

OCRA ANNUAL REPORT
2010 – 2011

<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.....	2
2) Analysis of Consumers Served	5
3) Outreach/Trainings.....	6
B. Issues and complaints are resolved expeditiously and at the lowest level of appropriate intervention.....	7
C. Collaborative and harmonious working relationships are fostered	8
1) Memorandums of Understanding	8
2) Meeting with Association of Regional Center Agencies (ARCA)	8
D. Consumer Satisfaction.....	9
1) Consumer Satisfaction Survey	9
2) Letters of Appreciation	9
3) Cases will be handled in a timely manner	12
E. Coordination of services with the DDS contract manager, stake holder organizations, and multi-cultural community.....	12
F. Self-Advocacy Trainings.....	13
III. TITLE 17 COMPLAINTS.....	15
IV. DENIAL OF CLIENTS’ RIGHTS.....	15
V. CONSUMER GRIEVANCES.....	15

VI. COLLECTION OF ATTORNEYS FEES..... 16

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ENHANCEMENT
OF SERVICES 16

VIII. CONCLUSION..... 17

EXHIBIT LIST

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

(Under Separate Cover)

OCRA SELF-ADVOCACY TRAINING EVALUATION BINDER

I. INTRODUCTION

Disability Rights California provides state-wide clients' rights advocacy services for regional center consumers pursuant to a multi-year contract, 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 final Annual Report required under the contract, pursuant to Exhibit E, Paragraph 14, for Fiscal Year 2009-2010.

Disability Rights California was awarded the grant for the next five year contract, effective July 1, 2011, Contract No. HD119002.

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 9,323 issues for consumers. OCRA also participated in 422 trainings last fiscal year, presenting to approximately 18,172 people.

Disability Rights California is pleased that this year it implemented 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.

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 9,323 issues for regional center consumers during the fiscal year. Last fiscal year, OCRA experienced a nine percent increase in cases from the previous year, 2008-2009. This year, OCRA experienced a five percent increase from 2008-2009. OCRA believes that it cannot increase the number of cases that its staff handles without adverse consequences to the services it provides, either by handling fewer direct representation cases, being only able to provide brief services, or other unanticipated outcomes.

Additionally, the breath of issues in these cases is staggering and reflects the need for staff to know the current law that affects people with developmental disabilities in a large number of areas. The statistics, attached as Exhibit B, are discussed below and show the wide variety of issues and the large number of cases handled by OCRA staff, as does copies of the last two advocacy reports, which are included as Exhibit C.

1) Advocacy Reports.

Each advocate provides on a quarterly basis a summary of at least one case that has unique situations from which others can learn and that can be used as examples of the advocacy that OCRA accomplishes. The summaries for Winter, 2010, and Spring, 2011, 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:

OCRA Assists J.J. to Obtain Additional IHSS Hours.

OCRA was initially contacted by J.J.'s mother, a monolingual-Spanish speaker, questioning the County's determination that her 16-year-old son was ineligible for additional hours under the IHSS program. The County authorized J.J. a total of 53.6 hours per month of IHSS personal care services. However, no time was allocated by the County for related services.

OCRA agreed to represent J.J. in an effort to resolve this matter informally. The sole basis of the County's denial of personal care hours was that J.J. was a minor and therefore was not entitled to related services. Following unsuccessful attempts to resolve this issue with the County Representative, OCRA agreed to represent J.J. at hearing.

At hearing, OCRA maintained that J.J. was entitled to receive both personal care and related services. The ALJ agreed with OCRA's interpretation of the regulations and concluded that J.J. was entitled to an increase of 17.32 hours a week for related and personal care services. This resulted in an increase of 75 hours per month of IHSS retroactive to January 1, 2010

ALJ Finds Consumer Eligible for SSI and Awards \$16,000 in Retroactive Payments.

K.G.'s mother contacted OCRA requesting assistance with a denial of SSI eligibility. K.G. is a 21-year-old who receives regional center services. OCRA agreed to represent K.G. at an SSI hearing. It was determined that K.G. met the listing for mental retardation and should have been found eligible for SSI previously. As a result of the failure of SSI to find him eligible, the ALJ found that K.G. was entitled to a retroactive payment to the date he initially applied for benefits. The ALJ awarded over \$16,000 in retroactive benefits.

OCRA Successfully Advocates for Restoration of Section 8 Voucher.

C.P. lived with her husband in Section 8 housing. C.P. had been “hoarding.” Her husband did not believe that they would pass an inspection by the housing authority. He moved them out of their apartment and they became homeless.

The housing authority was unwilling to reinstate C.P.’s Section 8 voucher. OCRA met with the housing authority and explained the nature of C.P.’s disability and the need for subsidized housing. The housing authority agreed to reinstate the Section 8 voucher.

OCRA Prevents Expulsion and Non-Public School Placement.

J.M. is a foster child in elementary school. J.M. was not receiving any behavioral support services in his special education program. J.M. was suspended and the school district threatened expulsion for serious behaviors including inappropriate sexual behaviors, physical aggression, and emotional outbursts committed outside of the classroom.

The regional center contacted OCRA and referred J.M. for advocacy and representation. OCRA reviewed J.M.’s school records and regional center records. OCRA referred J.M. to a psychologist for assessment. OCRA then represented J.M. at the manifestation IEP meeting and argued that the manifestation determination should be changed to reflect that J.M.’s behaviors were directly due to his multiple disabilities. OCRA presented relevant regional center records that the school district originally failed to take into account. The new psychological report confirmed that J.M.’s behaviors were related to his disability.

The school district changed the manifestation determination. As a result of this change, the school district did not expel J.M. but did propose a non-public school placement (NPS). OCRA opposed the NPS placement on the basis that it was not the least restrictive placement and that the local public school could meet J.M.’s needs if he was provided appropriate behavioral supports and services. OCRA requested the district consider a public school placement and

conduct a functional analysis assessment (FAA), a behavior intervention plan, and a 1:1 aide. The district agreed.

J.L. was also provided with door-to-door transportation with a daily bus rider to accompany J.M. to and from school, an occupational therapy assessment, a mental health referral for counseling and therapy for mental health services, and 22 hours of compensatory education.

C.C. Retains Transportation.

C.C. requested assistance to appeal a suspension of transportation services. C.C. requires assistance from her supported Living Services provider (SLS) to schedule all of her transportation. C.C. was told by her new staff that C.C. should schedule her own transportation. Three months later, C.C. received suspension letters due to several no shows and late cancellations. The letters informed C.C. that she would be suspended for four months from receiving transportation services because she had violated the cancellation policy numerous times. The CRA represented C.C. at an appeal. The CRA presented witnesses and documentation to show that due to C.C.'s disability, C.C. is dependent on staff to schedule transportation. Evidence was also presented to show that C.C., the CRA, and the regional center service coordinator worked together to obtain appropriate support staff for C.C., so that she would not have any no shows or cancellations in the future. After the appeal, C.C. received a letter informing her that her transportation services had been reinstated.

2) Analysis of Consumers Served.

OCRA handled a total of 9,323 cases from July 1, 2010, through June 30, 2011. 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, 2,442 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 1,291 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, approximately 60 percent of all regional center consumers were male and 39 percent female.

The percentage of consumers residing in the parental or other family home remains by far the largest number of consumers served with 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. DDS has changed the format for its reporting of the ethnicities of the consumers served by each regional center. DDS now reports four ethnicities and a category called other. Charts showing a comparison by percentage of the ethnicities served by OCRA and those served by the regional centers are attached as Exhibit B1. The ethnicities reports do not completely correspond but do show that OCRA is generally in parity statewide in its provision of services to the ethnicities identified as served by the regional centers statewide.

3) Outreach/Trainings.

OCRA recognizes that outreach and training are an essential part of providing effective advocacy for regional center consumers and also recognizes that trainings are one of the best ways to maximize staff and operational resources. Therefore, OCRA offers training on a

wide variety of issues to a large variety of participants, including consumers, parents, regional center staff, vendors, and other interested people. Topics covered include, but are not limited to, consumers' rights, abuse and neglect issues, special education, voting rights, SSI, rights in the community, and conservatorships, among other topics.

During the last fiscal year, OCRA presented at 422 trainings with a total attendance of approximately 18,172 people at the various trainings. This represents a return to OCRA's more traditional number of outreaches and people attending. Last year, during the significant changes in the Lanterman Act, OCRA's statistics had increased 26 percent in the number of trainings and 27 percent in the number of attendees from the previous fiscal year. The current statistics represent a tremendous amount of training and is a number that OCRA hopes to maintain or increase.

