 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

Supervised by Katie Hornberger

SAN DIEGO REGIONAL CENTER

Wendy Dumlao - 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: Wendy.Dumlao@disabilityrightsca.org

Alba.Gomez@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Jeanne Molineaux

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

Anastasia Bacigalupo - 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: Anastasia.Bacigalupo@disabilityrightsca.org

Christine.Armand@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Irma Wagster

TRI-COUNTIES REGIONAL CENTER

Katherine Mottarella – 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: Katherine.Mottarella@disabilityrightsca.org,

Gina.Gheno@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Irma Wagster

VALLEY MOUNTAIN REGIONAL CENTER

Leinani Walter – CRA

Filomena Alomar - Assistant CRA

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy

Valley Mountain Regional Center

702 N. Aurora Street

Stockton, CA 95202

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

Fax: (209) 462-7020

E-mail: Leinani.Walter@disabilityrightsca.org

Filomena.Alomar@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
100 Howe Avenue, Suite 240N
Sacramento, CA 95825
Telephone: (916) 575-1615
Toll-Free: (800) 390-7032
Fax: (916) 575-1623/TTY: (877) 669-6023
DIRECT DIAL NUMBER: (916) 575-1615

Los Angeles OCRA

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
3580 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 925
Los Angeles, CA 90010
Telephone: (213) 427-8761
Toll-Free: (866) 833-6712
Fax: (213) 427-8772/Use (877) 669-6023 for LA as well.
DIRECT DIAL NUMBER: (213) 427-8757

Director:

Jeanne Molineaux Sacramento
Email: Jeanne.Molineaux@disabilityrightsca.org
OCRASAC Office, (916) 575-1615, Extension 8142

Supervising Clients' Rights Advocates:

Gail Gresham Sacramento
Email: Gail.Gresham@disabilityrightsca.org
(916) 575-1615, Extension 8146

Irma Wagster Los Angeles
Email: Irma.Wagster@disabilityrightsca.org
Regional Center of Orange County CRA Office – (714) 750-0709

Katie Hornberger Cerritos
Email: Katie.Hornberger@disabilityrightsca.org
Harbor Regional Center Office- (562) 623-9911

Support Staff Sacramento:

Alice Ximenez, Office Manager II

(916) 575-1615, Extension 8143

Email: Alice.Ximenez@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Jeanne Molineaux

Sacramento

Vanessa Ochoa-Alcaraz, Administrative Assistant I

(916) 575-1615, Extension 8141

Email: Vanessa.OchoaA@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Alice Ximenez

Sacramento

Kimberly Morales, Bilingual Temporary Assistant

(916) 575-1615, Extension 8148

Email: Kimberly.Morales@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Gail Gresham/Alice Ximenez

Sacramento

Support Staff Los Angeles:

Maria Ortega, Office Manager I

(213) 427-8761, Extension 3670

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.	Arciaga, Jordan	LRC (Volunteer)
2.	Alcaraz, Vanessa Ochoa	OCRASAC
3.	Alomar, Filomena	VMRC
4.	Armand, Christine	SCLARC
5.	Atamian, Lorie	FNRC
6.	Bacigalupo, Anastasia	SCLARC
7.	Breuer, Annie	NBRC
8.	Cervantes, Veronica	IRC
9.	Chiang, Jackie	LRC
10.	Coleman, Jackie	ACRC
11.	Cruz, Marisol	SGPRC
12.	Delgadillo, Luisa	WRC
13.	Delgado, Aimee	SGPRC
14.	Defilippis, Rita	SARC
15.	Dumlao, Wendy	SDRC
16.	Espinoza, Mario	KRC
17.	Flugum, Gloria	NLACRC
18.	Gallegos, Jacqueline	ACRC
19.	Garcia, Lucy	ELARC
20.	Geary, Valerie	KRC
21.	Gheno, Gina	TCRC
22.	Gomez, Alba	SDRC
23.	Gresham, Gail	OCRASAC
24.	Hamer, Ada	NLACRC
25.	Hernandez, Yulahlia	NBRC
26.	Holcombe, Andy	FNRC
27.	Hornberger, Katie	HRC
28.	Hurtado, Victor	NBRC (Volunteer)
29.	Kennedy, Elizabeth	ACRC
30.	Khan, Sanna	HRC (Volunteer)
31.	Lipscomb, Arthur	CVRC
32.	Lopez, Anabel	HRC (Volunteer)
33.	Lusson, Katy	GGRC
34.	McWright, Kendra	RC

35. Meyer, Katie	WRC
36. Miller, Jacqueline	RCOC
37. Molineaux, Jeanne	OCRASAC
38. Morales, Kimberly	OCRASAC (Agency Temp)
39. Mottarella, Katherine	TCRC
40. Oppel, Margie	KRC (Special Project)
41. Ortega, Maria	OCRALA
42. Palmer, Celeste	RCEB
43. Pelayo, Ana	KRC
44. Perez, Abigail	HRC
45. <i>Poe, Tim</i>	<i>HRC</i>
46. Pope, Matthew	ELARC
47. Rabut, Diana	FNRC (Volunteer)
48. Reyes, Beatriz	IRC
49. Romero, Jazmin	LRC
50. Saab, Ibrahim	NLACRC
51. Saldana, Trina	GGRC
52. Salomón, Cynthia	RCOC
53. Spencer, Kay	CVRC
54. Stoepler, Jim	RCRC
55. Takhar, James	ELARC (Volunteer)
56. Wagster, Irma	OCRALA
57. Walter, Leinani	VMRC
58. Ximenez, Alice	OCRASAC

Updated as of August 24, 2010.

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
 Annual Report - July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010
 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
Age 0-3	30	15	18	9	14	35	31	7	37	6	19	16	25	3	23	30	12	18	13	18	35	414
Age 4-17	114	153	225	82	74	142	197	135	91	110	90	111	77	59	175	173	84	126	132	99	167	2616
Age 18-22	47	60	59	32	35	39	62	38	24	41	50	38	23	34	48	41	38	45	68	55	54	931
Age 23-40	71	50	69	68	74	48	81	59	26	54	60	90	52	56	39	44	55	51	86	82	71	1286
Age 41-50	24	14	17	43	33	11	20	10	9	18	22	26	18	31	13	7	11	16	33	25	27	428
Age 51+	20	11	65	36	42	18	13	11	7	25	16	30	22	22	19	9	6	20	47	34	26	499
Age Unknown	4	1	1			1		4					4									15
Total	310	304	454	270	272	294	404	264	194	254	257	311	221	205	317	304	206	276	379	313	380	6189

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Annual Report - July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010
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				6					1		283			3								294
Amador																				15			15
Butte	4			231																			235
Calaveras																				13			13
Colusa				1																			1
Contra Costa	1				1					1		192									1		196
Del Norte														8									8
El Dorado	12			1																			13
Fresno	4	218																					222
Glenn				9										1									10
Humboldt													68										68
Imperial																	15						15
Kern		1	1	1		1		391		1		1		1						4			402
Kings		24						2															26
Lake														101									101
Lassen				9																			9
Los Angeles	6		633	2		549	4	3	450		335		6	2	1	493		479	2		610		3575
Madera		25																2					27
Marin				146																			146
Mariposa		3																					3
Mendocino						1				1				73									75
Merced		28								1											1		30
Monterey															40								40
Napa										60													60
Nevada	3																						3
Not Selected		7	6	4			3	23		12			4	3	4	3		1	9		3		82
Orange			1		4		2					1	421			1	1	1					432
Placer	39			5																			44
Plumas				5																			5
Riverside							266		1				1				1						269

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Annual Report - July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010
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
Sacramento	324	3		1			1			5		1				2				4		341
San Benito															7							7
San Bernardino	3		4			1	285			1		1				1		12	5			313
San Diego	1						2										322	1				326
San Francisco					97							2			1			1				101
San Joaquin												1						1		216		218
San Luis Obispo						1													42			43
San Mateo					171																	171
Santa Barbara	1																		165		1	167
Santa Clara	1	1	1			1		1		2		1	10		345					1		364
Santa Cruz												1			39							40
Shasta				63			1															64
Siskiyou				6																		6
Solano										146		1										147
Sonoma	3	5								199				1								208
Stanislaus	1											1								149		151
Sutter	2																					2
Tehama				41																		41
Trinity				2																		2
Tulare	3	97					1	2														103
Tuolumne																				17		17
Unknown		2	1																			3
Ventura								1										1	382			384
Yolo	12																					12
Yuba	20			1																		21
Total	441	414	647	382	425	554	565	423	451	430	335	486	442	258	440	500	339	499	609	417	614	9671

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Annual Report - July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010
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	19	32	15	33	42	2	7	16	4	40	12	25	23	3	12	5	3	4	28	9	23	357
Autism	57	79	236	52	47	116	153	73	89	52	78	84	79	35	115	127	71	92	105	49	166	1955
Cerebral Palsy	24	22	25	25	35	31	56	17	19	28	16	67	19	16	29	18	25	42	52	35	41	642
Dual Diagnosis - 5th Category	2	1		1	1			1		12		3		1			1		2	1	2	28
Dual Diagnosis - Autism	1	1			4	2	6		1	14	2	4	3	1	5	6			2	5	4	61
Dual Diagnosis - Cerebral Palsy		2		1	1		2			2	4		4	1	2	1			4	1		25
Dual Diagnosis - Epilepsy				1		1	2	1		2	2	3	2	2	2			1	7	4		30
Dual Diagnosis - Mental Retardation	3	8	1	7	13	8	10	2	4	18	20	15	11	16	10	6	1	4	19	12	10	198
Early Start	1	8	1	6	5	29	21	1	26	5	9	11	7		19	13	4	16	8	7	30	227
Epilepsy	4	27	15	24	13	5	45	6	8	7	11	10	8	6	13	8	13	17	27	17	22	306
Mental Retardation	168	145	171	148	134	111	180	162	53	111	104	105	55	138	113	104	126	114	173	213	130	2758
Not Selected		1				1	1	1		1				3				1	1			10
Unknown	64	24	18	8	10	22	23	13	14	4	19	6	45	11	32	43	5	35	26	46	10	478
Total	343	350	482	306	305	328	506	293	218	296	277	333	256	233	352	331	249	326	454	399	438	7075

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Annual Report - July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010
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	6	2		10	1	1		5	1	3		3	1	10	2				6	2		53
Asian	8	7	53	5	15	24	4	2	8	2	3	25	15		32	2	7	15	2	11	14	254
Black or African American	43	20	5	5	30	27	37	20	14	44	24	68	4	3	10	82	7	13	8	18	61	543
Hispanic / Latino	49	128	294	38	34	86	180	100	85	66	78	76	56	22	113	196	67	153	124	74	122	2141
Multiracial	5	15	24	6	26	19	29	2	21	5	12	1	3	2	8	6	6	16	9	6	12	233
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	3	1	5	1	11	5	8	5	6	5		8	4	1	9		11	5	3	6	2	99
Unknown	5	5	14	4	2	4	20	1	2	3	14		21	2	2		4	1	31	1	11	147
White	191	126	59	201	153	128	126	129	57	126	126	130	117	165	141	18	104	73	196	195	158	2719
Total	310	304	454	270	272	294	404	264	194	254	257	311	221	205	317	304	206	276	379	313	380	6189

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
 Annual Report - July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010
 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	119	118	155	118	115	86	139	96	68	100	89	125	71	75	112	85	77	95	150	120	147	2260
Male	191	186	298	152	157	207	265	168	126	154	168	186	149	129	205	219	127	181	229	193	233	3923
Unknown			1			1							1	1			2					6
Total	310	304	454	270	272	294	404	264	194	254	257	311	221	205	317	304	206	276	379	313	380	6189

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Annual Report - July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010
Report by Living Arrangement

	ARC	CVRC	ELARC	FNRC	GGRC	HRC	IRC	KRC	LRC	NBRC	NLARC	RCEB	RCOC	RCRC	SARC	SCLARC	SDRC	SGPRC	TCRC	VMRC	WRC	Total	
Adult Residential Facility	25	11	2	15			18	9		9	1	28	8	3	1	1	31	3	16	27	4	212	
Board and Care	13				3	6	9		1	2	4	3			2				10	2	3	58	
Childrens Group Home		3	3	3				1			8	11		1		2	3	1	8	6		50	
Community Residential Home	2	4		2	3						5	1			2	4			1	24	1	49	
Detention Center					1		6				1						1					9	
Developmental Center	6					1	1	2			8		5		1	2	1			3		30	
Federal Facility											2								1			3	
Foster Care		2		1	2	2	3	2				2	1	1	2	3	3	2	3		1	30	
Foster Family Home		11	2		1		2	3		4	1	2	1	1	1	4	1		5	7		46	
Halfway House	1						1		1													3	
Homeless		4	1	5	2		1	1				1		3		1	4	2	2	1	1	29	
ICF DD					2		1								2					4		9	
ICF DD-H					2					1	7	2						1	4	1		18	
ICF DD-N		1					1			1	1								1	4		9	
ICF/MR/Nursing Home					1														6			7	
Independent Housing	59	28	16	129	64	6	29	95	33	59	33	67	32	69	25	44	26	30	85	59	74	1062	
Intermediate Care Facility/Nursing Home			1		1						3						2		1	3	2	13	
Jail	1			4	1	1	1			4	4	1	2	1	1	3			3	4		31	
Large Group Home (more than 3 beds)	9	9	5		49	25		23	2	6	6	22	13	12	19	5		5	14	1		225	
Legal Detention		1						3		2						1			1			8	
Municipal Detention Facility/Jail	4											1							3		2	10	
Nursing Home					1			1					2	1	2		1		1	1	3	13	
Other	4	2	5	1		27		1	1	1	2	1	3	2	2				4	2	2	60	
Other Federal Facility					1										2							3	
Parental or Other Family Home	274	318	590	203	255	482	490	271	412	296	257	310	353	140	365	421	261	450	391	269	498	7306	
Prison	2			3														2				9	
Private General Hospital Emergency Rooms											1				1							2	
Private Institutional Hospital/Treatment Facility								1			2	5				1			1		1	11	
Private Institutional Living Arrangement			1		1																	2	
Private Institutional School		4								4	2					1					1	12	
Psychiatric Wards of Private General Hospitals										1												1	
Psychiatric Wards of Public General Hospitals						1			1	2						1				1		6	
Public Institutional Hospital/Treatment Facility	2							2		1	2		3	1	2		1		1		1	16	
Public Institutional Living Arrangement	2				2									1								5	
Public Residential School										1					1					2	1	5	
Semi-indepent Home or Apartment	4	8	5		22		1			4		13	3	1	7	3	1	2	13		14	101	
Small Group Home (3 beds or less)				7	4			7		6	2	2	4	4	1	1			9			47	
Specialized Nursing Facility/Nursing Home	1			1				1				1	1					1		2		8	
Supervised Apartment	5	2	2	6	7	1				3	6	12	2	13					19		4	82	
Unknown	27	6	14	2		2	1			1			9	4	1	2			1			70	
VA Hospital																						1	1
Total	441	414	647	382	425	554	565	423	451	430	335	486	442	258	440	500	339	499	609	417	614	9671	

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Annual Report - July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010
Report by Problem Codes