OCRA understands the need to provide assistance to individuals from traditionally underserved communities. To further the goal of meeting this need, OCRA has each office target at least three outreaches per year to a specific group of persons who are underrepresented in the office's catchment area. To help with this, OCRA has appointed Beatriz Reyez as the Southern California Outreach Coordinator and Kendra McWright as the Northern California Outreach Coordinator. The coordinators advise staff in implementation of their target outreach plans. Based upon an evaluation of the original outreach plans' results, and using new census data and figures from DDS regarding the ethnicity of consumers served by each regional center, the OCRA offices update their target outreach plans on a bi-annual basis. 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, 2010, through June 30, 2011, OCRA resolved 9,323 issues for consumers. Of those served, all but 109 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 July, 2010, to discuss matters of interest between the two organizations. Since then, the two organizations have discussed matters regarding a case of mutual concern. 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.

Two thousand nine hundred and ninety-four (2,994) surveys were mailed out. Five hundred and two (502) people returned the survey. This represents a 17 percent return rate of the surveys.

Of those responding to the questions, 96 percent of the responders felt they were treated well by the staff, 93 percent understood the information they were provided, 93 percent believed their CRA listened to them, 91 percent believed they were helped by the CRA, and 94 percent would ask for help from OCRA again. See Exhibit G, which discusses the results of OCRA's survey.

2) Letters of Appreciation.

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

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

- Once again thank you for all you have done for me. Sorry for not sending this card earlier but know I haven't forgotten all your generosity and for helping me get hours for my daughter ____.
With Lots of Love.
- In behalf of me and my uncle we want to thank you for all your help. When we found out my uncle was going to be transfer to another program we had no idea what to do. We didn't know who to go to. When we heard about you guys we were blessed. You took care of us and guided us in the whole process. I don't think we could have done this without you guys. All of you were very friendly and very understanding. Thank you again for lending us a hand. If we ever need help we know where to go to.
- Thank you so much for all your help in this Herculean effort. Your knowledge of the law, as it applied to IHSS, made the difference in crafting the arguments behind the appeal, and gathering supporting evidence...
- Dios te dio Sabiduria para proteger a los que lo necesitan eres bendecida por toda la eternidad tu vida tendra luz abundante siempre y en todo lugar.... Gracias. (God gave you Wisdom to protect to the ones that need it. You are blessed for all the eternity your life will have abundance of light always and everywhere in every place....Thank You.)
- We greatly appreciate you for advocating for my son and every special needs family. As you know when you have a special needs family member every day life is a much bigger challenge than normal. Your organizations mission makes a huge difference in our lives and I hope you guys are around a very long time and continue to advocate for families like mine. Thank you for being there.
- Ms. Meyer demonstrated a tremendous amount of persistent and consistent diligence for resolving ____ case of a "Wrongful Eviction." Ms. Meyer's level of tenacity and efficient manner is greatly appreciated. The level of collaboration

between Westside Regional Center and Protection and Advocacy generated a positive outcome as well as stellar advocacy. Both ___ and myself both agree that Ms. Meyer's professionalism and passion for what she does is absolutely awesome.

- Thank you so much for being instrumental in ___ current placement. Your calm tenacity is very effective and has helped maintain a good working relationship with the district. I don't now what I would have done without your help...
- Thank you for participating on the "Advocacy Panel" at our Winter 2011 conference last weekend....Your panel was very well received and it was very important part of the conference.
- Thank you so much for giving up your time to share such great info with us.
- You ladies have an amazing impact on so many families. I am blessed by the work that God is using you to do in the life of numerous kids. The reward that is in store for you is beyond anything you can imagine. No dollar figure can properly repay for the differences you have made in those that have been touched by your work and guidance.
- ... "Thanks" to you & the other's involved in the writing of the Brief ... and the consideration of our other people & how it could affect them. As a lay person, I am still able to recognize the hard work & hours that went into that document. Please convey our thanks to all that were a part of it. What a team this young man has!
- I really appreciate all of your help and I am glad I met you and that I attended your class on IHSS and I am hoping that I will continue to attend other training sections from your organization. I really believed in what my son's doctors told me that I will have to educate and take of myself in order to take care of my son.
- THANK YOU so much for all your help.You guys really make a big difference, specially in this hard time that disable, and olderly people are under attack, that's the way it feels,you guys

are a little light at the end of the tunnel. Thank God that we still have you guys around. You guys are a great support. Thank you again and God bless you.

- The news that I received bring tears to my eyes because after so much suffering my family has went through a lot and especially my son. God Bless you for all the help that you have provided for all the families that needed the support.

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 86 percent of all callers to OCRA received a call back within two days during the last 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, 2011.

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 24, 2010, were provided with the Semi Annual Report. The minutes for the February 25, 2011, meeting are included as Exhibit H.

DDS staff is invited and encouraged to participate in the next meeting, which is set for September 23, 2011, 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 two mandated trainings. Many offices provide more than one training and an advocate may use information from any of OCRA's self-advocacy packets in presenting his or her self-advocacy trainings to consumers.

To date, OCRA has developed 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 which may be used for the self-advocacy trainings.

Last fiscal year, OCRA also provided 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 utilized 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 also entered into a contract with People First of California to hire consumer trainers to help conduct the trainings with OCRA staff. A list of the Capital People First trainings is included here as part of Exhibit I.

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

OCRA is required to report in its Annual Report an evaluation of the self-advocacy trainings. This year, OCRA has randomly selected consumer training satisfaction evaluations from its Capital People First 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 trainings.

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

III. TITLE 17 COMPLAINTS

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

IV. DENIAL OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS

CCR, Title 17, Section 50530, sets forth a procedure whereby a care provider may deny one of the basic rights of a consumer if there is a danger to self or others or a danger of property destruction caused by the actions of a consumer. The 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.

Nine grievances were filed by consumers or their families during the past year. Of the nine grievances, OCRA was able to take further action in three, in order to meet some of the consumers' concerns.

Information concerning each grievance has previously been submitted to DDS. Attached as Exhibit L is a chart detailing the grievances filed against OCRA during this period.

VI. COLLECTION OF ATTORNEYS FEES

OCRA does not charge consumers, their families or advocates fees for services nor does OCRA seek to recover costs from these individuals. Clients' Rights Advocates who are licensed to practice law in California, or Assistant 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 five percent higher than

2008-2009. 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. Although we believe the large number of requests for assistance at some regional centers justifies the need for additional staff, we understand this is not feasible given the state's fiscal climate. We are extremely appreciative of DDS' support of the OCRA program during these difficult economic times.

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 provided 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 9,323 cases the last year, provided 422 trainings to over 18,172 people, and met each of its performance objectives. OCRA remains dedicated to ensuring that the rights of all of California's citizens with developmental disabilities are enforced.

OFFICE OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS ADVOCACY LISTING

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

Toll Free Number: 1-800-390-7032

Changes to offices – *as of August 25, 2011* - Change is italicized.

ALTA CALIFORNIA REGIONAL CENTER

Jackie Coleman - CRA

VACANT – Assistant CRA

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy

100 Howe Avenue, Ste. 240N

Sacramento, CA 95825

Phone: (916) 283-8144 Jackie/(916) 283-8158 Alta ACRA

/Fax: (916) 575-1623

Email: Jackie.Coleman@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Gail Gresham

CENTRAL VALLEY REGIONAL CENTER

Kendra McWright - CRA

Kay Spencer- Assistant CRA (part-time)

Maricruz Magdaleno – Temp Assistant CRA

567 W. Shaw Avenue, Suite C-3

Fresno, CA 93704

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

E-mail: Kendra.McWright@disabilityrightsca.org,

Kay.Spencer@disabilityrightsca.org,

Maricruz.Magdaleno@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Kathy Mottarella

EASTERN LOS ANGELES REGIONAL CENTER

Jackie (Chiang) Dai - CRA

Lucy Garcia - Assistant CRA

1000 S. Fremont Avenue

(P.O. Box 7916)

Alhambra, CA 91802

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

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

E-mail: Jackie.Dai@disabilityrightsca.org

Lucy.Garcia@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Irma Wagster

FAR NORTHERN REGIONAL CENTER

Andy Holcombe - CRA

Lorie Atamian – Assistant CRA (part-time)

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

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

Eva Casas-Sarmiento – CRA

Abigail Perez - Assistant CRA

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy

13005 Artesia Blvd., Suite A214

Cerritos, CA 90703

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

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

Abigail.Perez@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Katie Hornberger

INLAND REGIONAL CENTER

Veronica Cervantes – CRA

Beatriz Reyes - Assistant CRA

1585 South D Street, Suite # 206

San Bernardino, CA. 92408

Phone: (909) 383-1133

FAX (909) 383-1113

E-mail: Veronica.Cervantes@disabilityrightsca.org

Beatriz.Reyes@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Katie Hornberger

KERN REGIONAL CENTER

Mario Espinoza - CRA

Valerie Geary - Assistant CRA

Wanda Arreola – Administrative Assistant (part-time)

3200 North Sillect Ave.

Bakersfield, CA 93308

Phone: (661)327-8531, Extension 313

Fax: (661)322-6417

E-mail: Mario.Espinoza@disabilityrightsca.org

Valerie.Geary@disabilityrightsca.org

Wanda.Arreola@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Kathy Mottarella

FRANK D. LANTERMAN REGIONAL CENTER

Tim Poe - CRA

Jazmin Romero – Assistant CRA

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy

3580 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 925

Los Angeles, CA 90010

Phone: (213)427-8761, Extensión 3673

Fax: (213)427-8772

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

Jazmin.Romero@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Kathy Mottarella

NORTH BAY REGIONAL CENTER

Yulahlia Hernandez - CRA

Annie Breuer - Assistant CRA

Mailing Address is:

P.O. Box 3360

Napa, CA 94558

Phone: (707)224-2798

Fax: (707)255-1567

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

Annie.Breuer@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Gail Gresham

NORTH LOS ANGELES COUNTY REGIONAL CENTER

Ibrahim Saab - CRA

Ada Hamer - Assistant CRA

Gloria Flugum – Clerical Support

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy

3580 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 925

Los Angeles, CA 90010

Phone: Bebo (213)355-3684 / Ada (213)355-3618

Fax: (213)427-8772

E-mail: Bebo.Saab@disabilityrightsca.org

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

Supervised by Tim Poe

REDWOOD COAST REGIONAL CENTER - Eureka

Cary Frazee – Interim CRA

525 Second Street, Suite 300

Eureka, CA 95501

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

Fax: (707) 444-2563

E-mail: Cary.Frazee@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Katie Hornberger

REDWOOD COAST REGIONAL CENTER - Ukiah

Jim Stoepler - CRA

1116 Airport Park Blvd.

Ukiah, CA 95482

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

Fax: (707) 462-2483

E-mail: Jim.Stoepler@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Katie Hornberger

REGIONAL CENTER OF THE EAST BAY

Caroline Sage – Interim 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,

Caroline.Sage@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Andy Holcombe

REGIONAL CENTER OF ORANGE COUNTY

Jacqueline Miller - CRA

Cynthia Salomon – Assistant CRA

13272 Garden Grove Blvd.

Garden Grove, CA 92843

Phone: (714) 621-0563

Fax: (714) 621-0550

E-mail: Jacqueline.Miller@disabilityrightsca.org,

Cynthia.Salomon@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Irma Wagster

SAN ANDREAS REGIONAL CENTER

Rita Defilippis - CRA

Filomena Alomar – Assistant CRA

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy

C/o San Andreas Regional Center

300 Orchard City Drive, Suite 170

Campbell, CA 95008

Phone: (408) 374-2470

Fax: (408) 374-2956

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

Filomena.Alomar@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Katie Hornberger

SAN DIEGO REGIONAL CENTER

Megan Chambers – CRA

Alba Gomez - Assistant CRA

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy

1111 Sixth Avenue, Suite 200

San Diego, CA 92101

Phone: (619) 239-7877

Fax: (619) 239-7838

E-mail: Megan.Chambers@disabilityrightsca.org

Alba.Gomez@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by 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

Mary Melendrez – CRA

Christine Armand - Associate CRA

4401 S. Crenshaw Boulevard, Suite 316

Los Angeles, CA 90043-1200.

Phone: (323) 292-9907

Fax: (323) 293-4259

E-mail: Mary.Melendrez@disabilityrightsca.org

Christine.Armand@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Irma Wagster

TRI-COUNTIES REGIONAL CENTER

Margie Oppel – Interim CRA

Gina Gheno - Assistant CRA

520 East Montecito Street

Santa Barbara, CA 93103

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

Fax: 805-884-7219

E-mail: Gina.Gheno@disabilityrightsca.org,

Margie.Oppel@disabilityrightsca.org,

Supervised by Kathy Mottarella

VALLEY MOUNTAIN REGIONAL CENTER

Leinani Walter – CRA

Christine Hager - 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,

Christine.Hager@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Gail Gresham

WESTSIDE REGIONAL CENTER

Katie Meyer - CRA

Luisa Delgadillo - Assistant CRA

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

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy

5901 Green Valley Circle, Suite 410

Culver City, CA 90230

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

Fax: (310)338-9716

E-mail: Katie.Meyer@disabilityrightsca.org

Luisa.Delgadillo@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Katie Hornberger

Sacramento OCRA

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy

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/TTY: (877) 669-6023

DIRECT DIAL NUMBER: (213) 427-8757

Director:

Jeanne Molineaux Sacramento

Email: Jeanne.Molineaux@disabilityrightsca.org

OCRASAC Office, (916) 283-8142

Supervising Clients' Rights Advocates:

Gail Gresham Sacramento
Email: Gail.Gresham@disabilityrightsca.org
(916) 283-8146

Irma Wagster Garden Grove
Email: Irma.Wagster@disabilityrightsca.org
Regional Center of Orange County Office - (714) 750-0709

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

Kathy Mottarella Santa Barbara
Email: Katherine.Mottarella@disabilityrightsca.org
Tri-Counties Regional Center Office - (805) 884-7205

Support Staff Sacramento:

Alice Ximenez, Office Manager II Sacramento
(916) 283-8143
Email: Alice.Ximenez@disabilityrightsca.org
Supervised by Jeanne Molineaux

Vanessa Ochoa-Alcaraz, Administrative Assistant I Sacramento
(916) 283-8141
Email: Vanessa.OchoaA@disabilityrightsca.org
Supervised by Alice Ximenez

Support Staff Los Angeles:

Maria Ortega, Office Manager I Los Angeles
(213) 427-8761, Extension 3670
Email: Maria.Ortega@disabilityrightsca.org
Supervised by Alice Ximenez

Rosana Orozco, Bilingual ACRA

(213) 427-8761

Email: Rosana.Orozco@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Irma Wagster

Los Angeles

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

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

36. Mottarella, Katherine	TCRC
37. Oppel, Margie	TCRC
38. Orozco, Rosana	OCRALA (Agency Temp)
39. Ortega, Maria	OCRALA
40. Palmer, Celeste	RCEB
41. Perez, Abigail	HRC
42. Poe, Tim	LRC
43. Reyes, Beatriz	IRC
44. Romero, Jazmin	LRC
45. Saab, Ibrahim	NLACRC
46. Sage, Caroline	RCEB
47. Saldana, Trina	GGRC
48. Salomón, Cynthia	RCOC
49. Spencer, Kay	CVRC
50. Stoepler, Jim	RCRC-Ukiah
51. Stohlmeyer, Amy	RCOC (Agency Temp)
52. Wagster, Irma	OCRALA
53. Walter, Leinani	VMRC
54. Ximenez, Alice	OCRASAC

Updated as of August 25, 2011

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
 Annual Report - July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011
 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	17	11	20	5	11	14	19	8	17	11	10	11	16	2	10	25	16	15	11	5	38	292
Age 4-17	123	166	192	53	47	89	168	120	92	78	80	126	86	48	157	209	110	116	128	105	149	2442
Age 18-22	44	57	62	33	34	37	47	45	16	48	48	54	25	23	46	47	41	27	57	60	69	920
Age 23-40	71	49	80	92	73	28	72	65	29	88	42	84	51	53	37	50	54	45	79	72	77	1291
Age 41-50	29	19	24	41	37	11	17	21	6	42	29	19	23	22	17	11	16	18	23	37	45	507
Age 51+	25	19	27	27	44	11	17	18	5	26	15	34	17	18	10	12	12	11	32	27	32	439
Age Unknown			1										1									2
Total	309	321	406	251	246	190	340	277	165	293	224	328	219	166	277	354	249	232	330	306	410	5893