		ARC	CVRC	ELARC	FNRC	GGRC	HRC	IFC	KRC	LR	NBRC	NLARC	RCEB	ROCC	RCRC	SARC	SCLARC	SDRC	SGPRC	TCRC	VMRC	WRC	Total	
4731 Complaint	4731 - Developmental Center										2												2	
	4731 - Regional Center	2						3	2	1	13	2	3	1		4	5	1	3	2	5	4	51	
	4731 - Service Provider	2							3			1	2							4	3		15	
	Title 17	1																1				2	4	
4731 Complaint Total		5						3	5	1	15	3	5	1		4	5	2	3	6	10	4	72	
Abuse	Emotional / Psychological Abuse	1		1					3	1				1		4	5	2	3	6	10	4	8	
	Exploitation / Coercion								3	1				1	3						1	1	6	
	Financial Abuse		1	1	1	3			3		1		4	1	5	2	6	3		6	4	4	45	
	Inappropriate / Involuntary Medication Therapy											1											1	
	Inappropriate Medical Treatment		1						1	1		1											4	
	Other Abuse							1	1					1	2	3		1			2		11	
	Physical Assault	2	1	2	1	18			8	1	1	1	1	1	1	4			1	1			1	43
	Physical Neglect	1				2								2		2	2		1		1			11
	Physical Restraint / Seclusion									2		1	1											3
	Sexual Assault		1	1		8					1						5					2		18
	Verbal Abuse					2										2						1		5
Abuse Total		4	4	5	2	33		2	18	2	3	4	6	5	15	16	7	5	1	7	11	5	155	
Assistive Technology	Assistive Technology - Medi-Cal				1			1															3	
	Assistive Technology - Other AT	1																				3	4	
	Assistive Technology - Regional Center	1											2								2	1	6	
	Assistive Technology - Vocational Rehabilitation																				1		1	
Assistive Technology Total		2		1				1					2						1		6	1	14	
Consent	Capacity / Incapacity of Client					1		2	1			3									1	1	9	
	Informed Consent										3	1			1						2		8	
	Other Consent						1				1	2			1						2	2	9	
	Substituted Decision Making (Ex. DPAHC)										1	1											2	
	Withhold Consent														1								2	
Consent Total					1		2	1			5	7		1	2					4	3	2	30	
Conservatorship	Alternatives to Conservatorship	2	1	8	2	4		8	24	8	9	1	3	5	1	8	9	11	10	37	10	12	173	
	Change Conservatorship	1		2	1		2			1	2	1	2	2		3				2	2		21	
	Conservatee's Rights	2			2			1			4	28	5	1	2	3		3		3	7		62	
	Conservator's Duties	4					1					3		1									10	
	LPS Conservatorship			1						1			1	1	1					1			11	
	Opposition to Petition		6	1				1				3		2		2	1	1			2	4	24	
	Petition	1	1	4	3		4	3				3	1	1	1	2				4	8		35	
	Termination of Conservatorship		1		1	1			2			1		1	1	4		1	1	2	2	2	20	
	Conservatorship Total	10	9	17	7	7	7	13	26	10	19	36	15	11	7	21	10	16	18	50	33	14	356	
Criminal Justice / Forensic Mental	Competency	1			1					1		1											5	
	Criminal Justice Issues - Rights	1		2	1	7	1		2			1	2	2	1								20	
	Criminal Matter Representation – Not IOLTA eligible - OCRA								1														1	
	Diversion								1				3					2			1	1	8	
	Jail	2				1					1			2			1						7	
	Juvenile (Detention and Probation)											1				2							3	
	Other Criminal Justice	2	1	4	2	2	1		1			1	1	1		1					1	3	1	22
Probation				1																			1	
Criminal Justice / Forensic Mental Health Issues Total	6	1	6	5	10	2	6	2	1	1	3	1	6	5	1	4	2	2	3	4	1	67		
Discrimination (Other than Employment)	Architectural barriers										1											1	2	
	Civil Rights (Race, Religion, Sexual Orientation)			1			1			1			1										4	
	Higher Education (Public and Private)				1		1																2	
	Insurance Discrimination			1											2	2	2				1	4	1	
	Other Discrimination	1	1	3	2	3		1	1							2	2				1	4	2	26
	Public Accommodations (Hotels, Restaurants, Etc.)	1		3	1	2						1	1			1		1	3		1	5		17
	Transportation (Public and Private)		1	2		1			1					1					1		2			6
Discrimination (Other than Employment) Total	1	3	7	4	6	2	2	1	1	3	1	1	2	2	3	2	1	4	1	7	6	8	67	
Education	Education - Adult Education Programs		9							1							1				1		15	
	Education - After School Programs										1												1	
	Education - Assessment	3	5	5	1	1	5	6	6	6	7		4	3		1	3		2	1	1	5	65	
	Education - Assistive Technology			1	1								1	2					1				8	
	Education - Behavioral Intervention, Services and Supports	8	11	17		2	6	4	4	5	2	1	3			20	16	2	2	3	5	6	117	
	Education - Compliance Complaint	1	7	3	1	1	1	6	5	5	13		6	3	4	6	2	5	3	3	6	1	82	
	Education - Discipline (Suspension / Expulsion / Other)		11	5	4		2	2	5				2	1	1	6	2		5	10	6	3	65	
	Education - Discrimination	3	1		1	3			1			3		1		1	3				2	1	3	23
	Education - Due Process Appeals		1	1	2		3		3	15	5	4		4		1	3	2	1	5		5	55	
	Education - Early Intervention (Part B / Over Age 3)			1					1					1	1		1	1			2	2	2	12
	Education - Eligibility		2	3			1	1		2	4			1		1	3	4		11	1	2		36
	Education - Extra Curricular Activities	1		2			1					1									1	1		7

	Education - Full Inclusion (Except Pre-School)		1	2		2	2	1	1				2	1		3	1		1			17			
	Education - Higher Education		1	1								2			2	1	3	1				11			
	Education - Home / Hospital Instruction		1	1		2			1			2			1	2		2	1		1	14			
	Education - IEP Development		32	40	32	34	14	31	30	17	30	35	7	14	22	14	77	38	5	33	19	7	20	551	
	Education - Least Restrictive Environment		1	8	6	1		1	1	2	3	4				12	2	1	3	4			49		
	Education - Mental Health Services (AB 3632)																	1		2			3		
	Education - Non-Public School Placement		1		9	1	3	4	1	5	1	3	1	3	3		3			1	2	3	5	49	
	Education - Other Education		14	7	7	4	6	4	17	1	5	1	3	10		6	1	1	4	12	5	1	109		
	Education - Personal Injury (Tort Claim)			1	4		1			4	5		1		2		1	1	1		1	3	4	29	
	Education - Preschool Programs and Full Inclusion		1	1	2	1	1	5	1					1	2	1	1	1		1	3	1	1	24	
	Education - Public School Placement		8	25	17	3	10	5	9	15	15	5		12	4	1	20	11	1	13	8	14	4	200	
	Education - Related Services (Ex. OT / PT / S&L / 1:1 / Medication)			15	37	5	7	27	8	3	14	5	7	13	4	1	24	19	3	19	10	4	5	230	
	Education - Residential Placement		1	2			2		1					2										9	
	Education - Transition Planning (Any Age)			2	3		1	2	2	1	1	2		9	1		3	6		4	1	1	2	41	
	Education - Transportation		7	9	3	7	1	1		2		5	2	4	4	2	5	4	2		7	2		67	
Education Total			83	160	160	64	53	104	79	92	104	100	25	84	67	26	200	119	27	106	100	64	72	1889	
Employment	Employment Discrimination: General / Hiring		1			2	5	3		1	1			2	1	2					4	1	4	27	
	Employment Discrimination: Reasonable Accommodations		1		2	2	1	1				1		1	1	1					2	2	1	15	
	Vocational Rehabilitation Services		1						1	1	1		1	6	1	2	1				2			14	
	Wrongful Termination		1		4			1	1			1		3	2	2	1			1	5		4	26	
Employment Total			4	2	6	4	6	5	1	2	2	2	1	12	4	5	2			1	13	3	9	82	
Family	Adoption		2	1		1		2						1										7	
	Child Support							1	2	1	1			1		1	1		4					6	18
	Custody Issues		4	5	5	5		6	2	5		1	5	7		5	1	4	2		6	4	5	72	
	Dissolution / Annulment					2	1	1			1	1			1	2		1						1	11
	Domestic Violence		1		2											1		1					3	7	
	Family Support Services		3	1	3	2		3				1		2		1	1			2	1			20	
	Foster Care		1			1		1						1		1								5	
	Guardianship of Minors				1	1					1			2							4	2	1	12	
	Marriage		1													1	1						3	6	
	Parental Rights		5		2	2	2			3		4	1	2	2	2		5	1	3	1			35	
Family Total			17	7	13	14	3	13	5	9	3	7	6	16	4	14	3	10	7	3	13	7	19	193	
Finance	Debtor / Creditor Issues		11		7	19	14	3	1	5		6	4	8	1	12	1	1	5	6	10	9	10	133	
	Estate Planning					4			2	1	1	1	1	1		3	2	1	1	2	2	3	5	29	
	Special Needs Trust		2		4	1	5	1	1	2		9	1	2	2	2	1	3	1	1	6	2	9	53	
Finance Total			13	7	11	24	19	4	4	8	1	7	14	9	6	16	3	5	6	9	18	14	24	215	
Health	CCS Eligibility					2			1			1				1							1	6	
	CCS Services			1				2				1		4		2	2	1					1	14	
	EPSDT						2				2													4	
	In Home Nursing				1		2	4	1	1		2		1	1				2	2				1	18
	Medi-Cal Eligibility		1			1		4	3		8	1	3	3	12	2	1	3	5	2	8	2	14	73	
	Medi-Cal Services		6	2	3		2	3	2	2	8	2	4	2	10	1	2	2	6	1	4			5	67
	Medi-Cal Share of Cost / Co-Payment				3		1	3	2			1	2	15	1	1		2	1	2	5	2	2	43	
	Medical Treatment		3	1	1	2	4		1	2	2	2	3	4	3	1	1	3	2		2	6	6	49	
	Medicare				1		1	1				1	1	1	2								1	2	11
	Medi-Medi																			1	1	3		3	8
	Other Health		7		2	2			3	2		1	1	5	1	3			2	2	9	6	1	49	
	Private Insurance		2		4		2	6	1	3									1	1	4	1	3	28	
Health Total			19	4	15	7	16	23	11	11	22	10	15	31	34	9	11	20	11	35	18	39	370		
Housing	Eviction		8	1	2	3	10	2	2	1		2	1	3	2	5	1	1		3	7	1	4	59	
	Foreclosure							1		1										1				4	
	Habitability		3			2		1		2	1			2									1	3	15
	Housing Discrimination (Zoning / Covenants)			1	1						1			2					1		1			1	9
	Landlord and Tenant Rights		5	3	4	32	7	1		12		2	4	3	6	12	2	1			10	6	7	117	
	Mobilehome Law			1							2				1					1	1			6	
	Property Rights		1		1		1				2			1		1		1		1			2	12	
	Reasonable Accommodations				3	3				1		2		1	1	1	4			2	2	3		23	
	Section 8		2			2	2	1	1			1	2	5	5			2		2	4	1		30	
	Subsidized Housing		1		2	2					1	1			3	1		3		1			1	4	20
Housing Total			20	6	13	44	20	6	3	19	5	7	6	14	18	25	8	7	2	7	23	17	25	295	
Immigration	Citizenship (Application / Interview)							1	1	1		1			3		3	1			1			14	
	Other Immigration				1	1		1	3	3							1	1		1	1	1	1	16	
	Public Charge																				1			1	
Immigration Total				3	1		1	2	3	4		2		3		4	2		2	2	1	1	31		
Income Maintenance	AAP				1			3	3					3					2					12	
	CAPI													1										2	
	IHSS Eligibility		13	14	19	9		12	11	5	30	6	7	10	6	2	2	11	12	12	8	1	28	218	
	IHSS Hours		24	4	26	10	9	15	18	3	23	2	7	17	18	4	7	22	13	49	12	4	8	295	
	IHSS Protective Supervision		14	3	14	8	2	15	6		8	1	9	3	9	7	7	8	7	2	3	4	24	154	
	IHSS Share of Cost		1		1			2	1					2					1		2		1	11	
	Other Income Programs		10	3			6	2	1			1	1	1	1	1	1	1		3			1	34	
	SSA - Child Benefits										4			1		1			1		1		1	9	
	SSA - DAC					2					3			2		1			2	2	6	4	9	31	

	SSA - SSDI	1	1	1	3	2				1	2			2	1	1			8		3	26		
	SSI - Eligibility	5	27	36	14	14	11	17	8	12	8	7	15	2	13	9	11	23	13	18	19	30	312	
	SSI - Other	6	1	17	7	8	1	2	7	6	2	5	3	5	9	3	3	5	6	16	16	23	151	
	SSI - Overpayment	7	7	21	6	19	4	4	6	2	2	3	5	2	5	6	12	8	11	12	5	21	168	
	SSI - Representative Payee	3		6		1	2		5		2	4	3	1	4	1	1	3	1	7	6	2	52	
	State Disability Benefits	1	1	1				1			1						1					1	7	
	Income Maintenance Total	85	60	142	56	64	69	64	34	88	26	45	66	44	49	37	71	79	96	96	59	152	1482	
Legal Referral	Civil (General)		3	1	3	2	3	1	2		5	1	5	7	7	3		2	12	7		6	70	
	Criminal (General) - Rights	1			3	1		1		2		1		2	1		2				3		1	18
	Personal Injury	1	1	1	2	5	1	3	5	2	2	3	2	1			6	1	4	5	3	6	54	
	Public Defender		1		7				2												2		12	
	Small Claims	1			3					1		1	2	1			1	1	4	1	2		18	
	Worker's Compensation				1					1			1	1			1	1	4	1	2		4	
	Legal Referral Total	3	5	2	19	8	4	5	9	4	9	5	8	13	10	3	8	4	17	21	4	15	176	
Mental Health Issues	Mental Health - Complaint																1				1		2	
	Mental Health - Eligibility																1				1	1	4	
	Mental Health - Involuntary Commitment		1		5	1							1	1		2		1	1				13	
	Mental Health - Service, Supports and Treatment				1	2	1		1				1	2	1		2	3	2		2		16	
	Mental Health Issues Total	1	1	1	7	2	1	1	1	1	2	3	3	2	2	4	5	1	1	35	1	1	35	
Placement	Discharge Planning					2									1		1			5	2		11	
	Facility Conditions	1		1	1	1		1		2				1							3		11	
	Facility Evictions	1			1	1		1							1						1		6	
	Health Facilities				1																2		3	
	Move from Institution to Community	1						3		5			1	1			1				1		13	
	Support Services Needed for Placement	1	1		6	2		2		1			1		2				1	9	1		27	
	Transitional Housing		1	1				1		1	1	1		1			1	1		3			9	
	Unit / Facility / Institution Transfer		5					3						1	1		1	1		3			14	
	Placement Total	4	7	1	1	9	6	1	10	9	1	1	1	5	2	3	3	9	18	3	94	1	94	
Privacy/Personal Autonomy / Choices	Community Activities	1		5	1			1		1	1	1		2	1	1		1	1			1	17	
	Least Restrictive Environment		1	2	4	1		1		2		1		2				1		1	2		18	
	Mail				1															1		1	3	
	Other Privacy / Personal Autonomy / Choices	17	6	5	3	14	3	12	5	10	3	3		3	6	4	8		7	28	4		141	
	Personal Property	4		1				1		3				1	1		2		1	1			16	
	Privacy				2	3		5		1		1	1	1	2	2		1	1	1			21	
	Religion											2											2	
	Sexuality			1	1					2							1				1		6	
	Telephone				1	3	2	2		2							1				1		13	
	Privacy/Personal Autonomy / Choices Total	22	7	13	11	21	6	20	9	1	21	3	8	1	9	11	8	11	2	13	33	7	237	
Records	Breach of Confidentiality												1	1									2	
	Denial of Access		2			1		1		1		2	3			1							10	
	Erroneous Information	1		1				1		1		1		1									5	
	Records Total	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	17	
Regional Center Services	Lanterman Act - Regional Center										1	1											2	
	Licensed Residential Services					1																	1	
	Regional Center - 6500				1			1						1							6		9	
	Regional Center - Assessment of Needs	6	4	6	3		35	53	2	16	2	2	11	3	4	6	9	1		1	17	3	184	
	Regional Center - Behavioral Services	15	19	6		1	31	13	2	17		13	14	21		2	28	9	4	11	5	7	218	
	Regional Center - Case Management	1	9	9	12	3	6	28	21	19	10	26	28	5	3	6	13	7	8	25	4	18	261	
	Regional Center - Coordination with County Mental Health																					1	1	
	Regional Center - Crisis Services			1	1				1	1			2	2			1		1	3			13	
	Regional Center - Day Program, Training and Activity	2	2	6	4	5	26	8	10	2	12	8	5	6	9	4	24	14	6	2	2	3	160	
	Regional Center - DDS Policies / Procedures	2		1	2	1	1	9		2		2	4	1			3	10					40	
	Regional Center - Early Start (Part C / Under Age 3)	1	2	3		12	41	20	2	10	3	3	7	10		5	14	2	4	5	7	33	184	
	Regional Center - Eligibility for Regional Center services	16	49	25	30	29	32	96	23	19	31	21	31	40	9	37	55	17	25	30	24	27	666	
	Regional Center - Fair Hearing Procedures (Information only; no repres		8	110	17	15	15	17	9	40	41	25	3	37	1	3	39	5	119	25	6	17	552	
	Regional Center - Independent Living Services	2	7	9	1	1	2	1	3	7	1	2	4	2		4	2	8	2			3	61	
	Regional Center - IPP (Development / Meeting / Compliance)	1	10	6	20	6	11	8	8	6	13	7	10	12	4	9	7	11	16	20	5	9	199	
	Regional Center - Microenterprises							2												1			3	
	Regional Center - Other Regional Center Services	66	5	34	3	18	49	33	39	13	11	11	24	46	9	5	1	20	19	17	19	53	495	
	Regional Center - Prevention Services			4	3					1						1	1	10			1		21	
	Regional Center - Respite	15	13	3	8	34	37	52	12	26	42	33	32	13	16	17	7	28	3	12	8	28	439	
	Regional Center - Supported Employment	2		1	1			2			1		2	1		1	2					1	14	
	Regional Center - Supported Living	9	3	4		10	6	5	8	5	9	3	13	12	1	8	6	5	1	13	2	8	131	
	Regional Center - Transportation	4	6	3	11	5	4	2	16	12	2		6	2	1	2	13	1	1	4	2	1	98	
	Regional Center - Waiver		1	1		1	1			5	7		1	2	1	3	4	5	2	6	2		42	
	Regional Center Services Total	142	138	232	116	142	298	347	159	201	185	157	198	215	59	108	230	149	217	184	105	212	3794	
Grand		441	414	647	382	425	554	565	423	451	430	335	486	442	258	440	500	339	499	609	417	614	9671	

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Annual Report - July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010
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										11			1									12
1 - Information/Referral	61	133	145	62	167	231	80	80	91	55	36	95	51	98	121	75	32	118	81	245	208	2265
2 - Rights Information/Consultation (RC/Generic)	215	135	141	83	89	255	412	79	196	265	178	100	219	116	42	374	120	337	251	61	296	3964
3 - Rights Information/Consultation (Other)	85	23	171	135	33	14	5	108	132	21	75	105	96	37	125	8	108	3	259	86	16	1645
4 - Abuse/Neglect Investigation	3	3		2	5		6	7					1	1	5							33
5 - Special Education Compliance Complaint	1	2	1	1				3		1		4	2		5		3			2	1	26
6 - IEP		31	5	28	2		3	5	8	5	4		7		39	8	2	2		6	8	163
7 - IPP/IDT	1	9		2		6	1	2		9	3		1		13	1	15	3	2	1		69
8 - W&I 4731	2		1				1	1		2	1					1	1		1	1		12
9 - Technical Assistance	44	4	121	15	24	28	4	121	3	26	7	34	48	3	23	6	22	32	5	4	20	594
10 - Evaluation and Assessment	14	38	49	39	49	7	10	8	9	31	4	40	12	1	23	7	14	4	5	9	18	391
11 - Informal Regional Center / Provider Problem Resolution	6	17	1	7	17	3	26	3	1	1	14	61			11	11	4		1	2	9	195
12 - Informal Generic Service Agency Problem Resolution	1	10		4	35	3	2		2	1	5	39			25	6	5				20	158
13 - Case Settlement Prior to Informal Meeting, Mediation or Hearing			1	2			1		1	1			1				2					4
14 - Direct Representation in RC "Voluntary Informal Meeting"	2	2	2	1		1	3	2	1		1		2									17
15 - Direct Representation in Mediation / RC Fair Hearing	2	1		1	2	1	4		4		1	1	1	1	6	1	7				1	34
16 - Direct Representation in an Appeal for Generic Services	3	4	8		2	5	7	2	3	1	6	7		1	1	2	4		4		13	73
17 - Court Litigation	1	2	1					2							1							7
Total	441	414	647	382	425	554	565	423	451	430	335	486	442	258	440	500	339	499	609	417	614	9671

ADVOCACY REPORT

OFFICE OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS ADVOCACY

Spring 2010

BENEFITS

In-Home Support Services from County Departments of Social Service (IHSS); Protective Supervision.