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Annual Report - July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011
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										3		317			1							321
Alpine	2																					2
Amador																				22		22
Butte				229																		229
Calaveras																				9		9
Colusa	1																					1
Contra Costa	1				2							194										197
Del Norte														6								6
El Dorado	35																					35
Fresno		239		1																	1	241
Glenn				10																		10
Humboldt														73								73
Imperial	1																19					20
Inyo								1														1
Kern		2	1			2		473	1						1					1		481
Kings		23						1														24
Lake				1										60							1	62
Lassen				11		1																12
Los Angeles	4		558	3		308	14	1	375	1	319		6	1	2	563		447	3		671	3276
Madera		41			2																	43
Marin					177							3										180
Mariposa		1			1																	2
Mendocino	1				1									60								62
Merced	1	33										1										35
Monterey															30							30
Napa	2				1					72					1							76
Nevada	3																					3
Orange					2	1							436			1	3		2			445
Placer	48			5																		53
Riverside	1							221														3

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Annual Report - July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011
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	301	2		2			1			1												307
San Benito															1							1
San Bernardino	1	1	2				261					1	1				1	5				273
San Diego	1						4						1				391					397
San Francisco	2				98							1			1							102
San Joaquin	4											1			3					225		233
San Luis Obispo	1					1									1				33			36
San Mateo					125							1										126
Santa Barbara	1																		144			145
Santa Clara	1				2								2		289						1	295
Santa Cruz					1										31							32
Shasta				71																		71
Siskiyou				5																		5
Solano	4									228												232
Sonoma	2	8			1					187		1			1			1				201
Stanislaus	1	1																		149		151
Sutter	2																					2
Tehama				30										1								31
Tulare	4	114																				118
Tuolumne																				10		10
Unknown	2					1	2	3	2					1						3		14
Ventura							1	2					1			2			359			365
Yolo	8									1												9
Yuba	8			1																	1	10
Total	427	465	561	368	413	314	504	481	378	492	319	520	447	202	362	567	414	453	545	417	674	9323

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Annual Report - July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011
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	29	16	13	23	52	1	11	12	5	20	14	13	18	7	8	14	4	3	27	8	21	319
Autism	76	92	188	41	34	77	122	75	90	63	77	105	91	27	110	142	80	69	100	60	173	1892
Cerebral Palsy	15	17	26	30	31	18	32	6	17	39	11	62	21	11	19	21	23	29	33	33	40	534
Dual Diagnosis - 5th Category	1			2	1			1		9	1	3		1	1	1	2		2		3	28
Dual Diagnosis - Autism		2		1	1	1	3	1	1	3	3	2		2	3	2	2	1	3	1	6	38
Dual Diagnosis - Cerebral Palsy		1		2		2		2	1	3	5	1	1	2	3	1			1	1	1	27
Dual Diagnosis - Epilepsy						1	1	1		2	2			1	1			2	2	1		14
Dual Diagnosis - Mental Retardation	5	11	4	7	13	7	7	9	3	11	13	20	5	13	8	6	4	4	15	9	8	182
Early Start	3	1	7	4	3	10	14		10		6	4			6	13	6	15	7	2	27	138
Epilepsy	4	16	10	22	6	1	11	7	6	1	5	7	3	6	6	7	12	6	7	19	17	179
Mental Retardation	122	120	122	113	99	61	102	139	23	141	76	96	45	83	86	113	101	78	98	148	129	2095
Unknown	54	45	35	6	6	11	37	24	9	1	11	15	34	13	26	34	15	25	35	24	2	462
Grand Total	309	321	405	251	246	190	340	277	165	293	224	328	218	166	277	354	249	232	330	306	427	5908

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Annual Report - July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011
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	4			3	1			5		5		1		5	3				4	1		32
Asian	13	8	50	7	18	17	3	2	17	6	2	30	23	2	39	1	5	14	3	4	8	272
Black or African American	44	30	6	5	34	17	38	19	8	36	17	78	6	4	4	97	10	19	6	32	71	581
Hispanic / Latino	44	141	241	23	42	59	127	104	76	74	76	74	59	21	89	223	88	129	109	67	139	2005
Multiracial	6	16	20	10	9	11	27	3	12	4	9	5	2	2	12	8	8	18	8	10	26	226
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	3	2	8	1	7	4	3	3	1	7	2	7	1		7		6	3	1	7	2	75
Not Selected					1																1	2
Unknown	1	4	17		6		27		7	2	14	10	24	5	1	2		1	29	1	13	164
White	194	120	63	202	128	82	115	141	44	159	104	123	103	127	122	23	132	48	170	184	167	2551
Total	309	321	405	251	246	190	340	277	165	293	224	328	218	166	277	354	249	232	330	306	427	5908

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
 Annual Report - July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011
 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	112	111	132	115	108	62	118	110	67	120	71	117	79	72	91	122	79	68	131	117	165	2167
Male	196	210	262	136	138	128	221	166	97	172	153	211	139	91	186	232	165	164	199	188	262	3716
Unknown	1		11				1	1	1	1				3			5			1		25
Grand Total	309	321	405	251	246	190	340	277	165	293	224	328	218	166	277	354	249	232	330	306	427	5908

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Annual Report - July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011
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	15	10	1	8	3		16	12	1	4	6	18	1		1	5	16	3	11	37	7	175
Board and Care	12	1		1			11		1	8	3	1	1						5	2		47
Childrens Group Home	2	3		1			1	1		3		6			2	1			3	19		42
Community Residential Home		2	1		8		1		1	15	4			1		4			1	21	1	60
Detention Center	1				2		1															4
Developmental Center	2			1	1					5	1	1	1				2		1			15
Foster Care		4		1				3			1		3	1		10		1	1			25
Foster Family Home		4	3				2	1		4	1	2		1	1	1	4	2	1	3		30
Halfway House												1										1
Homeless	2	2	1	4	2		1			4				5		4	5	1	2	2	2	37
ICF DD			1		2		1				1									2	5	12
ICF DD-H					1						2	2	1				3	1		4	4	18
ICF DD-N		2			2					1			4				1		11	1		22
ICF/MR/Nursing Home					2					2				2								7
Independent Housing	53	45	20	166	64	10	38	129	26	70	45	68	58	65	35	36	78	30	85	49	99	1269
Intermediate Care Facility/Nursing Home		1	2		2			3	5	1	1		1		3		4		1	1	3	28
Jail		2		2	1		1			4	5	1	1			2	1	1	1	1		23
Large Group Home (more than 3 beds)	14	15	4	2	46	7		22		41	19	23	6	8	11	8	5	10	5	3		249
Legal Detention	1			1		1		3								1						7
Municipal Detention Facility/Jail																	2					2
Nursing Home	1	7															1	1			4	14
Other	37	1	4	2	2	4	1	1	5			1	3		4		10	1	4	3	2	85
Other Federal Facility					2	3																7
Parental or Other Family Home	275	339	480	155	218	283	420	288	333	291	218	367	339	93	289	485	280	397	365	258	528	6701
Prison															1	1			1	1	2	6
Private General Hospital Emergency Rooms													1									1
Private Institutional Hospital/Treatment Facility	1				3			7						3	1	2			3	1	1	22
Private Institutional Living Arrangement	1				3				2			2										8
Private Institutional School		8								2	5	1				2					1	19
Psychiatric Wards of Private General Hospitals											1	1			1							3
Psychiatric Wards of Public General Hospitals	1		3		1	1				2						1			1			10
Public Institutional Hospital/Treatment Facility	3	1	1			1		4							4				3			17
Public Institutional Living Arrangement					5			1														6
Public Residential School						1					1					1						5
Semi-indepent Home or Apartment	5	11			27			3		8		1	8	5	4	2			3	3	10	90
Small Group Home (3 beds or less)	1	2	6	10	1	3		3	1	23	1	2	5	5	2			3	16		1	85
Specialized Nursing Facility/Nursing Home		1	1							2	1	1			1				3	1		11
Supervised Apartment	1			12	12		1			2	3	17	6	6					10		3	73
Unknown	15	4	33	3	3		9		3	1		4	8	7	1	1	2	2	6	3	1	106
Grand Total	443	465	561	369	413	314	504	481	378	493	319	520	447	202	362	567	414	453	545	418	674	9342