OCRA Assists K.H. to Obtain Retroactive IHSS Benefits.

K.H. is a 21-year-old woman who is diagnosed with mental retardation and engages in self-injurious behavior. On June 4, 2009, the County Department of Social Services (County) notified K.H. that effective June 1, 2009, she had been found ineligible for protective supervision (protective supervision) benefits and that her IHSS would remain at 22.3 hours per month.

On August 31, 2009, OCRA assisted K.H. with filing a hearing to challenge the County's denial of protective supervision. At hearing, the County worker argued that K.H. did not engage in self-injurious behavior and that K.H.'s tendency to scratch herself would not be ameliorated by granting protective supervision.

OCRA provided documentation from K.H.'s physician indicating that K.H. has deficits in memory and severe deficits in orientation and judgment. The physician also confirmed that K.H. has self-injurious behaviors. The County argued that this information was unpersuasive because protective supervision is not available for medical conditions.

K.H.'s mother, who is monolingual-Spanish speaking, testified that she watches her daughter constantly when she is at home because K.H. has a tendency to leave the apartment and sit outside where she talks to strangers. K.H.'s mother also reported that K.H. scratches herself regularly.

The Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that the weight of the evidence supported the conclusion that K.H. qualifies for protective supervision by virtue of her mental impairments, lack of self-direction, propensity to place herself in possible danger by attempting to leave the home and her tendency to injure herself. The ALJ ruled that K.H. was entitled to receive 217.3 hours of protective supervision and other hours effective June 1, 2009, given the August 31, 2009, filing date. The parent recently notified OCRA that she received retroactive benefits in the amount of \$17,510. Ibrahim Saab, CRA, Ada Hamer, Assistant CRA, North Los Angeles County Regional Center.

County Ordered to Reinstate Protective Supervision Hours.

C.H. has multiple disabilities and requires significant personal support services that include feeding, bathing, and all other personal care needs. In addition, due to C.H.'s significant self-injurious behaviors, including pulling out his g-tube, C.H. requires protective supervision. IHSS reduced C.H.'s hours by terminating all protective supervision hours, claiming that medical documentation and C.H.'s current condition did not warrant this level of help.

C.H.'s family and IHSS care providers speak Hmong. They were not adequately informed and therefore did not know what documentation was required by IHSS to support continuation of C.H.'s protective supervision.

OCRA requested updated records from doctors and the regional center to support C.H.'s need for protective supervision. OCRA prepared a position statement and evidence packet for use by C.H.'s parent at the hearing. All of C.H.'s protective supervision hours were reinstated at hearing. Leinani Walter, CRA, Filomena Alomar, Assistant CRA, Valley Mountain Regional Center.

C.S. Receives IHSS Retroactive to March, 2009.

C.S. is a young man with mental retardation and autism who lives with his parents and siblings. He finished school in January of 2009,

and was approved for 49 hours a month of IHSS. He was not awarded protective supervision.

C.S. could not be left alone for any period of time due to his wandering behavior and lack of safety awareness. C.S.'s mother requested a hearing to get protective supervision after receiving OCRA's training materials.

OCRA reviewed documents, obtained reports and assisted C.S.'s doctor with completing the IHSS forms. OCRA then represented the family in negotiations with the County. OCRA agreed to a conditional withdrawal for reassessment in the matter. OCRA attended the reassessment, supplied all supporting information, and advocated for protective supervision. C.S. was awarded 244.1 hours of IHSS, the maximum allowed for protective supervision. This is an increase of 195 hours per month, with retroactive payments over \$20,000. Katie Hornberger, CRA, Harbor Regional Center.

V.T. Gets Protective Supervision.

V.T. is a young boy with autism, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, speech delays, mild mental retardation, a sleep disorder, and behavioral problems. After V.T.'s mother applied for IHSS, the County social worker did an in-home assessment of V.T. and concluded that he appeared to be "an average 8-year old." The County then denied V.T.'s application for IHSS, saying that he did not meet the criteria for protective supervision.

OCRA provided technical assistance to V.T.'s mother to prepare for her hearing. OCRA reviewed documents, helped prepare an evidence packet for the family, and assisted with witness preparation. V.T.'s mother presented the information at the hearing. The ALJ found that V.T. needs protective supervision. The testimony of the child care worker, the only "non-party, non-family member" witness was key to the ALJ. Even though V.T. had been making progress at school, the ALJ found that V.T.'s need for supervision is due to his developmental disability and is not consistent with typical children of the same age. The ALJ further noted that the County was incorrect to suggest that modifications to the environment were necessary prior to the award of protective supervision. V.T. is now receiving

protective supervision. Jim Stoepler, CRA, Redwood Coast Regional Center.

283 Hours of IHSS Awarded with Retroactive Benefits.

B.H. is a 6-year old with significant delays. B.H. is fully dependent on his parents for his care. B.H.'s mother requested IHSS protective supervision for B.H. due to his need for 24-hour care. Despite the fact that the IHSS social worker was provided with regional center documents, school district documents, and three doctors forms, which all documented B.H.'s need for protective supervision, IHSS continued to deny the request.

IHSS awarded B.H. 54.3 hours in the first Notice of Action and 120.2 hours in the third Notice of Action. No protective supervision was granted. OCRA agreed to represent at hearing.

OCRA argued all of the points summarized in its position statement. B.H. received a favorable hearing decision of 283 hours, all retroactive to March 3, 2009, and prospectively. Jackie S. Chiang, CRA, Guadalupe Marquez, Assistant CRA, Frank D. Lanterman Regional Center.

Child Receives 195 Hours of Protective Supervision.

M.V. was denied IHSS due to his age. M.V. has autism. His behaviors include eloping and trying to climb tall items. On one occasion, M.V.'s mother found M.V. trying to climb out of a second-story window. OCRA helped M.V.'s mother complete the IHSS self-assessment packet including documenting the need for protective supervision and provided a sample position statement to help the mother pursue an administrative hearing against the County. After M.V.'s mother filed for hearing, the County requested an opportunity to assess M.V.

OCRA helped M.V.'s mother prepare for the assessment and attended to ensure a proper assessment was completed. M.V.'s mother received a notice of action stating that M.V. was entitled to 195 hours of protective supervision. Wendy Dumlao, CRA, Alba Gomez, Assistant CRA, San Diego Regional Center.

M.N. Receives Maximum IHSS Hours.

M.N. is a 13-year-old boy diagnosed with severe mental retardation, infantile cerebral palsy, and vision impairment. After applying for IHSS in 2008, M.N. was awarded 93.1 hours per month but was denied protective supervision. The County social worker felt that M.N. did not need protective supervision because he could not walk as a result of his visual impairment and, therefore, could not get hurt. M.N.'s mother did not agree with the decision and appealed. M.N.'s mother contacted OCRA for assistance and OCRA agreed to represent at hearing. OCRA argued that the County misinterpreted and misapplied the legal standards for protective supervision and was incorrect in its denial.

The ALJ concluded that M.N. is severely impaired and in need of protective supervision retroactive to the initial application date. As ordered by the ALJ, the County assessed but only awarded 195 hours per month, the maximum for non-severely impaired recipients. OCRA contacted the County social worker's supervisor and made him aware of the ALJ's decision. The County supervisor required the social worker to award 283 hours of IHSS services retroactive to September 2, 2008. M.N.'s mother is owed approximately \$35,036 in retroactive payments. Veronica Cervantes, CRA, Beatriz A. Reyes, Assistant CRA, Inland Regional Center.

Social Security Administration (SSA)

Social Security Overpayment Waived.

A.K. is a youngster with significant developmental disabilities. He was sent to a residential placement out-of-state which was paid for by the regional center and the school district. A.K.'s parents had applied for Supplemental Social Security (SSI) on the advice of the regional center in order to offset the cost of the placement. A.K.'s mother was informed by the Social Security Administration (SSA) that A.K. would receive both the state and federal grant since his residence remained with his parents while he was temporarily at school.

Several years later, SSA notified A.K.'s parents that A.K. should not have received the state portion of the grant and that he had a \$5,500 overpayment. When A.K. returned home, his mother notified SSI. SSI continued to send checks. A.K.'s mother repeatedly sent letters and made phone calls and returned the money to SSI. SSI then applied that money to the first overpayment and continued charging for the remainder of that overpayment and the new overpayment. The total sum equaled over \$8,000.

OCRA was retained to provide assistance. OCRA represented A.K. at hearing. In a fully favorable decision, the ALJ stated that A.K.'s parents were without fault in regard to the overpayment and that repayment would be against equity and good conscience. The entire overpayment was waived. Katy Lusson, CRA, Trina Saldana, Assistant CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

OCRA Intervenes in Social Security Matter.

OCRA was contacted because Y.O. was only receiving \$157 a month in Social Security due to an alleged overpayment. OCRA contacted the local SSA Office and provided representation at a meeting. As a result, the SSA acknowledged that it was mistaken about the overpayment. In fact, Y.O. had been underpaid \$9,788. As required by the SSA regulations, a dedicated account, which may be used for the child's needs only, was opened for Y.O. and her monthly payment increased from \$157 to \$737 a month. Arthur Lipscomb, CRA, Kay Spencer, Assistant CRA, Nate Navarro, Temporary Assistant CRA, Central Valley Regional Center.

D.T. Found Eligible for SSI.

D.T. is 19 and diagnosed with mental retardation and a mental health condition. D.T. was part of the foster care system as a minor and recently moved into her current regional center area without a complete file history or family support system. As a result, relevant medical and clinical records were not provided to SSA during the application process.

OCRA researched D.T.'s medical, clinical, and educational history to support D.T.'s application for SSI. New evidence was submitted to

SSA. After reviewing the new records, SSA determined that D.T. qualified and was eligible for SSI. Leinani Walter, CRA, Valley Mountain Regional Center.

SSA Waives All Past Overpayments.

OCRA has assisted M.M. over a period of many years regarding multiple SSI overpayments. Because M.M.'s work is sporadic and his hours vary, he continuously receives overpayment notices. Each time, OCRA has filed both a waiver request and a request for reconsideration.

Despite repeated calls and letters to the SSA, OCRA did not receive any response. OCRA was finally able to contact someone at the SSA who searched the record thoroughly. OCRA was informed that all waiver requests had been granted—a total of four. Katy Lusson, CRA, Trina Saldana, Assistant CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

SSA Reconsiders In-Kind Support and Restores SSI Rate.

D.S.'s representative payee received a Notice of Action stating that D.S.'s SSI monthly check would be reduced by over \$200. SSA had incorrectly calculated the amount of in-kind support that D.S. received based on insufficient annual financial information regarding household expenses submitted by D.S.'s father.

OCRA requested that SSA reconsider its decision. OCRA provided documentation that D.S. pays his fair share of expenses each month. It was established that D.S. does not receive in-kind income from his family. SSA reinstated all of D.S.'s monthly SSI monies. Leinani Walter, CRA, Filomena Alomar, Assistant CRA, Valley Mountain Regional Center.

C.A. Obtains the Correct Amount of SSI.

C.A. is an adult who receives SSI and lives with his mother, who speaks Spanish. C.A. started working and earns a small amount each month. The SSA had reduced C.A.'s monthly amount, claiming that he was, "living in the household of another," and sent notice to

his mother/payee in English only. C.A.'s mother thought that C.A.'s SSI was reduced because he was working.

The reason C.A.'s SSI was reduced was that he was subject to a one-third reduction in the benefit since SSA determined that he was living in the household of another and was being provided living expenses by his mother. OCRA filed a request for reconsideration, providing proof that C.A. pays his pro-rata share of living expenses and therefore should not be subject to the one-third reduction. OCRA attended the informal conference at SSA with C.A. and his mother. OCRA presented a letter from C.A.'s landlord regarding rent, a breakdown of expenses, and copies of utility bills. The reconsideration was granted and C.A. is now receiving the full SSI benefit, including reimbursement for the months in error. Katie Meyer, CRA, Luisa Delgadillo, Assistant CRA, Westside Regional Center.

DAC Benefits Reinstated.

K.B. is a 35-year-old man with Down Syndrome. In the 1980's, K.B.'s mother became disabled and K.B. began to receive Disabled Adult Child benefits from the SSA. He also receives SSI, which made him a dual-eligible beneficiary. In 1987, K.B. met the mayor of his city at the Special Olympics, where K.B. was an athlete participant. The mayor created a special position for K.B. with the city, so he could have gainful employment. In 1987, K.B. began to earn too much to qualify for Disabled Adult Child. However, SSA continued to pay him for 15 more years. Even when his Disabled Adult Child was discontinued, K.B.'s SSI was raised so K.B. did not notice that the Disabled Adult Child had ceased. K.B. and his mother did notice when K.B.'s Medicare finally ceased.

OCRA investigated K.B.'s work for the city in the 1980's. OCRA found a secretary who remembered K.B. well, and described his duties which met the SSA criteria for subsidy and special circumstances. The secretary drafted a letter to the SSA regarding K.B.'s work. OCRA asked for a re-opening of the 1988 decision that K.B. was earning substantial gainful activity and was not entitled to Disabled Adult Child benefits. After several months of fact investigation by OCRA and the "special disability case" SSA

representative assigned, SSA found that K.B.'s work was not substantial during the 1980's and afterward.

K.B.'s Disabled Adult Child was reinstated, his overpayments were cleared, and he received a check for \$6,815 in back-payments (minus underpayments). His Medicare was also reinstated and he received his new card in the mail. K.B. now has Disabled Adult Child, SSI, Medi-Cal and Medicare. Katie Meyer, CRA, Luisa Delgadillo, Assistant CRA, Westside Regional Center.

Medi-Cal.

E.M. Receives Zero-Share of Cost Medi-Cal.

E.M. is a teenager with autism and severe disabilities. He lives with a guardian because his parents are deceased. E.M. was receiving Medi-Cal because he was on the waiver for people with developmental disabilities. His Disabled Adult Child benefits are \$1,029 a month. E.M. was told that he was not eligible for Medi-Cal except through the waiver because of the income and resources of his guardian. E.M. was assessed a monthly share of cost of \$429 which was based on his countable income over \$600.

Under the Medi-Cal program, only the income and resources of a parent with whom a child lives is counted. The income and resources of a stepparent, guardian, or other relative with whom a person lives is not counted. Because E.M. does not live with a parent, only his own income and resources are counted.

Also, E.M. does not need the institutional deeming feature of the DD Waiver. E.M. qualifies for zero-share of cost Medi-Cal under the Aged & Disabled Federal Poverty Level (A&D FPL) Program, provided he meets the SSI disability standard.

OCRA assisted the guardians in contacting their Medi-Cal Social Worker and asked that E.M. be screened for eligibility under the A&D FPL program. E.M. was found eligible with zero share of cost. Jackie Coleman, CRA, Elizabeth Kennedy, Temporary Assistant CRA, Alta California Regional Center.

M.H.'s Benefits Are Restored.

M.H. has cerebral palsy and lives in her own apartment. M.H. is vendorized with the regional center to provide supported living services. M.H. receives Social Security Disabled Adult Child benefits on the earnings record of her deceased father. M.H. contacted OCRA because her Medi-Cal benefits and IHSS were terminated. Without IHSS, M.H. was unable to pay her attendants and was worried that if she could not resolve the situation quickly, she would not be able to live safely in her own home.

OCRA filed for a state hearing on M.H.'s behalf. The hearing request explained that as a Disabled Adult Child recipient, M.H. is entitled to continue receiving zero-share of cost Medi-Cal despite the fact that her income is over the earnings limit. The CRA worked directly with the County appeals worker and was able to ensure that M.H.'s benefits were restored. After the benefits were restored, the CRA worked with the County IHSS payroll department and M.H.'s social worker to ensure that M.H. promptly received her retroactive payment. Anna Leach-Proffer, CRA, Celeste Palmer, Associate CRA, Regional Center of the East Bay.