	Least Restrictive Environment	1		1	1	2			1		4		3	1	4		3	1		2	3		27
	Mail	2											2									1	5
	Other Privacy / Personal Autonomy / Choices	10	2	15	6	20	3	7	22	2	7	2	3	5	3	10	2	12	1	6	26	1	165
	Personal Property			2	1	2	1		3		6				1	1	1			1	7		26
	Privacy			2					3		2		1			1	2	3		2	1		17
	Religion		1																				1
	Sexuality	1			1	5					1				3	1	2			1	1		16
	Telephone				1	1			2		1				1	1					5		12
	Privacy/Personal Autonomy / Choices Total	15	4	20	11	34	4	12	29	3	21	3	9	7	13	15	11	16	2	12	45	2	288
	Records																	1			1		2
	Breach of Confidentiality								1		1												4
	Denial of Access	1																					7
	Erroneous Information				1	2			1			1									2		13
	Records Total	1			1	2			2		1	1			1				1		2	1	13
	Regional Center Services																						10
	Regional Center - 6500	1						1	3							1				1	2	1	9
	Regional Center - Assessment of Needs	4	1	4	3		39	11		10	1	2	3	7	3	12	7	3	1		19	3	133
	Regional Center - Behavioral Services	13	21	15	1	4	15	19	4	19	2	10	10	22	1	5	23	10	7	25	17	8	251
	Regional Center - Case Management	3	5	8	10	12	2	28	31	9	21	13	23	2	4	6	24	9	6	15	5	19	255
	Regional Center - Coordination with County Mental Health															1							1
	Regional Center - Crisis Services	1	1	1									1		3						1		9
	Regional Center - Day Program, Training and Activity	7	2	9	3	1	28	7	3	10	17	6	13	2		6	8	15	6	7	5	4	159
	Regional Center - DDS Policies / Procedures				1		1	12		2	1		2	1			3	10	1				35
	Regional Center - Early Start (Part C / Under Age 3)		2	5	1	4	1	7		5	4	4	5	12		2	12	6	5	6	1	20	102
	Regional Center - Eligibility for Regional Center services	26	38	22	22	34	15	96	39	9	34	20	35	52	9	26	55	30	43	47	13	30	695
	Regional Center - Fair Hearing Procedures (Information only; no repre		4	45		18	21	13	4	16	15	4	4	20		1	35	7	81	23	7	14	332
	Regional Center - Independent Living Services	6	13	7	3	3		3	3	1	4	2	3		1		5	1	4	5	1	2	67
	Regional Center - IPP (Development / Meeting / Compliance)	11	8	3	13	4	9	15	12	9	38	20	5	6	8	4	19	7	27	19	5	5	247
	Regional Center - Other Regional Center Services	50	15	22	2	12	10	15	38	20	3	22	29	24	3	15	1	20	12	15	19	33	380
	Regional Center - Prevention Services								1								2	2		2	4	2	14
	Regional Center - Respite	9	6	22	3	5	10	25	11	31	9	9	23	3	2	4	10	33	5	5	6	20	251
	Regional Center - Supported Employment	2		1				3	1		6		3	2			2		1	1		2	24
	Regional Center - Supported Living	11	3	5	4	20		5	8	3	24	2	14	20	2	10	6	8	2	14	2	8	171
	Regional Center - Transportation	4	5	1	3	3	2	3	10	10	5	1	2	6	4	1	4	4	1	1	8	2	80
	Regional Center - Waiver				1		1	2		6			1	7		1	3	2	1	1			27
	Regional Center Services Total	147	124	171	70	120	155	264	167	161	184	116	175	190	37	95	220	167	204	189	113	174	3243
	Grand Total	443	465	561	369	413	314	504	481	378	493	319	520	447	202	362	567	414	453	545	418	674	9342

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Annual Report - July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011
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	
1 - Information/Referral	68	85	188	60	176	200	124	69	118	60	49	81	88	62	108	111	39	114	91	239	256	2386	
2 - Rights Information/Consultation (RC/Generic)	278	118	136	39	42	45	336	125	152	224	166	221	242	108	48	413	106	316	316	83	304	3818	
3 - Rights Information/Consultation (Other)	12	171	152	185	21	38	3	177	67	117	45	125	54	14	125	4	194	6	127	67	23	1727	
4 - Abuse/Neglect Investigation	11	2		8	2			5	1	8					1	1	2					1	42
5 - Special Education Compliance Complaint	2							1			1	4		2	1		3			2	3	19	
6 - IEP	1	24	6	10	2	2	1	30	3	5	8	1	4		13	7	5		1	13	3	139	
7 - IPP/IDT		7		2		5	1	4		9	13		2	1	3	4	6				2	1	60
8 - W&I 4731	1		1			1		2			4		1		1		1				1	13	
9 - Technical Assistance	32	1	33	13	60	11	1	29	3	13	9	6	38	9	12	7	23	15		9	7	331	
10 - Evaluation and Assessment	27	47	29	39	87	5	7	33	17	50	5	29	14	1	5	8	7	2	5	2	17	436	
11 - Informal Regional Center / Provider Problem Resolution	3	3	3	4	14		19	4	7	2	8	24		1	15	4	7		2		8	128	
12 - Informal Generic Service Agency Problem Resolution	3	1	4	5	5	1	6		6	3	4	27			26	5	3				35	134	
13 - Case Settlement Prior to Informal Meeting, Mediation or Hearing	1		2	1		1	3		2	1	1			1	1		1					2	17
14 - Direct Representation in RC "Voluntary Informal Meeting"	2	1		2	1	2		1	1						1					1		12	
15 - Direct Representation in Mediation / RC Fair Hearing	1		1		3	3	3				2				1	2	8				3	27	
16 - Direct Representation in an Appeal for Generic Services		3	5	1					1	1	4	2	4	2		2	9		2		11	47	
17 - Court Litigation	1	2	1					1							1							6	
Grand Total	443	465	561	369	413	314	504	481	378	493	319	520	447	202	362	567	414	453	545	418	674	9342	

ADVOCACY REPORT

OFFICE OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS ADVOCACY

Spring 2011

BENEFITS

Adoption Assistance Program (AAP)

AAP Reinstates Payments after Acknowledging Defective NOA.

R.G., an 18-year-old consumer, received a notice of action (NOA) dated April 3, 2011, stating that she did not meet the age guidelines for the Adoption Assistance Program (AAP) and therefore her AAP would be terminated effective April 30th.

OCRA agreed to evaluate and assess her matter and reviewed the NOA. The NOA did not meet the 30-day notice requirement so it did not constitute a proper NOA. OCRA advised R.G.'s mother regarding that fact that AAP does not have to terminate at the age of 18. OCRA helped the mother file an appeal. Consequently, AAP rescinded the NOA and provided a new NOA stating that R.G.'s AAP will continue. Wendy Dumlao, CRA, Alba Gomez, Assistant CRA, San Diego Regional Center.

In-Home Support Services (IHSS)

Protective Supervision Received.

R.P. was having increased behavioral issues at home. R.P.'s mother is her IHSS provider. She was struggling to provide enough support to R.P. because R.P. had needs that exceeded the 195 hours of IHSS per month that R.P. was allocated.

R.P.'s mother contacted OCRA for assistance. As part of OCRA's evaluation of R.P.'s services at home, OCRA scheduled a meeting to review R.P.'s IHSS records. OCRA was concerned that R.P. was not

receiving more IHSS hours. When asked, the IHSS worker stated that the policy for children was to provide a maximum amount of 195 hours per month. OCRA explained that this was incorrect and that R.P. was in need of protective supervision.

R.P.'s IHSS case manager called OCRA the following day, stating that R.P. was eligible for the maximum amount of IHSS protective supervision hours. R.P. is now eligible for 283 hours of IHSS support. Yulahlia Hernandez, CRA, Annie Breuer, Assistant CRA, North Bay Regional Center.

M.G. Secures 195 Hours of IHSS Protective Supervision.

M.G.'s parent contacted OCRA for assistance in preparing for M.G.'s hearing to appeal the County's determination that M.G. did not qualify for protective supervision services under the IHSS program. OCRA agreed to review the numerous records and helped the parent prepare the evidence and a brief prior to hearing. M.G. received a favorable decision awarding him 195 hours of protective supervision. Ibrahim Saab, CRA, Ada Hamer, Assistant CRA, North Los Angeles County Regional Center.

K.M. Obtains Protective Supervision.

K.M. was denied IHSS protective supervision. The CRA assisted K.M.'s mother in appealing the denial and preparing for hearing. K.M.'s mother provided the County Representative with medical and educational records that substantiated the need for protective supervision services. K.M.'s mother agreed to the County's request to conduct a 30-day reassessment. Based upon the newly submitted documents, a hearing was avoided, and K.M. was found eligible to receive protective supervision. Jacqueline Miller, CRA, Cynthia Salomon, Assistant CRA, Regional Center of Orange County.