Other Public Benefits.

Woman Wins Paratransit Eligibility after Reduction.

E.F. is a woman with multiple disabilities who had been eligible for unrestricted Access Paratransit since Access began in the 1990's. In 2006, she was terminated from Access. OCRA assisted her in getting doctor's notes and helped her draft an appeal letter. OCRA attended the medical evaluation with E.F., which she won and was made fully eligible.

Upon redetermination in 2010, Access found she was only eligible for restricted Access, that is, she could only ride at night. OCRA immediately drafted an appeal letter and sent it to Access, along with Access's own 2006 decision, and more letters of support from E.F.'s doctors. Access sent her to the same doctor again, who reviewed all the documentation and examined her. She was made fully eligible for Access, unrestricted. Katie Meyer, CRA, Westside Regional Center.

DISCRIMINATION

Swim Club Membership Restored.

S.D. is a young man who loves swimming at his fitness center. He has always been accompanied into the pool by his mother. Last summer, S.D. wanted to interact with a young girl and to play with her doll. The girl's mother became very upset and starting yelling. After this incident, S.D.'s mother was told that S.D. could not use the pool without a male aide and that S.D. could only attend at certain times. As a result of this, S.D. did not go swimming for several months.

OCRA contacted the director at the fitness center. A meeting was arranged with OCRA, the center's director, and S.D.'s parents. At the meeting, everyone had a chance to express their concerns and feelings about the situation. It was agreed that S.D. would be allowed back into the fitness center as a full member with no restrictions on his use of the facilities, including the pool. The center's director also requested that OCRA do training on disability rights for the staff. Katy Lusson, CRA, Trina Saldana, Assistant CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

CONSUMER FINANCE

Purchase of Diapers Results in Overdraft.

M.C. is a young woman with developmental disabilities. She has a young child. As a result of budget cuts, she was no longer receiving diapers for her baby. M.C. went to the bank and took out money that was not sufficiently covered. She thought it was a "loan" and that she could pay it back when she had the money. She did this several times over a few months. She then began receiving notices from the bank, with fines added. Her account was frozen. M.C.'s regional center social worker had been working with the bank but had not been able to resolve the issue.

OCRA went to the bank with M.C. and the social worker and spoke with the bank manager, documenting that M.C. was a regional center consumer. M.C. agreed to allow her Independent Living skills worker to go over her finances and bank statements with her. The bank

agreed to forgive the debt and not to take any legal action against M.C. Katy Lusson, CRA, Trina Saldana, Assistant CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

County Files Civil Complaint against J.Z.

The County filed a complaint in Superior Court against J.Z. for money due for hospital, medical, and attendant care rendered at County General Hospital. J.Z. had been hospitalized in the Intensive Care Unit as a result of serious medical conditions including asthma, pneumonia, and respiratory failure. The County demanded that J.Z. pay \$28,586 for this hospital care plus interest on the sum at the rate of 10% per annum.

OCRA intervened, speaking directly with a Deputy County Counsel and the Office of Revenue and Recovery. OCRA filed an Answer on J.Z.'s behalf. Following this intervention, OCRA was advised that no further action will be taken against J.Z. Leinani Walter, CRA, Filomena Alomar, Assistant CRA, Gail Gresham, Supervising CRA, Valley Mountain Regional Center.

EARLY INTERVENTION

Early Intervention Services Continue.

V.A. is a 4-year-old client with mental retardation who lives with his grandmother, who is also his legal guardian. OCRA received a call from V.A.'s grandmother requesting assistance to prepare for a fair hearing because she received a notice of action stating that the regional center was discontinuing funding for the National Academy of Child Development Early Intervention Program (NACD). The regional center also indicated that it was terminating transportation services for V.A.'s doctor visits. OCRA provided technical assistance. OCRA informed V.A.'s grandmother about the exemption requirements for suspension of services.

OCRA advised V.A.'s grandmother to contact V.A.'s primary doctor and neurologist to request letters specifically addressing the benefits and needs being met by NACD as evidence to present at the hearing. OCRA also advised V.A.'s grandmother to take witnesses to the

hearing who could verify V.A.'s improvement since he started the program and present any other records at the hearing that support this improvement.

V.A.'s grandmother was also advised to point out that local schools in the very remote area where they live could not provide V.A. with the necessary early intervention strategies V.A. needs. After the hearing, the grandmother called OCRA and informed it that the ALJ ruled in V.A.'s favor at the hearing. She received 9 months of continued NACD in her home and the regional center agreed to pay for an attorney to represent her at a due process hearing against the school district. In addition, the ALJ decided that the funding for transportation services to the medical visits should continue. Mario Espinoza, CRA, Valerie Geary, Assistant CRA, Kern Regional Center.

HOUSING

Section 8 Benefits Restored and New Informal Dispute Resolution Process Established.

B.S. was living in privately owned subsidized housing through the federal Section 8 Voucher program. The owner of the apartment complex where B.S. lived gave a cause to evict notice due to relatives of B.S. who were living there without permission, and due to alleged improper or illegal conduct of other family members living with B.S.

B.S. was referred to OCRA after the Housing Authority had already held an administrative hearing to determine if the participating landlord had cause to evict, and to determine if the Section 8 Voucher assistance should also be terminated. The Housing Authority had concluded there was cause to evict, but had not yet ruled on discontinuing the Section 8 Voucher assistance.

OCRA intervened at this point, and convinced the Housing Authority to hold a comprehensive informal meeting with B.S., the CRA, the regional center service coordinator, an ILS program representative, B.S.' ILS worker, and supportive family members. It was established that the problematic family members who had moved in did so

against B.S.'s will, and were taking advantage of him. Accordingly, B.S. should not be held responsible for them or their misconduct. In order to resolve the problems posed by the unwanted family members, B. S. agreed to move, and was given additional time to do so. His Section 8 Voucher assistance was to continue.

Additional collateral benefit was that the Housing Authority decided to implement or offer an informal but comprehensive problem solving meeting in tenancies with tenants with disabilities, if they asked for it. Further, with tenant agreement, copies of any notices would routinely be sent to the representative of their choice (e.g. service coordinator), so that corrective action could be taken, and additional services provided, to help prevent minor issues from escalating into potential cause to evict or termination of benefits. Andy Holcombe, CRA, Lorie Atamian, Assistant CRA, Far Northern Regional Center.

PERSONAL AUTONOMY

Petition for Limited Conservatorship Denied.

F.W. is 45 and has developmental delays. F.W. is independent, physically mobile, and is a strong self-advocate. F.W. has developed and maintained several positive relationships in her home, day program, and in the community.

F.W.'s. sister lives in Texas. She filed a petition for limited conservatorship because the sister wanted to be appointed conservator. F.W. objected to this petition. She said that her sister had tried to control her life for years. F.W. said she did not need or want a conservator.

OCRA provided technical assistance and met with the IPP team to prepare documentation to oppose the conservatorship. OCRA provided consultation and contacted the probate court investigator to advocate for F.W. Consistent with F.W.'s wishes, OCRA asserted that the conservatorship was not necessary. As a result of F.W.'s self-advocacy and the support of OCRA, the court investigator recommended that the conservatorship petition be denied. The judge

advised that the court would not be granting the conservatorship. Leinani A. Neves, CRA, Valley Mountain Regional Center.

K.F. Challenges Parent's Conservatorship Petition.

K.F., an adult consumer, had been residing with her mother for her entire life but had very little opportunity to live her own life since her mother was controlling and verbally abusive. One day, K.F.'s mother became physically aggressive with K.F. A neighbor heard what was going on and called the police. K.F.'s mother was arrested for battery and K.F. was asked whether she wanted to wait for her mother at home or if she wanted to go to a group home. K.F. relocated to a group home in a confidential location.

When K.F.'s mother was released by the police, the mother immediately filed a petition with the court to conserve K.F. K.F.'s service coordinator contacted OCRA. OCRA met with K.F. and reviewed the petition and the accompanying documents. OCRA asked K.F. whether she wanted to be conserved and if she did, did she want her mother to be her conservator. K.F. emphatically stated that she did not want to be conserved. OCRA advised K.F. of the next step in the hearing process and advised K.F. to be vocal about her feelings at the hearing, specifically with the judge.

OCRA also contacted the probate attorney assigned to K.F.'s case and, with K.F.'s permission, revealed that K.F. did not want to be conserved. The attorney stated that K.F. had made her desires to not be conserved very clear and had no doubt that based on K.F.'s testimony the judge would deny the petition. The judge did deny the petition for conservatorship. Anastasia Bacigalupo, CRA, South Central Los Angeles Regional Center.

REGIONAL CENTER

Placement Occurs outside IPP Process.

K.Y. was removed from the only home he ever knew and placed in a new facility without an IPP meeting and against K.Y.'s wishes. The regional center refused to honor K.Y.'s choice as to where he wanted

to live. OCRA provided direct representation at meetings with the regional center. The regional center agreed to transfer K.Y. so he could continue to be with his family. Arthur Lipscomb, CRA, Kay Spencer, Assistant CRA, Nate Navarro, Temporary Assistant CRA, Central Valley Regional Center.

Regional Center to Help E.H. Pursue an SSI Appeal.

E.H. was terminated from SSI benefits and received a Notice of Overpayment. The SSA notice of action stated that E.H. was no longer eligible for SSI based on his disability. OCRA recommended that E.H.'s mother ask the regional center to complete a new protective supervision psychological and medical evaluation to assist E.H. in appealing the SSI termination. The regional center agreed. E.H. can now pursue his SSI appeal. Wendy Dumlao, CRA, Alba Gomez, Assistant CRA, San Diego Regional Center.

Regional Center Agrees to Move Client Back to Her Community of Choice.

Following a series of unfortunate events, B.P. was being held on a temporary hold in a locked facility outside of her home community under the WIC § 6500 statutes. She clearly did not meet the criteria for the 6500 and was being held pending appropriate placement in the community. The regional center felt that B.P. would best be served by moving to Arizona to be with family members. Once B.P. was told of the plans to move her to Arizona, she decompensated further, required hospitalization and subsequently the locked unit at a psychiatric hospital. OCRA was contacted by B.P.'s public defender to assist with the placement process. OCRA met with B.P. and agreed to represent her in the regional center I.P.P. meetings. B.P. wanted to move back to her home community of 30 years to be near her husband. Several I.P.P. meetings were held, a transition plan was developed for services and supports, and the regional center agreed to move B.P. back to her home community just a few minutes away from her husband. The 6500 petition was subsequently dismissed. Kendra McWright, Temporary CRA, Gina Gheno, Assistant CRA, Tri-Counties Regional Center.

Consumer Gets Floor Time Therapy.

A.C.'s mother noticed that A.C., a young boy with Down Syndrome, was not socializing well with his younger sister and other children. A.C. would either completely ignore other children or he would be aggressive. A.C.'s mother contacted the regional center for assistance, which paid for a social skills assessment. The social skills assessment recommended an assessment for Floor Time therapy (FT); however, the regional center refused to provide the assessment, stating it was unnecessary. A.C.'s mother contacted a private psychologist to assess and determine whether A.C. needed FT. The psychologist supported the conclusion that A.C. should be assessed for FT and furthermore, A.C. would benefit from FT.

A.C.'s mother gave the regional center the psychologist's report and asked again for the FT assessment. The regional center issued a notice of action stating that since A.C. did not have autism, he was not appropriate to be assessed for FT since it was only for children with autism. A.C.'s mother appealed and eventually the regional center agreed to perform the FT assessment.

The regional center selected an agency to assess for FT and a behaviorist met with A.C. and his mother for the assessment. The completed FT assessment indicated that A.C. would benefit from FT and recommended FT for 6 hours a week for 6 months. A.C.'s mother contacted the regional center to ask when the FT would start but was told that the request was denied. Soon after, the regional center issued a notice stating that FT was not needed because A.C. was receiving FT at school.

A.C.'s mother contacted OCRA for assistance. OCRA accepted A.C.'s case for direct representation and filed for fair hearing. OCRA attended an informal meeting and began preparation of the witnesses; A.C.'s mother, the private psychologist and the behaviorist who conducted the assessment. OCRA represented A.C. at hearing. Several weeks later, the ALJ issued a decision ordering that the regional center fund the recommended FT program. Anastasia Bacigalupo, CRA, South Central Los Angeles Regional Center.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

School District Agrees to Fund Functional Analysis Assessment.

S.B. is 7 years old. He has autism and significant behavioral challenges. Despite these serious behaviors, the school district recommended a large reduction in ABA behavior intervention services.

OCRA assisted S.B.'s parents to request an independent functional analysis assessment (FAA) due to her disagreement with the district's recommendation to reduce ABA services. After the district refused to honor the parent's request for a specific qualified evaluator, OCRA contacted the district. Shortly thereafter, the district agreed to fund the evaluation as requested by the parents. Rita Defilippis, CRA, Eleanor LoBue, Assistant CRA, San Andreas Regional Center.

Kindergarten Student Remains in Appropriate Placement.

J.B.'s placement had recently been changed from a special day class (SDC) to a general education kindergarten class. He had only been in the class for about a month and J.B.'s mother believed it had been positive except for a few toileting accidents. Unfortunately, at J.B.'s 30-day Individual Education Plan (IEP), the local education agency informed J.B.'s mother that J.B. should be returned to his prior SDC. J.B.'s mother informed the IEP team that she did not agree and contacted OCRA for technical assistance. J.B.'s mother was provided technical assistance to request a 1:1 aide and add a toileting goal to J.B.'s IEP. At the next IEP meeting, the local education agency agreed to all J.B.'s mother's requests. Aimee Delgado, CRA, Marisol Cruz, Assistant CRA, San Gabriel/Pomona Regional Center.

Student Able to Remain in After-School Program with Aide.

A.S. had been attending an after-school program daily for a month but had a few behavioral incidents while attending the program. A.S.'s mother was informed she needed to remove A.S. from the program because of his behaviors. A.S.'s mother contacted OCRA for technical assistance. A.S.'s mother was given assistance to write

a letter to the director of the after-school program asking for an aide for A.S. while attending the program. After receiving the letter, the director of the program informed the mother that an aide would be provided for A.S. Aimee Delgado, CRA, Marisol Cruz, Assistant CRA, San Gabriel/Pomona Regional Center.

J.P. is Provided a 1:1 Bus Aide to Keep Him Safe.

J.P. was in restraints on the school bus to keep J.P. in the seat and to prevent J.P. from aggressive behavior on the way to school. J.P. required an aide on the bus to train J.P. to remain safely in the seat and prevent maladaptive behaviors during the bus ride. OCRA attended several IEP meetings and advocated for an aide to assist J.P. with learning to be safe and independent on the bus. After several IEP meetings and a change in placement, the school district agreed to provide J.P. an aide on the bus. Jacqueline Miller, CRA, Cynthia Salomon, Assistant CRA, Regional Center of Orange County.

School District Agrees to Fund Independent Educational Evaluation.

J.A. is a student with autism and impaired communication skills. He received intensive speech and occupational therapy (O.T.) services through Early Start. Upon beginning special education, the school district reduced J.A.'s speech services to 15 minutes a week. The district did not offer O.T. services and never evaluated the O.T. needs of J.A.

OCRA assisted J.A.'s parent to request an Independent Educational Evaluation (IEE) for speech and a district evaluation for O.T. The district agreed to fund a speech evaluation by the parent's chosen evaluator. The district also agreed to do an O.T. evaluation of J.A. Rita Defilippis, CRA, Eleanor LoBue, Assistant CRA, San Andreas Regional Center.

School District Agrees to Provide Autism Services to A.R.

The school district refused to give special education services to A.R. under the eligibility criteria of autism. A.R. is a consumer of the regional center with a diagnosis of autism. The school district agreed

he was eligible for special education, however, refused to allow him entrance into its special preschool for children with autism. Instead, the district offered A.R. half an hour of speech and language services two times per week. A.R.'s mother contacted OCRA for help. The school district performed new assessments and an IEP meeting was scheduled. OCRA attended the IEP meeting and the school district agreed to extend eligibility to A.R. under the autism criteria and allowed him entrance into its autism pre-school class. Kendra McWright, Temporary CRA, Guadalupe Marquez, Assistant CRA, Lanterman Regional Center.

Student Receives Appropriate Services

N.B. is in elementary school and was told he could no longer ride the school bus due to his behaviors putting him and the other students on the bus in danger. N.B. would not stay in his seat and had on several occasions opened the emergency door of the school bus. In addition, N.B.'s behaviors in the classroom such as undressing, throwing objects at others and eloping from the classroom were preventing him from benefiting from his education to the fullest extent possible and were placing him and others in danger. N.B. was only able to communicate in 2 to 3 word sentences. OCRA attended an IEP and advocated on N.B.'s behalf, which resulted in N.B. receiving a full-time 1:1 aide, as well as a rider to accompany him on the school bus. In addition, N.B. received 10 minutes per week of direct speech services and 40 minutes per month consultation by the speech therapist. Andy Holcombe, CRA, Lorie Atamian, Assistant CRA, Far Northern Regional Center.

Student Gets to Fully Participate in His Education.

E.G. is a 14-year-old student with autism, who is in a special day class. The teacher did not want him in the class anymore and did not want E.G. to participate during the classroom outings due to his aggressive behavior. E.G. has a behavior therapist from a Non-Public Agency (NPA) with him for the entire school day. E.G.'s parents were frustrated because the teacher would call them to pick E.G. up from school each time he had an outburst.