Successful IHSS Hearing Due to Technical Assistance from OCRA.

H.C. is a regional center consumer with severe autism, a seizure disorder and a sleep disorder who was denied protective supervision by IHSS. H.C.'s parent contacted OCRA to request assistance to

appeal the decision. OCRA provided technical assistance to the parent by helping her prepare her hearing position statement and evidence packet. The parent represented H.C. at hearing and received a favorable decision. H.C.'s hours were increased from 237 to 272 hours for protective supervision. Filomena Alomar, Assistant CRA, San Andreas Regional Center.

ALJ Agrees that A.S. Qualified for Protective Supervision.

A.S. came to OCRA's office with her sister and primary caregiver, O.R. They explained to OCRA that they had been experiencing difficulties in convincing A.S.'s IHSS social worker that A.S. qualified for protective supervision despite obtaining two signed SOC 821 forms from A.S.'s doctors. In fact, the group had been trying for over two years to get A.S. protection supervision hours.

OCRA obtained a copy of A.S.'s regional center file and requested records from IHSS. OCRA reviewed the documents and gathered evidence supporting A.S.'s need for protective supervision. The needs were numerous.

OCRA represented A.S. at a state hearing and received a fully favorable decision in which the judge agreed that A.S. met the criteria for protective supervision and granted it retroactively to the date of application. Jackie S. Chiang, CRA, Lucy Garcia, Assistant CRA, Eastern Los Angeles Regional Center.

Medi-Cal

Medi-Cal Approves Funding for Pediatric Wheelchair.

D.R. is a 7-year-old with complex medical and developmental needs. D.R. utilized a convaid stroller (small foldable stroller) to meet his mobility needs beginning in early childhood. D.R. outgrew his stroller even though it had been modified to maximum capacity. The convaid stroller was no longer safe to use due to its small size and configuration.

Based on the conclusion that the stroller was no longer safe for D.R.'s use, the regional center completed a referral for an OT

assessment. OT recommended a Zippie Pediatric Wheelchair (larger with customized support and frame) for safe mobility and transportation to and from school and to increase mobility at home and in the community. D.R. had never owned or used a wheelchair. Medi-Cal denied the wheelchair request and stated it was not medically necessary.

OCRA represented D.R. in his Medi-Cal appeal. OCRA reviewed the OT report and requested a second OT assessment. OCRA filed the Medi-Cal appeal with the additional report. Medi-Cal reviewed the new report, made a finding that medical necessity did exist, and authorized funding for the wheelchair. Leinani Walter, CRA, Christine Hager, Assistant CRA, Valley Mountain Regional Center.

Medi-Cal Reinstated.

S.B. works full time and receives 1:1 employment support services because of his disability. S.B. contacted OCRA after receiving a notice that he was no longer eligible for Medi-Cal under the 250% Working Disabled Program because his income was slightly above the eligibility requirements. Since S.B. was no longer eligible for the program, he was going to have to pay a \$2,700 monthly share of cost for his IHSS.

OCRA assisted S.B. with a hearing request so that he could receive aid paid pending the hearing. OCRA provided S.B. with technical assistance and found that his mileage to and from work could be deducted from his income as an Impairment Related Work Expense (IRWE). OCRA assisted S.B. in gathering documentation of his IRWE and submitting it to Medi-Cal to try and resolve the issue without going to hearing.

Medi-Cal quickly determined that S.B. was eligible for Medi-Cal under the 250% Working Disabled Program because of his IRWE. S.B. is now eligible for Medi-Cal again and does not have to pay a share of cost for his IHSS services. Yulahlia Hernandez, CRA, Annie Breuer, Assistant CRA, North Bay Regional Center.

OCRA Assists A.H to become Eligible for No Share-of-Cost Medi-Cal.

A.H.'s family contacted OCRA for help in appealing Medi-Cal's written notice that A.H. no longer qualified for no share-of-cost Medi-Cal. After reviewing A.H.'s eligibility criteria for the different Medi-Cal programs, OCRA determined that Medi-Cal should have found A.H. eligible for the no share-of-cost Medi-Cal. OCRA agreed to provide direct representation to A.H. and contacted the County's Department of Social Services (County).

Following communications with OCRA, the County agreed to reassess A.H.'s eligibility for Medi-Cal benefits without a share-of-cost. A.H. was subsequently found eligible to receive Medi-Cal benefits without incurring a share-of-cost. Ibrahim Saab, CRA, Ada Hamer, Assistant CRA, North Los Angeles County Regional Center.

Social Security

SSI Overpayment Waived.

M.B. received an overpayment notice from SSI informing her that she owed over \$5,000. The overpayment was allegedly due to having excess resources. OCRA assisted M.B. with filing appeal forms that explained why the overpayment was miscalculated. Every month, M.B.'s Supported Living Services Agency (SLS) processed the rent payment by putting M.B.'s roommate's rent contribution into M.B.'s bank account. Then the rent check was issued. M.B. was unaware of this process.

After the Social Security Administration (SSA) reviewed M.B.'s appeal, the SSA notified M.B. of its intent to deny her appeal. OCRA accompanied M.B. to the SSA office to meet with a representative. The SSA representative began the meeting by explaining that M.B. was responsible and that there was proof that M.B.'s account had, on numerous occasions, a balance of more than \$2,000.

OCRA explained the nature of the problem to the SSA and advised the SSA that the improper deposits to M.B.'s account had stopped. OCRA further explained that it was not possible for M.B. to be at fault since she did not know about the improper deposits to her bank account. In addition, the SLS agency provided a signed letter explaining its responsibility for the improper account activities. SSA

determined that M.B. was not responsible. The entire overpayment was waived. Katy Lusson, CRA, Trina Saldana, Assistant CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

SSI Agrees to Waive \$10,000 Overpayment and Reinstate Benefits.

Three years ago, L.G. and his mother received a notice of a \$10,000 overpayment in L.G.'s SSI grant. The SSA asserted that L.G. had been overpaid due to his mother's, who was his representative payee, savings account that was over the resource limit. L.G.'s mother filed a waiver of overpayment arguing that L.G. should not be found at fault because the mother had been told by SSI staff that it was okay to save the money, and she had been reporting this resource properly to SSI. The waiver of overpayment was denied and L.G. was required to make \$100 per month payments to SSI. L.G. then stopped receiving SSI benefits. However, L.G. continued to make the monthly payments for two years.

L.G. and his mother contacted OCRA for assistance as they were no longer able to afford the monthly SSI payments. OCRA agreed to represent L.G. OCRA argued at an SSI informal meeting that L.G. should not be found liable for any overpayment caused by his representative payee, as L.G. was unable to understand or comply with the rules of the program. OCRA further argued that L.G.'s SSI benefits should be reinstated immediately. SSI determined that L.G. was not at fault nor liable for the overpayment. SSI also reinstated L.G.'s SSI benefit in the full amount. Kendra McWright, CRA, Kay Spencer, Assistant CRA, Maricruz Magdaleno, Temporary Assistant CRA, Central Valley Regional Center.

R.H. Gets Benefits Reinstated and \$80,257 Overpayment Cleared.

R.H. is a 51-year-old man who has been working at a store for over eight years. He receives periodic raises. He also receives Social Security benefits as a disabled adult child. A regional center vendor was serving as his representative payee. One day, the payee received a notice from the SSA that R.H.'s disability had ended and he had incurred an overpayment of \$80,257 because R.H. was

allegedly performing substantial work. The payee did not appeal or contact the SSA. The payee gave the notice to R.H.'s SLS provider about two months after receipt of the notice. The SLS provider called OCRA.

OCRA asked R.H. about his work, and if OCRA could contact his supervisor. OCRA learned that R.H. is not able to perform all of the duties in the job description for his position. R.H. performs about fifty percent of the work that a non-disabled employee in the same position performs. Further, R.H. is paid almost double the amount of a non-disabled employee in the same position, because he has been there so long and received many raises. R.H.'s supervisor completed the subsidy form (SSA Work Activity Questionnaire).

OCRA filed an appeal of the disability cessation and ask for expedited reinstatement, citing many reasons for good cause for late filing. OCRA provided evidence of subsidy, which meant that R.H. was not performing substantial work, is still eligible for benefits, and the overpayment should be cleared. SSA agreed and reinstated R.H.'s benefits as of the date the benefits were erroneously terminated. The Trial Work Period was recalculated and the overpayment was cleared. Katie Meyer, CRA, Luisa Delgadillo, Assistant CRA, Westside Regional Center.