OCRA represented E.G. at an emergency IEP meeting after reviewing his IEP, FAA, and other reports. It was clear that the school and NPA were not working together and they were not implementing the behavior plan as written in the IEP. OCRA requested a new FAA since there were new behaviors and a new location (the outings) and implementation of the current plan in the meantime. The team agreed to give E.G. additional transportation for outings and an O.T. evaluation to determine if sensory issues are affecting his behavior. The next meeting will include preparation for the transition to high school. Katie Meyer, CRA, Luisa Delgadillo, Assistant CRA, Westside Regional Center.

OUTREACH TRAINING

Consumers Learn Self-Advocacy Skills at OCRA Training.

OCRA visited an Arc day program in Stockton for the first time to meet consumers and staff. The program provides assistance in helping consumers achieve life goals and objectives. It focuses on consumer empowerment in making daily decisions, community integration, and learning basic self-advocacy skills.

The goals of the consumers and the program were consistent with the purpose of the OCRA Self-Advocacy BINGO game. Thirteen people plus staff participated in the game using personal communication systems in a room full of good times and laughter. Each consumer won several prizes. Consumers enjoyed the training and agreed that self-advocacy is always a good thing. Filomena Alomar, Assistant CRA, Gail Gresham, Supervising CRA, Valley Mountain Regional Center.

Students in Transition—Planning for Life.

On January 13, 2010, OCRA provided a training session at the Napa Transition Conference put on by Parents Can, a parent-child advocacy agency. The session included over 40 students who were transitioning out of high school. OCRA and community volunteers set up stations around the room to gather information from each student regarding their plans for their future.

The students had a variety of different plans, including plans to be chefs, hairstylists, mechanics, gardeners, as well as texting and hanging out with friends. OCRA organized all of the material so each student would have an individual document outlining his/her plan. The goal was for the student to have the document at the IEP meeting and to be able to participate more fully in advocating for themselves, as well as having fun. Yulahlia Hernandez, CRA, North Bay Regional Center.

F:\DOCS\JEANNE\ADVOCACY REPORT spring may 17 2010.doc

ADVOCACY REPORT

OFFICE OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS ADVOCACY

Summer 2010

BENEFITS

IN HOME SUPPORT SERVICES

OCRA and Parent Work Together to Get IHSS for M.C.

M.C. is a person who was in need of In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS). M.C.'s mother contacted OCRA who provided the mother Disability Rights California's publication, "IHSS Nuts and Bolts." OCRA explained to M.C.'s mother in detail the documents she needed to obtain and what to expect at the in-home assessment.

OCRA also agreed to attend the in-home assessment by the county. The social worker from IHSS failed to show up on time and then questioned the necessity of the CRA's attendance at the in-home assessment. Prior to the assessment, M.C.'s mother had attended an IHSS training that OCRA conducted with a parent support group at the regional center. M.C.'s mother explained that the training was especially useful given the timing of M.C.'s IHSS application. In April, M.C.'s mother contacted CRA to inform her that M.C. had been approved for IHSS, including protective supervision for 195 hours per month. Katie Meyer, Supervising CRA, Jackie S. Chiang, CRA, Jazmin Romero, Assistant CRA, Lanterman Regional Center.

Adult Remains in His Own Home.

J.H. is a young man with mental retardation and some challenging behaviors. His mother applied for protective supervision through IHSS for J.H. since the mother was not able to work anymore due to J.H.'s need for supervision. J.H.'s mother takes care of J.H. full-time and sometimes pays someone to watch him at night so she can sleep. The IHSS social worker found that J.H. needed personal care services and related service and awarded 70 hours per month. The

social worker denied protective supervision. The social worker told the mother to purchase an electric gate out in the back so that J.H. “can’t get out,” and to make other “environmental modifications.”

The Assistant CRA helped the mother in filing for hearing, understanding the IHSS program and protective supervision, and completing the self-assessment packet. OCRA provided technical assistance to help the mother during her meeting with the appeals specialist from the county and prepare documents for hearing. After negotiating with the appeals specialist, the county awarded protective supervision and the client was able to avoid a hearing. Luisa Delgadillo, Assistant CRA, Westside Regional Center.

IHSS Denial Reconsidered on Appeal.

G.P. is a non-verbal 9-year-old consumer who applied for IHSS, including protective supervision, in July, 2009. G.P.’s family speaks Spanish only. The application was lost by the county, and then the denial was mailed to an incorrect address. The family finally received the denial notice on January 10, 2010, and filed an appeal.

A regional center-funded interpreter contacted OCRA for help. OCRA researched the details of eligibility and advised the parent to appeal. OCRA contacted the county appeals specialist who indicated the denial was based on the fact that the consumer was at school when the original assessment/home visit occurred. The county representative also stated there could be no IHSS eligibility because there had been no benefits application filed for Supplemental Security Income (SSI).

The county agreed to a conditional withdrawal and a new assessment after OCRA contacted it indicating that the application was only for IHSS. OCRA assisted in gathering documents regarding the consumer’s disabilities. The case is currently pending a disability determination from the state agency regarding the IHSS application. Doug Harris, CRA, Redwood Coast Regional Center.

County's Attempt to Stop Authorized Representative Fails.

C.M. is a consumer at one regional center but was recently placed in the catchment area of another. C.M. needs around the clock supervision so a regional center vendor applied for protective supervision from IHSS on C.M.'s behalf.

The county challenged the validity of the executed Authorized Representative Form, saying that if C.M. had the capacity to sign an Authorized Representative Form it meant that C.M. did not need protective supervision. The county also alleged that the vendor had a conflict of interest in representing C.M. at the hearing.

The county asked the ALJ to bifurcate the hearing with the issue of capacity to sign the Authorized Representative Form heard first and apart from the merits of the claim. The vendor contacted OCRA. OCRA explained that there is a legal presumption that C.M. had the capacity to sign the Authorized Representative Form.

OCRA later assisted the vendor in getting the regional center to take a leading role in advocating for C.M. C.M. is expected to get the IHSS protective supervision hours to which he is entitled. Jim Stoepler, CRA, Redwood Coast Regional Center.

T.B.'s IHSS and In-Home Nursing Services Are Restored.

T.B. is a young adult with significant developmental and physical disabilities. T.B. receives 283 hours of IHSS per month in addition to 124 hours of nursing provided by Medi-Cal. OCRA was contacted by T.B.'s mother and care provider when she received a notice that T.B.'s services were being suspended because of an ongoing fraud investigation. At the time she contacted OCRA, T.B.'s mother had not received payment from IHSS or Medi-Cal in over 2 months. T.B.'s mother was worried that she would not be able to keep her son living safely in the home much longer.

Because it was clear that immediate action was necessary, OCRA contacted the IHSS program director to request her intervention. After several discussions with the IHSS program

director, OCRA was able to ensure that T.B.'s services were restored and that T.B.'s care provider was paid for all of the services rendered. Anna Leach-Proffer, CRA, Celeste Palmer, Associate CRA, Regional Center of the East Bay.

Q.N.'s IHSS Eligibility is Re-instated.

Q.N. is a teen-ager with autism who had been receiving 50.4 hours IHSS services. Q.N.'s mother received a notice of action from the Department of Social Services informing her that Q.N.'s IHSS services would be terminated as of November 1, 2009, due to the termination of Q.N.'s Medi-Cal services. Q.N.'s Medi-Cal had never been correctly terminated but the county failed to correct the mistake after several attempts from Q.N.'s mother to resolve the issue.

Q.N.'s mother contacted OCRA for assistance and OCRA helped Q.N.'s mother file for hearing, and agreed to attempt to settle the matter. After several calls to both the county hearing specialist and the IHSS local office supervisor, Q.N.'s IHSS eligibility was re-instated retroactive back to November 1, 2009. Veronica Cervantes, CRA, Beatriz A. Reyes, Assistant CRA, Inland Regional Center.

L.A. Awarded Protective Supervision Hours.

L.A. is a young adult with cerebral palsy and intellectual disability. L.A. applied for IHSS on July 8, 2009. After conducting an assessment, the county authorized 141.2 hours per month of IHSS. Although L.A.'s mother/conservator requested protective supervision hours, the county denied it based on its conclusion that L.A. is not mobile and that L.A.'s mental functioning in the areas of memory, orientation, and judgment is high. At hearing, the CRA provided evidence to the contrary. The ALJ concluded that L.A. is entitled to protective supervision based on the finding that he is able to crawl, lift himself up, and able to move around in a walker. The ALJ also concluded that L.A. is non-self directing, confused, and his mental functions are severely impaired, finding L. A. would be correctly ranked at the highest level of need in the categories of memory, orientation, and judgment. The county was ordered to rescind its denial of protective supervision and authorize 283 IHSS hours per month and provide retroactive benefits effective July 8, 2009.

Veronica Cervantes, CRA, Beatriz A. Reyes, Assistant CRA, Inland Regional Center.

IHSS Granted.

G.F.'s mother was denied IHSS for her son over the phone so G.F.'s mother contacted OCRA for assistance. The Assistant CRA explained the IHSS eligibility and application process. Since G.F.'s mother had not received a written notice for the denial, the Assistant CRA suggested that G.F.'s mother contact a supervisor to request a written notice of denial. Once G.F.'s mother spoke to the supervisor, a meeting was arranged for G.F. to have an evaluation. G.F.'s mother contacted OCRA once again to prepare for the evaluation. The CRA met with G.F.'s mother and explained how to complete the self assessment chart and prepared her for the meeting. G.F.'s mother was successful in obtaining the maximum number of hours of IHSS to which G.F. was entitled. Marisol Cruz, Assistant CRA, Aimee Delgado, CRA, San Gabriel/Pomona Regional Center.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Benefit Cessation Overturned.

T.F. had been receiving Supplemental Security Income (SSI) for over ten years but when she turned 18, the Social Security Administration (SSA) determined that T.F. was no longer disabled and issued a disability cessation letter. With the help of her mother, T.F. filed for reconsideration but the cessation determination was upheld by the Hearing Officer who heard the reconsideration request.

T.F. contacted OCRA requesting assistance. OCRA agreed to represent and funded a psychological assessment. The assessment found T.F. to be highly distractible and unable to sustain a pace that allowed her to engage in Substantial Gainful Activity (SGA). This assessment along with the testimony of T.F., her independent living skills instructor, and her mother, was presented at hearing.

At hearing, the CRA requested that T.F. be excused from the hearing room after she testified on her own behalf. T.F.'s mother then testified freely about T.F.'s limitations and prior work experience.

Ultimately, based on the mother's testimony that T.F. was unable to sustain a satisfactory pace in a work situation, the vocational expert determined that T.F. was unable to work, even in an unskilled repetitive job. The ALJ issued a favorable decision and T.F.'s benefits were reinstated. Matt Pope, CRA, Eastern Los Angeles Regional Center.

\$75,000 Social Security Overpayment Waived.

M.M. started working at a home repair store with a supportive employment agency. He was receiving Social Security. M.M. thought the supported employment agency was reporting his wages to the SSA. The agency failed to report the wages. M.M. received a notice stating that he had a \$75,000 overpayment from the SSA.

M.M. contacted OCRA. OCRA investigated the issue and represented M.M. at a hearing. OCRA argued that M.M. was without fault because the supported employment agency should have been reporting the wages. The ALJ agreed that M.M. was without fault and that repayment of the money would be an undue hardship. The \$75,000 overpayment was waived.

OCRA is now working with the regional center to educate service coordinators on the importance of identifying in the IPP which agency will assist the client in reporting wages to SSA. Yulahlia Hernandez, CRA, Annie Breuer, Assistant CRA, North Bay Regional Center.

OCRA Supports Consumer and Family in SSI Overpayment Case.

A.K. is a minor who had been attending a residential school for several years. At one point, A.K.'s parents received a letter from the SSA stating that A.K. was not a California resident and therefore had an overpayment.

A.K.'s parents contacted the SSA and were given information implying that this issue would be resolved. Several years later, the parents received another letter about the same overpayment. They filed a Request for Reconsideration and Waiver. After not hearing anything from SSA, they assumed again that the issue had been

resolved. Then the parents received another notice regarding the overpayment and asked OCRA to intervene.

OCRA filed new papers. After many months of procedural issues, OCRA represented at hearing. A.K. prevailed and the overpayment was waived. Katy Lusson, CRA, Trina Saldana, Assistant CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

Student Maintains Public Benefits.

A.N. is a high school student who gets paid for his work training classes. The SSA redetermined A.N.'s eligibility and decreased his benefits due to his income. OCRA went with A.K. to the SSA and explained that A.K.'s income did not count because he was a student. The outcome of the meeting was favorable and A.K.'s benefits were increased due to recalculation. Katy Lusson, CRA, Trina Saldana, Assistant CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

MEDI-CAL

M.A. Regains Zero-Share of Cost Medi-Cal.

M.A. is a regional center client who recently began receiving Social Security benefits on her deceased father's earnings account as a Disabled Adult Child (DAC) recipient. OCRA was contacted by M.A.'s supported living provider because he was concerned about M.A.'s notice of a \$610 Medi-Cal share of cost (SOC). M.F. needs her entire benefit amount to continue living safely in her own apartment with supported living services.

For several years, OCRA has worked hard to ensure that recipients of "Disabled Adult Child" or DAC benefits get the zero-share of cost Medi-Cal to which they are entitled. Consumers who lose financial eligibility for SSI because of an increase in DAC are treated for Medi-Cal purposes as if they still received SSI.

In this case, OCRA appealed the notice of action assigning a SOC and was able to get the county to review M.A.'s file and correctly assign her a zero SOC without going to hearing. Anna Leach-Proffer,

CRA, Celeste Palmer, Associate CRA, Regional Center of the East Bay.

L.R. Can Now Communicate with Other People.

L.R. is unable to verbally communicate due to his cerebral palsy, but is able to use a pinky finger to operate a speech generating device. L.R. had an older device that was no longer working, and L.R. was not able to communicate with anyone. L.R. obtained an assessment from a speech expert, and requested the device recommended by the expert. L.R. was denied a communication device from Medi-Cal.

L.R. appealed the denial. OCRA assisted L.R. in preparing for hearing, and worked with the speech expert to provide a position statement and expert testimony. The ALJ ordered the county to provide a speech generating device assessment. A few months later, the county conducted a cognitive assessment. The speech therapist wrote a letter to the county demanding an explanation as to why it had conducted a cognitive assessment and had not complied with the ALJ's order to conduct the speech generating device evaluation. The Director of Medi-Cal reviewed the case and approved the speech generating device. L.R. is now able to communicate. Jacqueline Miller, CRA, Cynthia Salomon, Assistant CRA, Regional Center of Orange County.

C.E. Will Keep Her Zero-Share of Cost Medi-Cal.

C.E. is an adult who lives with her mother and sister. C.E. had received Medi-Cal coverage under the HCBS waiver program as a child. When C.E. turned 18, she was taken off the waiver program and received a notice of action from Medi-Cal stating that her medical coverage would have a share-of-cost due to the Medi-Cal Family Budget Unit (MFBU) of 3 and the family going over the income limit for zero share-of-cost. C.E.'s mother appealed immediately to preserve C.E.'s aid paid pending rights. C.E.'s mother then contacted OCRA for assistance. After reviewing the file, the Assistant CRA agreed to attempt to negotiate with the county hearing specialist. The Assistant CRA argued that C.E. is eligible to be her own MFBU of one since C.E.'s mother agreed not to claim C.E. as a dependent on her income taxes. As a MFBU of one, C.E. would then

meet the income limits for zero-share of cost Medi-Cal. Also, Medi-Cal failed to acknowledge in its file that C.E. is a person with a disability (PWD) and, therefore, had her under the wrong service code and never conducted a disability determination. After providing that information to the hearing specialist, the hearing specialist offered a conditional withdrawal remanding the file back to the county for corrections and informed the county that C.E. is eligible for zero share-of-cost Medi-Cal. Veronica Cervantes, CRA, Beatriz A. Reyes, Assistant CRA, Inland Regional Center.

CONSUMER FINANCE

Court Dismisses County Hospital Claims against J/Z.

J.Z. is a young man diagnosed with mild mental retardation. J.Z. was hospitalized for pneumonia in May, 2006. Neither the hospital social worker nor the regional center case manager assisted the family in completing the necessary Medi-Cal application to acquire coverage to pay for J.Z.'s county hospital medical services.

In January, 2010, the county filed a lawsuit to recover unpaid medical expenses in the amount of \$28,586.49. OCRA investigated the case and confirmed that J.Z. was receiving SSI and Medi-Cal. He had no other source of income and no assets.

OCRA filed an answer to the complaint and advocated for the county to dismiss the case and take no further action against J.Z. The claims made by the county hospital were subsequently dismissed. Gail Gresham, Supervising CRA, Sacramento, Leinani Walter, CRA, Filomena Alomar, Assistant CRA.

EARLY INTERVENTION

Toddler Prevails in OAH Administrative Hearing.

R.E. is a two-year-old with Downs Syndrome. She was receiving O.T., P.T., and Speech and Language services as part of her Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP.) Her parents were notified by the regional center that due to changes in the law, private insurance

would have to be used before the regional center could continue to pay for R.E.'s services. The parents contacted their insurance and were told that there would be a large deductible and co-pay.

OCRA was contacted and agreed to represent the toddler at an administrative hearing. The ALJ determined that a family could not "use" their private insurance until it had exhausted the deductible, which this family had not yet done. Therefore, the regional center was responsible until that time. The ALJ noted that until the deductible was reached, the issue of co-pays could not be considered. Katy Lusson, CRA, Trina Saldana, Assistant CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

HOUSING

Foster Placement Remains Secure.

B.O. had lived in the same foster home since birth. He was an integral member of the family and wanted to remain with it. B.O. had changed school placements several times due to behavioral issues and was presently in a stable non-public school placement. His psychiatrist notified the regional center that B.O. needed an increased level of supervision and needed to be moved. Both his foster family and the regional center were opposed to moving B.O. away from his family and school. B.O. contacted OCRA and asked for assistance.

OCRA scheduled a meeting with the school, regional center, foster family, county mental health agency, and other support services involved with B.O. At the meeting, the psychiatrist stated that she thought B.O. should be put on a 6500 and moved. OCRA and the regional center argued that B.O. did not meet any criteria for a 6500, that the regional center would not initiate a 6500, and that if B.O. needed increased supports, they would be provided.

B.O.'s foster mother stated that B.O. did not have behavioral issues at home and that he was considered a member of the family. In fact, one of the foster mother's children wanted B.O. to live with her family when his foster mother was no longer able to care for B.O. As a result of the meeting, B.O. was given a new psychiatrist and his

placement remains secure. Katy Lusson, CRA, Trina Saldana, Assistant CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

Consumer Moves from Developmental Center.

J.D., after living for 15 years at Porterville Developmental Center (PDC), wanted to know what life was like in the community. He did not want his cerebral palsy and medical issues to interfere with living in a real home.

As a direct result of the continued advocacy of OCRA, J.D. is now out of PDC. J.D. is currently living in a “962 Home,” which are homes that provide special medical services in the community. J.D. has continuous nursing services at his new home, including tracheotomy care, g-tube care, specialized bathing equipment, and numerous other supports. Mario Espinoza, CRA, Valerie Geary, Assistant CRA, Kern Regional Center.

PERSONAL AUTONOMY

Reasonable Accommodation for Credentialing Exam.

K.I. is 43-years old, and a regional center consumer with cerebral palsy. K.I. took the California Basic Educational Skills Test (C-BEST) several times in an attempt to become credentialed as a teacher. K.I.’s education was being funded through the Social Security PASS program, but he was running out of time to complete his program of study. K.I. was unable to complete the test without an accommodation to allow him extra time to take the test. He also needed assistance to physically perform the test in the time allowed due to his disability. K.I. contacted OCRA after his request to use his adapted computer with “Math Talk” and “Dragon Speak” was denied. The accommodation of a scribe was offered, but did not work out due to the time limitations and the physical demands of taking the test.

OCRA assisted K.I. with submitting a reasonable accommodation request to challenge the denial of voice recognition software. With OCRA’s technical assistance, K.I. was able to successfully advocate for himself and get the reasonable accommodations he needed to

take the C-BEST exam, and proceed with his education plan. Andy Holcombe, CRA, Far Northern Regional Center.

Discharge Plan from a Nursing Facility to Community Placement Is Secured.

S.H. is a non-conserved adult with cerebral palsy who uses a wheelchair and is non-verbal. S.H. has been living in a skilled nursing facility due to the insertion of a J tube. Although he is non-verbal, S.H. uses sign language to communicate “yes” and “no”. He is able to communicate his wants and needs when asked.

S.H.’s mother contacted OCRA on S.H.’s behalf, due to concerns she had regarding him living in a nursing facility. When the CRA met with S.H. he communicated that he wanted to live with people his own age. OCRA contacted the regional center, S.H.’s parents and the nursing facility administration and requested a meeting to draft a discharge plan. OCRA advocated for a discharge plan with objectives that would move S.H. into a less restrictive environment. The ultimate objective of the discharge plan is to transition S.H. into an ICF-DDN and then into a small group home that has intermittent nursing care. Wendy Dumlao, CRA, Alba Gomez, Assistant CRA, San Diego Regional Center.

T.O. Advocates for His Right to Choose Where He Lives.

A regional center service coordinator contacted OCRA because the service coordinator was concerned that T.O. was being coerced to move by his family. T.O. is a male with intellectual disabilities and is deaf. His family knows ASL and has been a good support system to him for many years. But, more recently the family decided to move to Maine and wanted T.O. to go with them.

T.O. began expressing to his care provider that he did not want to move. T.O. asked her to tell his family to stop asking him to move. OCRA met with T.O. with an ASL interpreter to explain to T.O. his personal rights. During the meeting, T.O. expressed he did not want to move to Maine. T.O. asked OCRA to tell his family to stop asking him to move.

OCRA requested a meeting with T.O., the regional center, T.O.'s care provider and his family. During this meeting, the CRA explained to everyone that T.O. cared very much for his family but did not want to move with them to Maine.

A month later, T.O.'s family contacted OCRA to explain that T.O. changed his mind. OCRA met with T.O. again and he explained again that he did not want to move. He explained that he told his family he did, because they cried and made him feel bad. The CRA explained to T.O. his rights again. OCRA then mailed a letter to everyone involved explaining that T.O. has made his decision not to move and that this decision must be respected. Wendy Dumlao, CRA, Alba Gomez, Assistant CRA, San Diego Regional Center.

Conservatorship Petition Dismissed.

P.J. was an adult living in her family home and was afraid all the time. She had endured many types of abuse. She was denied the right to use the phone, to dress in private, and sometimes even denied food. P.J. finally got the courage to speak out when she found her family was petitioning to have her conserved. P.J. contacted OCRA.

P.J. was able to move from her home to a safe environment. OCRA provided technical assistance to the Public Defender representing P.J. in the conservatorship case. The conservatorship petition was denied. Yulahlia Hernandez, CRA, Annie Breuer, Assistant CRA, North Bay Regional Center.

REGIONAL CENTER

M.C. Receives Needed Services and Is Re-Admitted to His Day Program.

M.C. was re-admitted to his day program after being indefinitely suspended for inappropriate sexual behavior. The day program staff and OCRA worked together with the regional center to determine what services M.C. would need before he was able to return to the program.

OCRA attended meetings and negotiated with the regional center and the day program administration to ensure M.C. was provided with the services needed to understand his feelings and control his behaviors. After negotiations, the regional center agreed to provide M.C. with sexuality training and 1:1 behavior services to teach M.C. the skills needed to be successful in the community and his program. Katie Hornberger, Supervising CRA, Kendra McWright, CRA, Abigail Perez, Assistant CRA, Harbor Regional Center.

Increased Respite Approved.

S.C. has intellectual disabilities and autism. He resides with his mother. Because of his behavior problems, S.C.'s day program could no longer provide adequate services and keep other consumers safe, so S.C. was removed from his day program. In addition, S.C.'s maternal grandfather is 90 and has health problems and S.C.'s mother had to go to Arizona to care for her father.

In July, 2009, the California legislature reduced in-home respite to 90 hours per quarter, unless someone met an exemption. S.C. mother/conservator was notified that respite would be reduced from 120 hours per quarter to 90 hours per quarter. She repeatedly asked the service coordinator if there was an exception and was told there were no exceptions.

The regional center issued a notice of action reducing respite and stated that there would be no aid paid pending because the mother had agreed to the reduction of respite. S.C. requested help from OCRA.

OCRA filed a Fair Hearing Request and a Motion for Aid Paid Pending with the Office of Administrative Hearings. The regional center opposed the motion claiming that the regional center had no duty to notify S.C. of the exemptions to the new law or the right to a Fair Hearing. The Hearing Officer ruled: "Whether or not claimant's mother may have orally agreed to the reduction of claimant's respite hours during the telephone calls, any such consent cannot be deemed to be informed or valid in the absence of an explanation of section 4686.5's exemption criteria or claimant's due process rights to challenge RC's determination that the exemption criteria did not apply

to claimant. The information that was provided to claimant's mother was inadequate and cannot be relied upon as a basis for denying claimant aid paid pending. 120 hours of respite per quarter is awarded during pendency of proceeding.”

S.C.'s respite was immediately restored to 120 hours and the regional center agreed to continue providing this amount of respite until S.C. agreed to modify his IPP or the regional center issued a notice of action. Jackie Coleman, CRA, Elizabeth Kennedy, Temporary Assistant CRA, Alta California Regional Center.

Extraordinary Circumstance Necessitates Increased Respite.

A.A. is 10 years old. She currently lives with her mother and sisters who are 27 and 16. A.A.'s father works out of state and spends minimal time with this family. Both of A.A.'s sisters have been diagnosed with cancer. The oldest sister is in the late stages of cancer with little hope for survival. The middle sister was recently diagnosed. The mother contacted the regional center service coordinator to request additional respite hours as A.A. was having difficulty as her mother has less time to spend with her given the increased needs of her other children. The services coordinator did not respond.

The mother contacted OCRA and requested assistance obtaining more respite. The Assistant CRA contacted the supervisor and arranged an IPP meeting. By the end of the meeting, the regional center agreed to provide 6 hours per day of respite as an exception to the 90 hours per quarter cap. Lucy Garcia, Assistant CRA, Eastern Los Angeles Regional Center.

R. G. Keeps His Respite Hours.

R.G. is a minor male who lives with his parents and requires total care due to his disability as a result of an accidental asphyxiation when he was younger. R.G. was receiving 68 hours per month of LVN respite funded by the regional center, and it proposed to reduce his respite to 30 hours a month, as a result of the recent trailer bill changes in the law. The mother appealed and contacted OCRA for assistance. The Assistant CRA agreed to review the case and

represent at an informal hearing. At the informal hearing, the Assistant CRA discussed R.G.'s need for the additional hours. The regional center agreed to settle the matter by reinstating the 68 hours of respite pending the exploration and approval, if possible, of generic resources such as IHSS and Medi-Cal EPSDT services. Veronica Cervantes, CRA, Beatriz A. Reyes, Assistant CRA, Inland Regional Center.

Regional Center Agrees to Provide Supportive Living Assessments.

After fourteen years of living in the same home, C.M. had to move to an Intermediate Care Facility (ICF) on a temporary basis because the group home in which C.M. lived closed. C.M. did not like the ICF and wanted to continue living with her group home roommates. Before she moved out of the group home, OCRA agreed to represent C.M. at an IPP meeting to request a supported living assessment. At the IPP meeting, the regional center agreed to provide C.M. with three assessments from supported living vendors. After agreeing to the assessments, the regional center decided it needed to have a Person Centered Planning meeting to better determine what C.M.'s choices and preferences were in the community. OCRA represented C.M. at the Person Centered Planning meeting in which she expressed that when she moved into her own supported living apartment, C.M. wanted to continue living close to her father so she could visit him. She also stated that she wanted to continue attending the same day program she had been going to for many years. Additionally she stated her desire to plan menus, go grocery shopping and take trips to the local shopping mall. C.M. has now been assessed by two supported living vendors. OCRA and the regional center will be working together with C.M. to determine which vendor can best provide the appropriate services to meet her needs in a supported living setting. Kathy Mottarella, CRA, Gina Gheno Assistant CRA, Tri-Counties Regional Center.

OCRA Advocates for Supported Living Services.

Y.C. had been living in a Level-4 Group Home. She requested supported living services and wanted to move to an apartment where all of the residents receive supported living services. The regional

center notified her that the move was not cost effective and could not be approved.

OCRA assisted Y.C. in filing a hearing request. OCRA and the regional center began negotiations before the informal meeting while the regional center reviewed the cost. Y.C. was notified that the issue had been resolved and that she would be able to move to the apartment she had requested. Katy Lusson, CRA, Trina Saldana, Assistant CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

B.M. Becomes Eligible for Regional Center Services Based on Autism.

B.M. is a 15-year-old boy who had been denied regional center eligibility twice before. The previous denials were based on the regional center's psychologist's determination that B.M. only exhibited characteristics consistent with mild Pervasive Developmental Disorder (PDD) rather than autism. The regional center pointed to B.M.'s higher cognitive ability and functioning, his mental health issues including anxiety and depression coupled with B.M.'s apparent normal speech development.

In addition, throughout his development, B.M. had been diagnosed with PDD and/or Aspergers syndrome, all of which are considered to be in the autism spectrum, which the regional center argued were not qualifying conditions for regional center eligibility. OCRA agreed to represent B.M. at hearing. The parent obtained an independent psychological evaluation which concluded that B.M. was autistic.

To further corroborate the psychologist's conclusions, OCRA also obtained an independent speech and language evaluation which found that although B.M. had a functional communication system and was able to create sentences which conformed to adult rules of grammar, B.M. had significant deficits in the area of pragmatic language. Pragmatics refers to B.M.'s ability to use language appropriately especially in the ability to engage in reciprocal social conversations. In ruling in B.M.'s favor, the ALJ concluded that B.M. was substantially disabled by autism and qualified for regional center services. Ibrahim Saab, CRA, Ada Hamer, Assistant CRA, North Los Angeles County Regional Center.

Two Brothers Found Eligible for Regional Center Services.

R.C. and M.C., brothers, were denied regional center eligibility twice by regional center psychologists even though the results of their testing placed them within the range of mental retardation. Both boys qualified for special education services as students with intellectual disabilities since the age of 3. Both boys had recently been adopted and their adoptive parent contacted OCRA for assistance with the boys' regional center eligibility.

Based on a review of all documentation related to both boys, OCRA contacted the last psychologist who had assessed the boys in the foster care system. The psychologist agreed to reexamine her assessment and review the assessments from the regional center psychologists. She wrote new assessments which concluded that both boys should be eligible under the category of mental retardation. OCRA submitted the boys' records to the regional center for a new eligibility determination. Although the regional center initially denied eligibility, after OCRA filed an appeal and attended the informal meeting with the adoptive parent, the regional center reversed its decision and made both boys eligible. Anastasia Bacigalupo, CRA, South Central Los Angeles Regional Center.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

P.K. Obtains Needed Special Education Supports.

P.K. is a 9-year-old boy with autism. His mother requested assistance from OCRA for an Independent Education Program (IEP) meeting as her son was having behavioral problems. She believed that the district was ignoring P.K.'s sensory needs which lead to his behavioral problems. OCRA represented P.K. at the IEP meeting. The district agreed to document the need for sensory related services and incorporated a special diet into the IEP. They also agreed to provide speech therapy services during the Extended School Year for the purpose of addressing P.K.'s need to continue developing his social skills. The IEP team revised the behavior support plan and edited the student goals to be more measurable. P.K.'s supports are

much more appropriate following the IEP. Rita Defilippis, CRA, Eleanor LoBue, Assistant CRA, San Andreas Regional Center.

OCRA Secures IEP Support Services.

C.G. has autism and has always done well academically in school. His parents contacted OCRA after the school contacted the police and had C.G. arrested because he made sexual gestures and patted a female student on the buttocks. Despite the fact that C.G. had a history of acting in a sexually inappropriate manner, his behavior plan only dealt with him making excessively loud noises in class.

After his arrest and suspension, the school offered to do a Functional Behavioral Analysis (FBA), rather than the more precise and in-depth state standard, of a Functional Analysis Assessment (FAA). The school also recommended changing C.G.'s placement to home schooling. Additionally C.G. was being bullied at school on a daily basis and the school was making no attempt to stop the bullying, despite having knowledge that it was taking place.

OCRA provided direct representation at three IEP meetings over a four month period. Because English was a second language for C.G.'s mom, OCRA requested and the school provided a Spanish interpreter at the IEP meetings. After attending the first IEP meeting on C.G.'s behalf, OCRA also got the school to provide an independent facilitator at all of C.G.'s IEP meetings.

OCRA negotiated a settlement agreement whereby the school agreed to fund the parents' choice of an independent psychologist to act as the Behavior Intervention Case Manager who would oversee an FAA and develop a Positive Behavior Intervention Support Plan for C.G. OCRA's advocacy also resulted in the school providing counseling services, a full-time 1:1 aide so that C.G. could continue to be educated in a mainstream classroom, and an extensive school-wide plan to address the bullying issues. Lorie Atamian, Assistant CRA, Far Northern Regional Center.

District Agreed to Permit County Student to Participate in High School Graduation Ceremony.

B.R. was a special education student on a certificate of completion track in the County Educational program. B.R. was a senior. His twin brother was also in special education as a student on a certificate of completion track in the district special education program. Both students attend school on the same high school campus. B.R.'s twin received a cap and gown to participate in the graduation ceremony. However, B.R. was excluded from the graduation ceremony due to the Office of County Education's policy. OCRA contacted the principal of the high school, who agreed to allow B.R. to participate in the high school graduation ceremony with his brother. Rita Defilippis, CRA, San Andreas Regional Center.

K.D. Gets Appropriate IEP.

K.D.'s mother knew something was not right with her son's educational services. K.D., who is 9-years-old and has an autism spectrum disorder and intellectual disabilities, was not meeting his IEP goals and did not seem to have any support from the school.

OCRA reviewed all of K.D.'s records and sent a request to the district to obtain assessments in many educational areas of suspected need. After one IEP meeting, but before the assessments were completed, OCRA was able to get the district to agree to offer K.D. extended school year, which the district had denied in the past. The district completed the assessments and held another IEP.

K.D. was able to get 60 minutes per week of speech therapy and a more appropriate placement in general education with resource support for next year. K.D.'s mother and OCRA participated in writing more appropriate goals for his education next year, and K.D. was able to select the teacher for next year who would work best to meet K.D.'s needs. Katie Meyer, CRA, Westside Regional Center.

School District Withdraws Complaint against G.R.