S.G.'s SSI Payments Are Reinstated and Overpayment Cleared.

S.G. is a child who was receiving SSI. He received a notice that his SSI was being terminated and he had a \$2,221 overpayment. OCRA investigated and learned S.G.'s parents' wages did not change, nor did anything else in S.G.'s household.

After reviewing notices, OCRA determined that the SSA was attributing the father's earned income to S.G. Instead of using the deeming formula, SSA used the earned income formula, which made S.G. ineligible for SSI and caused an overpayment. OCRA contacted the SSA and asked it to input S.G.'s income properly, reinstate his SSI, and clear his overpayment, which the SSA did. Katie Meyer, CRA, Luisa Delgadillo, Assistant CRA, Westside Regional Center.

Two Brothers Do Not Have to Repay Overpayments.

T.J. and K.J. are two brothers who were receiving both SSI and Disabled Adult Child (DAC) benefits from the SSA. T.J. and K.J. received DAC benefits because their mother and father were *both* receiving Social Security Disability Insurance (SSDI) benefits.

T.J. and K.J. each received notice that they incurred a DAC overpayment. K.J.'s overpayment was \$3,842 and T.J.'s was \$7,478, since he is older and had been receiving DAC for more years. The notice contained no information on how the overpayment occurred. OCRA agreed to investigate and ask for a proper notice. SSA told OCRA that in 2004, the brothers' father became ineligible for SSDI. However, the SSA continued to pay not only the father, but also K.J. and T.J., under the father's earnings record. In fact, the DAC benefits were calculated using the "combined family maximum," since both parents received SSDI. Once their father became ineligible, K.J. and T.J. were only eligible for a reduced amount, yet SSA continued to pay them the same amount for the next six years.

OCRA filed a request for waiver on behalf of both clients. OCRA explained that neither K.J. nor T.J. could have known that their father, who does not live with them, was erroneously receiving SSDI. Therefore, the brothers were without fault in causing the overpayment. OCRA also asserted that the brothers could not afford to pay the overpayment because their sole income is SSI and DAC benefits. SSA agreed and waived both overpayments. Katie Meyer, CRA, Luisa Delgadillo, Assistant CRA, Westside Regional Center.

SSA Increases Amount of SSI for Twins.

Twins, J.A. and J.A.A, were receiving monthly SSI benefits of \$151 each because SSI erroneously deemed almost all of their mother's workers compensation income to the twins. OCRA assisted by helping the mother file a request for reconsideration and completing a deeming worksheet with the correct income calculations. After a meeting with SSI, the twins were reassessed and received \$486 in SSI each per month, in addition to retroactive benefits for the months that were incorrectly calculated. Shortly after this, a new SSI notice

was sent. OCRA determined that the twins were each due \$250 more a month because SSI had again failed to fully account for two children with disabilities in the household. OCRA assisted the mother in filing a new request for reconsideration, providing SSI with another re-calculation and a copy of the appropriate SSI law. SSI sent yet another notice decreasing each child's SSI amount by \$30 a month. A third request for reconsideration has been filed. OCRA plans to assist J.A. and J.A.A's mother at the SSI informal conference to discuss this new notice. Margaret Oppel, CRA, Gina Gheno, Assistant CRA, Tri-Counties Regional Center.

CONSUMER FINANCE

Debt Issue Following Property Damage Resolved.

W.F. lives in a behavioral supported living situation. W.F. had a disagreement in the home and allegedly vandalized a staff member's car that was parked outside. The insurance company wanted W.F. to pay \$200 per month for the property damage. The regional center social worker had been negotiating with the insurance company but to no avail. OCRA was called to assist W.F.

OCRA called the insurance company and spoke directly with the agent. OCRA explained that W.F.'s only income was SSI and that W.F. could not possibly pay \$200 a month. OCRA wrote a letter to the insurance company memorializing this conversation. The insurance company decided not to pursue the matter. Katy Lusson, CRA, Trina Saldana, Assistant CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

OCRA Works with Regional Center to Get Debt Collection Dismissed.

C.M. contacted OCRA for advocacy assistance in getting an outstanding debt collection dismissed. During the summer of 1995, C.M. had dental work performed. Because the dental work had been denied for funding through Medi-Cal, the regional center had agreed to pay for the dental work. For several reasons, payment had not been credited as payment in full and C.M. was receiving harassing phone calls and correspondence from collection agencies. OCRA contacted the regional center which agreed to involve its attorney

since the regional center had paid for the dental work. After several months, OCRA received confirmation that the dental firm agreed to relieve the debt, thereby releasing C.M. from any liability. C.M. recently received written confirmation indicating that the debt has been relieved. Veronica Cervantes, CRA, Beatriz Reyes, Assistant CRA, Inland Regional Center.

HOUSING

Reasonable Accommodation Granted by Housing Authority.

R.A. has been receiving Section 8 Voucher rental assistance since 2008. She was renting a two-bedroom apartment with her minor son, though he turned eighteen within the last year. R.A.'s son, both while a minor and as an adult, was charged and convicted of drug and gang related activity. R.A. did not report this to the Housing Authority during the annual re-certification process.

R. A. suffers from a seizure condition due to a brain tumor. She has had three brain operations, both to remove tumors and to lessen seizure activity. The seizures have resulted in memory loss.

The Housing Authority gave R.A. a notice terminating her subsidy, and seeking to collect as an overpayment all assistance paid after R.A.'s failure to report her son's criminal activity.

OCRA was contacted by R.A. and assisted her with making an Informal Hearing request, and represented her at the hearing. The Hearing Officer found that a credible argument was presented that R.A. suffers from disabilities that impair or prevent her ability to ensure compliance with obligations as they relate to household members. The Hearing Officer also found that R.A. had not realized that she could have asked for a reasonable accommodation from the Housing Authority.

The Hearing Officer determined there was evidence that R.A. suffers from mental disabilities and may not have been fully cognizant of her responsibilities, and reversed the termination of her assistance on the condition that her son not reside in the home. Andy Holcombe, CRA, Far Northern Regional Center.

OCRA Helps L.V. Get Guardianship and Save Housing.

L.V., a 15-year-old consumer, lived with her grandmother, also her legal guardian, in federally subsidized housing. The regional center had funded structural modifications to make the townhouse fully accessible to L.V. These modifications included a specialized lift. L.V.'s grandmother became terminally ill and could no longer live in her private home with L.V. L.V.'s long time IHSS worker was willing to become L.V.'s guardian and move into the home to care for her. OCRA referred the family to the Self Help Law Project at the local courthouse for assistance in obtaining the new guardianship.

Meanwhile, the Housing Authority was threatening to terminate the voucher because L.V. could not live in the house alone nor could she have an unrelated person living in the home with her under the terms of the voucher. OCRA consulted with both the Housing Authority and its counsel and assured them that a guardianship was being obtained so that L.V. and her new guardian would soon be in compliance with the rules. OCRA further argued that because of L.V.'s disability and the specialized equipment installed in that particular unit, moving would be a hardship and the Housing Authority should grant additional time to obtain the guardianship as a reasonable accommodation. OCRA also provided L.V. and her new guardian with continuing advice about income and support services. Once the guardianship was granted, L.V.'s caregiver was a lawful resident of the home and L.V. was secure in her home with the necessary equipment. Jim Stoepler, CRA, Redwood Coast Regional Center, Ukiah.

NEGLECT/ABUSE

OCRA Obtains a Plan of Correction.

M.S. was placed in a nursing facility. The staff neglected M.S. and failed to administer the prescribed amount of anticonvulsant medication. This neglect led to M.S. having seizures and suffering brain damage. After M.S. went to the emergency room, a special incident report was received by OCRA.

OCRA sent a report to Adult Protective Services (APS), a complaint to licensing, and a request to the California Department of Public Health to investigate the incidents. It was determined by the Department of Public Health that the facility had failed to properly administer medication to M.S. It was determined that the seizures experienced by M.S. “were likely due to subtherapeutic antiepileptic medications.”

A ‘Plan of Correction’ was required and issued. All nursing staff was required to receive training on properly administering medication. Daily audits are now required by the records supervisor. M.S. is now living in a different facility and receiving proper medical care. Jackie Coleman, CRA, Adrianna Gutierrez, Interim Assistant CRA, Alta California Regional Center.

REGIONAL CENTER

Regional Center Services Reinstated following Termination.

J.M. is now 10-years old and became eligible for regional center services at the age of three. Following a reassessment, J.M. was found to no longer be eligible and his regional center services and supports were terminated.