G.R.'s mother was informed by the translator at the triennial IEP that she was not able to translate everything that was being said. G.R.'s

mother signed G.R.'s IEP without understanding what was on the document. When G.R.'s mother realized that G.R.'s 1:1 aide had been taken out of the classroom, the mother requested a meeting to revoke her consent to the IEP. When G.R.'s mother told the school district G.R. required the 1:1 aide, the school district filed a Due Process Hearing against G.R. G.R.'s mother contacted OCRA and requested assistance. OCRA agreed to represent G.R. at mediation after OCRA reviewed the IEP and noticed that assessments had not been conducted for the triennial IEP or before the District removed the 1:1 aide. The ALJ failed to appear for the mediation. At an informal meeting, OCRA was able to convince the school district to withdraw its complaint as well as provide the needed assessments that had not been done. G.R. will now be given the opportunity to be fully assessed, continue his 1:1 aide, and to participate with his class once again. Jacqueline Miller, CRA, Cynthia Salomon, Assistant CRA, Regional Center of Orange County.

Student Gets Appropriate Behavior Assessment.

J.P.'s mother contacted OCRA for assistance as J.P. often has difficulty demonstrating appropriate behavior during school. OCRA represented J.P. at four IEPs during May-June 2010. Due to the District's failure to appropriately address J.P.'s continuous, serious behavior, a non-public agency (NPA) FAA was requested. The District offered a FAA provided by school staff. OCRA made a written request for Informal Dispute Resolution (IDR) on behalf of the student to resolve the provision of the FAA by school staff or a NPA. The District considered the information and rationale offered by OCRA in the IDR request and subsequently agreed to provide J.P.'s parent an assessment plan, fund a non-public agency (NPA) FAA in September, 2010, and hold an implementation IEP meeting by December 17, 2010. Christine Armand, Associate CRA, South Central Los Angeles Regional Center.

School District Hires Outside Agency to Train Staff.

M.C.'s parents had concerns regarding his treatment at school after he was found unattended. The parents were concerned about the teacher and aide's lack of training and ability to work with a child with

autism. After many efforts to work with the school, M.C.'s parents contacted OCRA.

OCRA provided direct representation at IEP meetings. OCRA negotiated a settlement agreement whereby the district agreed to fund the parents' choice of an outside applied behavior analysis (ABA) agency for 20 hours to train M.C.'s teacher and classroom aide. Arthur Lipscomb, CRA, Kay Spencer, Assistant CRA, Nate Navarro, Assistant CRA, Central Valley Regional Center.

OCRA Prevents Expulsion and Assists with Appropriate Placement.

R.P. was being expelled from school. OCRA represented at the manifestation determination meeting, which is the IEP meeting held to determine if a student is being expelled due to behavior associated with a disability. As a result of advocacy efforts, the school district agreed that R.P.'s behavior was a product of his disability.

OCRA was contacted to represent at a second IEP to discuss placement. R.P.'s parents wanted his placement changed since he was at a school for emotionally disturbed children. The district agreed to transfer R.P. to a special day class on a general education campus and to continue all of R.P.'s services on the new campus. Arthur Lipscomb, CRA, Kay Spencer, Assistant CRA, Nate Navarro, Assistant CRA, Central Valley Regional Center.

IEP Support Services Obtained to Stop Bullying.

C.M. is a 13-year-old boy with autism and learning disabilities who attends junior high school. C.M. was bullied with verbal and physical assaults by peers during school for several months. As a result, C.M. had severe anxiety and was fearful of returning to school. C.M. received psychiatric treatment and even wanted to quit school and be home-schooled.

OCRA represented C.M. at an IEP meeting. OCRA advised the school of its responsibility to keep C.M. safe while in school and to ensure that C.M. was getting a free and appropriate public education. C.M.'s IEP goals and general education schedule were revised to

provide him support services throughout the day to ensure that C.M. was receiving an appropriate program. C.M.'s parents were provided with the school principal's home phone number so all alleged bullying incidents could be immediately and directly reported to him so that he could take prompt and appropriate action.

Both counseling and behavior services and supports were included in the IEP to increase C.M.'s social skills and improve his self-esteem. In addition, the school staff agreed to identify peers to "buddy-up" with C.M. to provide natural supports during the school day and to add sensitivity training to the classroom curriculum. It was agreed that the resource program in the fall would include a counselor and psychologist for C.M. to access regularly. C.M. was given a choice of social/peer groups so he could remain included in campus activities and expand his social network. Leinani A. Walter, CRA, Valley Mountain Regional Center.

Further Suspensions Prevented.

OCRA was contacted because L.J. was constantly being suspended from school. OCRA provided direct representation at three IEP team meetings. The school district agreed that L.J.'s behavior was related to his disability. The school district agreed to assess L.J. and to develop a behavior plan. The district also agreed to provide L.J. with a shadow aide. Arthur Lipscomb, CRA, Kay Spencer, Assistant CRA, Nate Navarro, Assistant CRA, Central Valley Regional Center.

OCRA Advocates for Special Education Services in Rural Area.

The school district in a rural area of California was not addressing or meeting the needs of J.R. J.R.'s mother believed that his health and safety were at risk because of the school district's failure to provide adequate care and supervision. OCRA represented J.R. at multiple IEP meetings along with his Spanish-speaking mother.

J.R. has a complex neurological condition that can interfere with brain and spinal cord function. He also has a feeding tube that was surgically implanted. Both conditions require intensive monitoring and intervention by trained staff.

As a result of OCRA advocacy efforts, the school district agreed to provide J.R. with a CPR certified 1:1 aide and a nurse who could properly manage the J-tube. The district also agreed to conduct a functional behavior analysis to address J.R.'s behaviors in the classroom and to fund a program to improve J.R.'s reading and comprehension skills. Mario Espinoza, CRA, Valerie Geary, Assistant CRA, Ana Pelayo, Administrative Assistant.

Student Gets 1:1 Aide, New Classroom, and Counseling Services to Stop Effects of Harassment.

M.C. was a student in a transition program at her local high school. She began complaining that one of the aides in her class was harassing her. She began having problems sleeping, complained of physical symptoms, and refused to go to school. Her mother attempted on several occasions to meet with school personnel in order to discuss this issue. Nothing was resolved in the meetings.

OCRA was asked to attend an emergency meeting to discuss placement. At the meeting, the district offered to place M.C. in another classroom, to instruct the offending aide not to communicate with M.C., to provide a 1:1 aide during the transitional period, and to provide counseling services for M.C. The district further agreed to look for a 1:1 so that this transfer could take place during the extended school year. Katy Lusson, CRA, Trina Saldana, Assistant CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

OUTREACH/ TRAINING

OCRA Self-Advocacy Training Is Ongoing.

OCRA presented a training at an Arc day program in San Joaquin. The program provides assistance in helping consumers achieve life goals and objectives. It focuses on consumer empowerment in making daily decisions, community integration, and learning basic self-advocacy skills.

The goals of the consumers and the program were served well by the OCRA Self-Advocacy Bingo game. Thirteen people plus staff

participated in the game using personal communication systems in a room full of good times and laughter. Each person won several prizes following several Bingos and a final prize for covering the entire card. Filomena Alomar, Assistant CRA, Valley Mountain Regional Center, Gail Gresham, Supervising CRA, Sacramento.

OCRA Conducts Outreach throughout the Central Valley.

OCRA has been conducting outreach throughout the Central Valley. To implement its goal of targeting the Latino population, OCRA has conducted introductory outreach activities on various topics including special education and regional center services to the Firebaugh Parent Advocacy Project, the Fresno City College Disability Awareness Day and EPU.

OCRA has also conducted substantive outreach trainings to “Speak Up Speak Out”, the Central Valley Regional Center and The Tule River Indian Tribe of the Tule River Reservation in the areas of the state budget cuts and special education.

OCRA also conducted self-advocacy outreach activities including an emergency preparedness training. Last year, OCRA conducted over 11 different trainings for consumers living in the Central Valley. Arthur Lipscomb, CRA, Kay Spencer, Assistant CRA, Nate Navarro, Assistant CRA, Central Valley Regional Center.

Self-Advocacy Training in Stockton.

Consumers in Stockton at the Casa Del Sol facility enjoyed a training with a DVD and discussion about community living options. This was the first training under a settlement agreement that the Department of Developmental Disabilities and Disability Rights California entered into to settle a class action law suit whose goal was to release people from institutions. DDS provided My Own Choice Sticker Books for each participant. The Sticker Book is a tool used to help individuals express their personal decisions about preferred living options.

Consumers were encouraged to discuss their dreams and goals. One client said that one day she wanted a place of her own. Another person said she was really happy that we were helping her make her

own choices. Staff from Disability Rights California completed intakes. Two people specifically requested assistance. They were both release from the facility shortly after the visit. Leinani Walter, CRA, Filomena Alomar, Assistant CRA, Valley Mountain Regional Center, Gail Gresham, Supervising CRA, Sacramento, Daniel Meadows, DD PSAU, Disability Rights California.



*Serving Consumers of
South Central Los Angeles Regional Center*

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
4401 S. Crenshaw Boulevard, Suite 316
Los Angeles, CA 90043-1200
Tel: (323) 292-9907
TTY: (877) 669-6023
Fax: (323) 293-4259

www.disabilityrightsca.org

MEMORANDUM

TO: Disability Rights California
Board of Directors
OCRA Advisory Committee

FROM: Anastasia Bacigalupo, Statewide Outreach Coordinator

RE: Annual OCRA Outreach Report
July 2009–June 2010

DATE: August 5, 2010

Overview of the Past Twelve Months

In the month of July, OCRA staff embarked upon the process of evaluating their communities, picking target communities and developing new outreach plans. Statewide staff participated in a training focused on supporting their outreach efforts. The training provided staff with information on how to cultivate new community contacts and how to do a legal clinic. In addition, staff watched a DVD on presentation skills and staff participated in an interactive dynamic implementing the skills discussed in the DVD. Lastly, all staff were acknowledged for their individual and collective contributions to OCRA's outreach effort for the 2007-2009 outreach years.

For August, September and October, 2009, staff finalized their outreach goals and objectives, and began to connect with their contacts within their respective catchment areas. Also, during this period, staff doubled their outreach efforts to reach consumers, their families and circles of supports regarding the Trailer Budget Bill and potential changes to the IHSS program. Staff collaborated with Disability Rights California staff

throughout the state to provide accessible outreach trainings related to the budget cuts and changes to IHSS.

During November and December, OCRA staff worked diligently, seeking opportunities to educate consumers, their families and communities about ways to maintain their services and supports despite the tough budget times. Staff continued its focus on the development of on-going relationships with traditionally underserved communities of color, providing trainings to communities on a variety of subjects including the following: Special Education Rights, IEP Development, IPP Development, Regional Center Fair Hearing Process, Medi-Cal, Social Security, In Home Supportive Services, and Denial of Rights. Staff also conducted numerous client-centered outreaches, training consumers on financial abuse, voting rights, and clients' rights.

In January, February and March, staff redoubled their efforts to provide the Emergency Preparedness self-advocacy training to consumers. OCRA staff used the 'Feeling Safe, Being Safe' materials supplied by DDS with great success. The Emergency Preparedness trainings were so popular with consumers that several offices did multiple trainings over the remaining six months of the 2009-2010 outreach years.

Lastly, for the months of April, May, and June, staff provided large numbers of outreaches and trainings at disability-related events all over the state. Here is a sampling of the spring conferences and resource fairs attended:

- Fresno Disability Awareness Day
- Junior Statesmen of America Conference in Long Beach
- Long Beach Special Education Transition Fair
- Fiesta Educativa in Riverside
- People First of San Diego Conference
- Sonoma Developmental Center Opportunity Fair
- Montgomery County Special Education Resource Fair in Salinas
- Santa Barbara County Office of Education Transitions Fair
- Autism Walkathon in Pasadena
- Tools for Transition Conference in Los Angeles

Target Communities

Organizationally, OCRA has made a commitment to actively outreach to and serve people with developmental disabilities from traditionally underserved communities. Of the 22 offices statewide, 15 offices have targeted the Latino community through their outreach plans, 3 offices have targeted Asians, 3 offices have targeted African Americans, and 1 office has targeted the Native American Community. The selection of the target communities for the 2009-2011 outreach years shows OCRA's continued effort to build lasting relationships of trust with leaders and members in communities typically underserved by the regional center and other social service agencies.

Outreach Highlights

Over the past twelve months, OCRA has provided 566 outreach trainings and reached 25,555 people. This is an increase of 26 per cent in the number of trainings and 27 per cent in the number of attendees from last fiscal year. This is a very substantial increase in the amount of work required for outreach/training, and there is serious doubt that such a huge increase can be sustained for a long period of time. The increase reflects the families and consumers' needs for current information caused as a result of the substantial changes to the Lanterman Act, Medi-Cal and IHSS laws.

Statewide staff continued to meet their goals and objectives by conducting self-advocacy trainings to consumers and their circles of support. OCRA offices conducted 1 or more self-advocacy trainings on topics like "Emergency Preparedness," "Voting Rights," and "Changes to the Lanterman Act."

OCRA staff look forward to the second year of their two year plan with great anticipation and enthusiasm. The people who comprise OCRA are impressive both on an individual and collective level. It is no great surprise that their outreach efforts are impressive as well.

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 10/17/06.
Far Northern	MOU dated 11/17/06.
Golden Gate	MOU dated 3/07.
Harbor	Previous MOU dated 4/02. Update submitted to RC.
Inland	MOU dated 4/10/07.
Kern	MOU dated 5/2007.
Lanternman	Previous MOU adopted 8/17/07.
North Bay	MOU dated 5/30/07.
North Los Angeles	MOU dated 11/1/08.
Redwood Coast	Previous MOU dated 10/01. Unable to schedule meeting with RC.
Regional Center of East Bay	MOU dated 8/8/08.
Regional Center of Orange	MOU dated 9/07.
San Andreas	MOU dated 2/07.
San Diego	MOU dated 1/07.
San Gabriel/Pomona	MOU dated 7/30/07.
South Central	MOU dated 10/06.
Tri-Counties	MOU dated 10/06.
Valley Mountain	MOU dated 11/14/06.
Westside	MOU dated 4/07.



Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
100 Howe Avenue, Suite 240N
Sacramento, CA 95825
Tel: (916) 575-1615
TTY: (877) 669-6023
Toll Free: (800) 390-7032
Fax: (916) 575-1623
www.disabilityrightsca.org

Memo

To: Disability Rights CA Board of Directors
From: Jeanne Molineaux, Director
Date: August 5, 2010
Re: Annual Consumer Satisfaction Survey
July 1, 2009, through June 30, 2010

Attached are the results of the fiscal year Consumer Satisfaction Survey. The surveys were sent out for the period of July 1, 2009, through June 30, 2010. Every fourth closed case was randomly selected from OCRA's computer intake system to receive a survey, which included a self-addressed stamped envelope.

Eleven hundred and sixty-two surveys were mailed out. Two hundred and thirty-one people returned the surveys. This represents a 19 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, 96 percent understood the information they were provided, 96 percent believed their CRA listened to them, 92 percent would ask for help from the Clients' Rights Advocate again, 88 percent were helped by the CRA, and 87 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.	223	9	3
2. My call was returned within two (2) days	197	30	8
3. I could understand the information I got.	220	11	6
4. My Clients' Rights Advocate listened to me.	220	11	4
5. I was helped with my question/problem by my Clients' Rights Advocate.	204	27	4
6. I would ask for help from the Clients' Rights Advocate again.	210	20	6

Comments: ¹

- Wendy Dumlao was a tremendous help. We were just about to give up but did not have to with her help. Thank you so much.
- Thank you for all you do!
- Kendra and Gina have been awesome and a tremendous help to me. They are very responsive! We love them!
- Amanda St. James and Katy Lusson are very responsible & professional in dealing with (people) clients.
- God bless you all & helping our families.
- I was not helped with my question/problem by my Clients' Rights Advocate, but did receive useful information, as always
- Excellent, excellent service!
- I was helped initially but when I called back I was told my case with them was terminated and due to overwhelming cases, they now only have an automated answer. I still need assistance with my appeal

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.

process. Please contact me with a name and number of someone who is available to assist me. Thank you.

- Gracias a ustedes y su alluda y pudimos recibir la alluda que mi nieto necesitaba. Muchas Gracias. (Thanks to you and your help we were able to receive the help my grandson needed. Thank you very much.)
- Katie Meyer is a great resource!!
- Eleanor was an excellent advocate.
- Representative did not have enough time to help.
- Overall I was satisfied.
- They are great.
- A ____ said someone would call & they never did. I called ____ back & she called me & left mess. Matter resolved by me breaking down & crying 4 mos. later in a waste of time student study team mtg. the district required....
- I always find Ms. Meyer & Ms. Delgadillo to be very responsive and knowledgeable.
- Never help to us. I don't know why it exists.
- Mi defensora ayudo a mi hijo ____ muy bien y le agradezco mucho toda la ayuda mil gracias y dios la vendiga. (My advocate helped my son ____ very well and I appreciate all of the help one thousand thanks and God bless you.)
- Katie Meyer is great. Very helpful.
- I am happy with the services that the Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy has provided for me during my time of need, but I am unhappy about the fact that a lawyer was not able to come to the court hearing with me.
- The Advocate helped me decide whether it was wise to appeal the ineligibility decision for our son.
- Don't understand meaning or question "I was listened to by my Client's Rights Advocate"?
- Jackie Chiang is an outstanding advocate! She went above and beyond the call of duty to support us in our efforts w/Regional Center and IHSS. I can't say enough about Jackie Chiang & efforts to shepherd us through the tangle of bureaucratic paperwork and in helping us understand our rights and responsibilities. She made a difficult process much more understandable and I genuinely felt she cared about the outcome of various efforts involved in securing the best treatment and services for our daughter....

- I wanted help with an appeal for SSI for my son, 19, who is a client of the _____. I was very disappointed to be told that I could not be assisted by the Regional Center. I would think, and have been told in the past, that the Regional Center helps clients who are denied SS. My son has had SSI for about 5 years and when he had his assessment for turning 18, he was denied and was told he could work....
- Took several phone calls till call returned & little help. Still expect consumer to do all work, even when difficult case, never tell people. No wonder.... No chance. RC's decide people's fate....
- Que son las mejores personas profesionalmente que me encontrado y les doy todo mis respeto. Estoy totalmente muy agradecida...(That they are the most professional people I have found and I give them all of my respect. I am totally appreciative.)
- Good Service.
- I can't really give high marks here, though my advocate I felt did a good job filling out the paperwork, she could not represent me physician at the hearing! To back up her information so hence I lost both of my motions/hearings, in my opinion this system is "Broke". Here a good example: If you give someone a car and no gas you go "No where" You give someone an attorney and doesn't show up for your hearing "You lose".
- Can my son get help?
- It really does not matter, as the person that handled my son's case did not stand up for my son! Not much of an effort was made by _____.
- Estoy muy agradecida con Anastasia ella sabe informarlo muy bien es una muy Buena defensora. (I appreciate Anasatasia, she knows how to keep you informed, she's a good Advocate.)
- I don't remember if my call was returned within two (2) days.
- I was not helped, all I was given was copies of my daughter's file and told that my problem was bigger than they could handle and referred to an out of town Advocate, even after I showed evidence....
- Si yo quiero decirte algo mas Atras. Lo siento solo escribo muy bien en español gracias por la atención. Yo estuve como por 3 años tratando por telefono de comunicarme con el centro regional y nunca contestaron mi llamada hasta que alguien me dijo que fuera directamente a _____ y llenara toda la información de mi hijo _____ directamente a las oficinas y tomaron mi caso y me llamo _____

trabajadora del ____ centro regional. . (Yes I want to tell you something else in the Back. I'm sorry but I only write well in Spanish, thank you for your attention. I was for about 3 years trying to communicate by telephone with the regional center and they never answered my call until someone told me to directly go to ____ and complete all of my son's _____ information directly to the offices and they took my case and _____ regional center worker called me.)

- Aimee Delgado is very helpful, informative and supportive. She's great.
- El servicio es pésimo, dicen que ayudan pero no es cierto, en el caso de mi hijo tuvimos una entrevista, entregamos los documentos, transcurrieron 2 meses, intentamos comunicarnos y nunca nos devolvieron la llamada, al final nuestra documentacion se extraviaron. (The service is poor, they say they help but it is not true, in my son's case we had an interview, turned in the documents, 2 months went by, we attempted to communicate and they never returned our call, finally our documents were lost.)
- I was hopping to get an advocate assistance.
- I am still waiting to hear if we have been accepted for services.
- We need your help always! Thank god for office of clients advocacy. Lots of people need help. Family and friends love you.
- Everyone has been extremely nice to us especially Ms. Katie Meyer.
- Mi agradecimiento para Anastasia y para su asistente, porque fueron de mucha ayuda para _____ y para mi. Aparte cambio. (My thanks to Anastasia and her assistant, because they were of much help for ____ and for me. Besides that he has changed.)
- I had asked one Clients' Rights Advocate with help regarding _____. I was appealing decision they had made. I did not understand what _____ actually did and I still don't really understand the decision they made and I think the Clients' Rights Advocate never really helped me understand. In the end, I appealed the decision myself without the help of the Advocate.
- _____ les agradese su ayuda. Muchisimas gracias en nombre de mi hijo por que su alluda hacido de muchisima importancia pues mi hijo la nesesita bastante la defensa. Gracias por segir apoyandolo. (_____ appreciates your help. I would like to thank you very much on behalf of my son because your assistance has been very important, my son needs the advocacy very much.)

- I was treated nicely by “Disability Rights California” but, I don’t think that enough was done to help me. Most of my complaints against _____ was not even looked at....
- She is the best!
- No recibí la ayuda en términos legales no me apollaron para nada. (I did not receive the help in legal terms. They did not support me for nothing.)
- Thank you. The help provided was appreciated.
- _____ consumers need additional assistance for their education advocacy.
- Thank goodness for Katy Lusson’s help!
- They are on top of their game!
- The initial call was returned but not after that. No email returned as well.
- Mrs. Katy Lusson is the very best. She knows her fields, she is great in helping her clients. She put her heart out, she helped so much for my son _____ and _____ . Thank you so much.
- Thank you!
- I am told that because my son is so high functioning, he does not need “job training” prior ending high school. My son was tested and I was told he does not show to be inspectrum. My son has an autistic diagnosis from the Regional Center, private doctor and AGRE.
- Thank you very much for the help and being there for people with disability.
- Advocate didn’t understand my problem.
- First phone call appointment = no call. _____ 2nd appt date = no call. Staff going home. 3rd appt = no call.
- We would not have been successful without your assistance. Thank you!
- Clients’ Rights Advocacy has always been a great service to me and my son. They are always very thorough with the information they give...They are always very friendly as well.
- I do not have words to say how thankful I am for the help I received, I felt I had a whole team on my side. Thank you.
- The lawyer was very nice, friendly, supportive and helpful. She even came to my house as its difficult to go places with _____. She made suggestions and recommendations as for my documents, sent me some legal documents and still answers my emails with all questions and concerns. She was amazing!

- Gracias por la informacion y ayuda y Apollo sigan brindando esta ayuda yo como madre de Walter Se los agradezco y que bueno a verla conocido y saber que ay alguien que no apolla es importante. (Thank you for the information and help and support. Continue to offer this help. Like the mother of _____ I am grateful and I'm glad to have met you and to know that there is someone to help and support is very important.)
- I'm thankful for all that you do for us and other family. Knowing my son's rights is a big help. Thank you.
- Thank you very much Rita for your sincere concern with my situation with ___ teacher and class. Also I thank Eleanor for her help. Sincerely ____.
- Quede satisfecha con la asesoria que me brindaron. (I was satisfied the services offered/rendered.)
- I was hoping to get advocate assistance.
- Mr. Matt Pope was excellent. He was very helpful and ready to help us. He was fast and put us at ease. We felt very comfortable with him. He took a lot of stress from us by knowing he was helping us. We are very happy to have him on our side. The case was won in our favor and we thank God for his help.
- Estoy agradecido por todo gracias (I am grateful for everything, thank you.)
- Very professional very helpful. We really need them a lot.
- Always helpful and knowledgeable.
- Rita Defilippis was able to get the school district to treat ___ right. Finally!
- Matt Pope is the best! This help was invaluable to me during a recent direct processing issue.
- Very helpful but they are very busy – We need lots of help.(parents' of special needs kids)
- Excellent! Staff (Jacqueline and others) were very responsive, and answered my questions and assisted me with providing resources and reference material.
- Gina was very helpful. PAI is always wonderful.
- I call OCRA Advocacy a month ago and still they haven't returned my call. Called 3 times during past months.
- Katie Hornberger is absolutely fantastic.

- We were very pleased with our most recent issue on transportation. This makes a dramatic difference in our daily lives. Thank ___ much. Thank all involved in settling our issues regarding transportation.
- ci es nesesario bolberia pues me trataron mui bien gradia muchas gracias estoy agradecida con ellos. (Yes if necessary I would return well, they treated me very well. Thank you. Thank you very much. I am very grateful for them.)
- It would be so much better to actually have an attorney sometimes, well it's always difficult to go against the regional center.
- IHSS programa, SSI seguro social, IEP, Juntas de escuelas y cambios o trancisiones para ninos mayores y centros regionales. (IHSS programs, SSI Social Security, IEP meetings school meetings and changes or transitions for older kids and regional centers.)
- They were kind on the phone but did not get MH service started again even though I have them on the books so to speak no is servicing this case. My daughter continues to seize and my body continues to be overworked with new exhaustion injuries a trial seems imminent. What a waste of tax dollars.
- Que el centro regional me a ayudado muy bien con mi hijo. (That the regional center has help me really well with my son.)
- El trabajo de la abogada Kathy asi como de su secretaria es excelente, ademas que en todo momento demostraron su profesionalismo pasiencia y me explcaron de forma muy detallada los pasos que yo debia seguir. Estoy muy contacta de contra con personas como ellas. Gracias! (The work done by the attorney Kathy as well as that of her secretary is excellent. Also in every moment they demonstrated there professionalism and patience and they explained to me in details the steps that were to come. I am very happy to count on people like them. Thank you.)
- Me centi muy confundido por que esperaba respuestas concretas. (I felt very confused because I expected concrete answers.)
- Can you get me and my dad on SSA.
- Excellent help and answers to a difficult situation.
- My niece was kicked out without a 30-day notice. She came by and the landlady said she wasn't allowed on the property if she came back she would give me a 30-day notice.
- E resivido mucha ayuda estoy muy feliz con Anastasia y Cristi. (I have received a lot of support. I am happy with Anastasia and Crisiti.)

- We need to have representatives at hearings for our kids. They are not getting represented.
- I didn't get the follow up about my question I asked. I asked about when filing for Medical Waiver and if I turn papers in after 30 days, does that automatically disqualify me? And how do I reach someone to find out about status of waiver?
- I seemed like she was in a hurry that I felt like I was rushed when I was sharing my problems with my son's IEP and with the school district.
- Advocate was so kind and made sure all my questions were answered.
- I would like more of my concerns to be addressed.
- Excellent communication – always follows up.
- The staff exec followed up with me to check if my issue/questions were resolved. They were very helpful.
- Excellent service!
- Ms. Jackie Chiang goes above and beyond. She helped me out enormously and I would absolutely seek her support and knowledge. It is difficult being a single mom with a special needs little girl. Having someone like Ms. Jackie Chiang on my team, is a big win. Please acknowledge her as a huge asset to OCRA. She is a breath of fresh air and highly understanding professional. Dealing with _____ is very difficult as they will do anything to alleviate service/support that my daughter clearly needs and is entitled to by law. Again, Ms. Chiang is truly a huge support. Thank you.
- Thank you Valerie Geary.
- Gracias por tener personal tan capacitada ya que en algunas preguntas nos orientan y los explican bastante bien. (Thank you for having capable personnel. With some questions they explained it and guided rather well.)
- Katy Lusson is very good.
- The CRA has been an invaluable resource for us.. Katie Hornberger and Katie have been excellent. The most recent call was returned the same day.
- They were awesome!
- _____ is now receiving PT twice a week. Thank you! The only thing I find difficult is to phone, leave a message, then wait for a return call from Luisa to do an intake. I'm simply home very rarely during working hours and as a classroom teacher, cannot easily be

reachable by cell. Katie, thanks for replying to my email and doing the intake when I was available! I appreciate it!

- Mi trabajadora social me respondia inmediatamente y acordamos que recibiamos entrenamiento de padres en casa y esto no se ha realizado hasta how Marzo 10, 2010. (My social worker responded immediately and remembered that we needed to receive training for parents in our home and to this day it has not occurs March10, 2010.)

DISABILITY RIGHTS CALIFORNIA BOARD
OCRA ADVISORY COMMITTEE
August, 2010

Committee Members:

Ted Cottini	(Oroville)
Spencer McClay	(Grass Valley)
Eric Ybarra	(Stockton)
Billy Hall	(Glendale)
Izetta Jackson	(Oakland)
Amy Kalivas	(San Diego)
Dianne Millner	(Oakland)

OCRA ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES
March 5, 2010

Present: Billy Hall, Russ Rankin(Board Member), Diane Millner (Board Member) and Eric Ybarra

Absent: Ted Cottini, Spencer McClay and Dan Owen

Staff: Cara Armstrong, Catherine Blakemore, Jackie Coleman, Maxine Dalaza, Kendra McWright, Jeanne Molineaux, Andy Mudryk, Dalena Quan, Beatriz Reyes and Alice Ximenez

Facilitators: Steve Austin and Yesenia Guillermo

Introductions and Announcements: Eric Ybarra called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m. Committee members introduced themselves.

Semi Annual Report: Jeanne Molineaux shared information from the OCRA Semi-Annual Report including staffing changes, and Capitol People First Training of the Trainers and plans for implementation of settlement agreement.

Asperger's Case Discussion and Individual Choice Budget: Catherine Blakemore presented information regarding budget cuts, Asperger cases and Individual Choice Budget.

Inland Regional Center Update: Beatriz Reyes, Assistant Clients' Rights Advocate, Inland Regional Center, discussed recent outcome of autism case in regards to denial of SSI based on being over resource limits.

Tri-Counties Regional Center Update: Kendra McWright, Clients' Rights Advocate, Tri-Counties Regional Center, discussed SSI eligibility case and what it is like working as a temporary staff person for OCRA.

Alta Regional Center Update: Jackie Coleman, Clients' Rights Advocate, Alta California Regional Center, discussed her aid paid pending cases and their outcome.

Public Member Re-Appointment: Request made to have public members re-appointed for an additional three-month period. It was M/S/C (Hall/Ybarra) that the Committee accept and confirm re-appointment for an additional three-month period.

The meeting adjourned at 12:45 p.m.

ATTEST,

Eric Ybarra, Chair

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Self-Advocacy Trainings
July 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010

Self-Advocacy Trainings held:

Alta RC	May 28, 2010
Central Valley RC	September 17, 2009 November 18, 2009
East LA RC	December 14, 2009 March 12, 2010
Far Northern RC	June 6, 2010 June 12, 2010
Golden Gate RC	August 20, 2009 September 22, 2009 December 8, 2009
Harbor RC	May 1, 2010
Inland RC	December 1, 2009
Kern RC	August 18, 2009 (1) August 18, 2009 (2) October 7, 2009
Lanternman RC	September 28, 2009 April 16, 2010
North Bay RC	September 25, 2009 April 21, 2010 April 27, 2010
North LA RC	August 28, 2009 May 1, 2010 September 5, 2009 September 18, 2009
RC of the East Bay	August 6, 2009(2)
RC of Orange County	July 8, 2009 August 19, 2009 September 8, 2009 September 22, 2009
Redwood Coast RC	April 19, 2010
San Andreas RC	April 22, 2010
San Diego RC	June 15, 2010

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Self-Advocacy Trainings
July 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010
Page Two

San Gabriel Pomona RC	May 12, 2010 June 23, 2010 June 25, 2010
South Central LA RC	May 18, 2010 June 24, 2010
Tri-Counties RC	February 2, 2010
Valley Mountain RC	October 16, 2009 April 16, 2010 April 19, 2010 May 25, 2010 June 30, 2010 August 17, 2009 October 16, 2009
Westside RC	October 16, 2009

**OFFICE OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS ADVOCACY
ANNUAL REPORT
JULY 1, 2009 – JUNE 30, 2010**

TITLE 17 REPORT

TITLE 17 LETTER	COMPLAINT (INITIALS)	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	STATUS	OUTCOME
7/24/09	S.A.	Various	Closed	Allegations not Supported
2/3/10	S.A.	Denial of right to access records	Closed	Allegations not Supported

**OFFICE OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS ADVOCACY
ANNUAL REPORT
(July 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010)**

DENIAL OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS

Regional Center	Good Cause	Right(s) Denied	Date Denial Began	Date of Review	Date of Restoration
HRC09-05	I, O	V, J	6/19/09	6/19/09	Ongoing Review
HRC09-05	I, O	V, J	6/19/09	7/8/09	7/8/09
IRC10-01	I	P	5/11/10	7/2010	7/2010
NBRC-01	O	T	4/8/10	4/8/10	Ongoing Review
NBRC-01	O	T	4/8/10	4/15/10	Ongoing Review
NBRC-01	O	T	4/8/10	4/22/10	Ongoing Review
NBRC-01	O	T	4/8/10	5/6/10	5/6/10
SD09-11	L	V	12/15/09	12/15/09	Ongoing Review
SD09-11	L	V	12/15/09	1/7/10	1/7/10

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, 2009 – June 30, 2010**

CONSUMER GRIEVANCES WITH CONTRACTOR

DATE OF RESOLUTION LETTER	COMPLAINT (INITIALS)	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	STATUS	OUTCOME
9/3/09	A.W.	OCRA unable to directly represent	Closed	Upheld OCRA's actions
9/28/09	N.C.	OCRA unable to directly represent	Closed	Upheld OCRA's actions
10/23/09	A.D.	OCRA unable to directly represent	Closed	Upheld OCRA's actions
12/10/09	M.W.	OCRA unable to directly represent	Closed	Upheld OCRA's actions
12/22/09	N.T.	Unable to represent	Closed	Misunderstanding; OCRA to provide technical assistance
12/24/09	S.S.	Conversations regarding conduct of OCRA; request for complaint to be kept on file.	Closed	Complaint will be kept on file.
6/21/10	J.J.	OCRA unable to provide assistance	Closed	Upheld OCRA's actions

**OCRA Attorney's Fees
Fiscal Year
July 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010**

Date:	From:	Subject:	Case #:	Amount:
November 2009	Los Angeles Unified School District	Special Education	903357	\$ 2,000
November 2009	Fresno Unified School District	Special Education	891919	<u>12,500.00</u>
April 2010	Santa Clara Office of Education	Special Education	899353	<u>5,000.00</u>
	Total For FY 2009 - 10			<u>\$19,500.00</u>