J.M.’s mother is Spanish speaking. She needed assistance requesting a fair hearing. OCRA was retained to evaluate the merits of the case. Records from multiple sources were obtained including medical, clinical, and educational records. A comprehensive evaluation was conducted by the UCLA Autism Clinic.

OCRA submitted the new records and the UCLA report to the regional center in support of J.M.’s continued eligibility. Two weeks prior to the fair hearing, the regional center determined that the services and supports for J.M. would continue. Leinani Walter, CRA, Christine Hager, Assistant CRA, Valley Mountain Regional Center.

ALJ Determines that Family Member May Be Paid as Direct Care Staff by SLS Agency.

OCRA provided technical assistance to an attorney who is a consumer at one of the regional centers. The consumer/attorney represented herself at her hearing. Previously, her sister was one of her paid SLS workers through an SLS agency. At one point, the consumer moved out of state to do an internship. When she came back, the regional center found that the consumer's sister was a "natural support" and therefore could not be paid.

At hearing, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) ruled that the consumer's sister can be paid as direct care staff through the SLS agency. The ALJ specifically noted, "The Lanterman Act does NOT prohibit the regional center from allowing a family member to act as a paid personal care assistant for a consumer. Although parents of minor children do have a duty to care for their minor children, no such duty exists among adult siblings." The ALJ also ruled that it was not cost effective to have a different paid worker. Jackie Coleman, CRA, Alta California Regional Center.

OCRA Secures Additional Supports for D.B. in the Community.

Due to her disability, D.B. is unable to communicate verbally in a way that others can understand. She enjoyed sign language classes and looked forward to continuing to take sign language since it enabled her to communicate better.

The regional center terminated her sign language classes. D.B. has never had a speech device to help her communicate. She was unhappy with the day program she was in and wanted to find a program more consistent with her needs and she also wanted to take college classes. OCRA represented D.B. at a combination informal hearing and addendum IPP meeting to advocate on her behalf.

That meeting resulted in D.B. being able to continue taking sign language classes. The regional center agreed to do an assessment for assistive technology to help D.B. to communicate and made referrals to the Department of Rehabilitation and the local community college. Additionally, D.B. quit going to her day program and she

toured other day programs to find one more suitable. Lorie Atamian, Assistant CRA, Far Northern Regional Center

OCRA Ensures C.G.'s Choice of Living Arrangement Is Heard.

C.G. has a mild intellectual disability, and visual and orthopedic impairments. C.G. sought OCRA's assistance because the regional center had sent him a NOA cutting his Independent Living Skills (ILS) services. On several occasions C.G. had informed his service coordinator and his ILS provider that he wanted to move out of his mother's home. OCRA assisted C.G. by having the first NOA dismissed due to the fact that it was defective. Then, OCRA had an informal meeting with the regional center to present the reasons why the regional center should continue to fund ILS services for C.G. After the informal meeting, the regional center offered to extend the ILS services until September, so that the ILS provider can assist C.G. in finding an apartment. A review will be conducted in September to see whether ILS remains an appropriate service. Jackie S. Chiang, CRA, Lucy Garcia, Assistant CRA, Eastern Los Angeles Regional Center.

C.S. Receives Early Start Intervention Services.

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

B.K. Found Eligible for Regional Center Services.

B.K. was raised by his grandparents, who had previously made several unsuccessful attempts to have the regional center find B.K. eligible for services. OCRA submitted a new evaluation along with a letter to the regional center requesting that it find B.K. eligible for services. After reviewing the evaluation, the regional center found B.K. eligible for services under the fifth category. OCRA represented B.K. at the initial IPP meeting where the team agreed to provide B.K. with the services and supports he requested so that he could live in the community. Mario Espinoza, CRA, Valerie Geary, Assistant CRA, Kern Regional Center.

TRANSPORTATION

C.C. Retains Transportation.

C.C. requested assistance to appeal a suspension of transportation services. C.C. requires assistance from her SLS to schedule all of her transportation. C.C. was told by her new staff that C.C. should schedule her own transportation. Three months later, C.C. received suspension letters due to several no shows and late cancellations. The letters informed C.C. that she would be suspended for four months from receiving transportation services because she had violated the cancellation policy numerous times. The CRA represented C.C. at an appeal. The CRA presented witnesses and documentation to show that due to C.C.'s disability, C.C. is dependent on staff to schedule transportation. Evidence was also presented to show that C.C., the CRA, and the regional center service coordinator worked together to obtain appropriate support staff for C.C., so that she would not have any no shows or cancellations in the future. After the appeal, C.C. received a letter informing her that her transportation services had been reinstated. Jacqueline Miller, CRA, Cynthia Salomon, Assistant CRA, Regional Center of Orange County.

Bus Pass Reinstated.

A.S. is an adult with an intellectual disability and an anxiety disorder. For 15 years, A.S. had been traveling in the community with a VTA Bus Pass due to his disability related needs. A.S. received notice that he no longer qualified for the VTA bus pass. A.S. contacted OCRA as his disability needs remained unchanged and he wanted to appeal the decision to deny his bus pass. OCRA assisted A.S. to gather evidence of his continued need for the bus pass from his medical doctors and other care providers. Shortly after this evidence was submitted, A.S. was granted another VTA bus pass. Filomena Alomar, Assistant CRA, San Andreas Regional Center

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Student No Longer Isolated During Mealtime at School.

K.L. is in elementary school and must feed through a gastrostomy tube (G-Tube). Whenever it was time for K.L. to be fed, he was sent to the nurse's office. K.L.'s school felt it was disturbing for his classmates to see him using a G-Tube to eat. As a result of the isolation, K.L. was not spending his lunch breaks or recesses with his peers.

K.L.'s parents contacted OCRA for help. OCRA immediately contacted K.L.'s doctor and then requested an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) meeting for K.L. OCRA represented K.L. at his IEP meeting and advocated for him to be fed at the same time as his classmates in the classroom. OCRA discussed the concern of the doctor that the isolation was preventing K.L. from learning oral feeding skills and social behaviors. K.L. associated feedings with isolation instead of as a social activity.

As a result of OCRA's advocacy, the school district changed its position and K.L. now socializes with his peers during meals. Yulahlia Hernandez, CRA, Annie Breuer, Assistant CRA, North Bay Regional Center.

OCRA Prevents Expulsion and Non-Public School Placement.

J.M. is a young foster child in elementary school. In his special education program, J.M. was not receiving any behavioral support services from the school district. J.M. was suspended and the school district threatened expulsion for serious behaviors including inappropriate sexual behaviors, physical aggression, and emotional outbursts committed outside of the classroom.

The regional center contacted OCRA and referred J.M. for advocacy and representation. OCRA reviewed J.M.'s school records and regional center records. OCRA referred J.M. to a psychologist for assessment. OCRA then represented J.M. at the manifestation IEP meeting and argued that the manifestation determination should be changed to reflect that J.M.'s behaviors were directly due to his multiple disabilities. OCRA presented relevant regional center records that the school district originally failed to take into account. The new psychological report confirmed that J.M.'s behaviors were related to his disability.

The school district changed the manifestation determination. As a result of this change, the school district did not expel J.M. but did propose a non-public school placement (NPS). OCRA opposed the NPS placement on the basis that it was not the least restrictive placement and that the local public school could meet J.M.'s needs if he was provided appropriate behavioral supports and services. OCRA requested the district consider a public school placement and conduct a functional analysis assessment (FAA), a behavior intervention plan, and a 1:1 aide. The district agreed.

J.L. was also provided with door-to-door transportation with a daily bus rider to accompany J.M. to and from school, an occupational therapy assessment, a mental health referral for counseling and therapy for mental health services, and 22 hours of compensatory education. Leinani Walter, CRA, Christine Hager, Assistant CRA, Valley Mountain Regional Center.

School District Agrees to Train Substitute Aides.

D.O. is a middle school student who needs the assistance of a 1:1 aide during her school day. D.O.'s regular 1:1 aide did a good job of helping her eat, get enough water, and dress appropriately for the weather. When D.O.'s regular aide was absent, however, the classroom teacher failed to assign another 1:1 aide to assist D.O., and the two general aides in the classroom did not take responsibility for D.O.'s care or know how to feed her properly. D.O.'s mother observed the classroom on a day when the 1:1 aide was absent and saw that her daughter was left behind in the classroom when the class went to lunch. When her mother took her to the cafeteria, no one would agree to feed D.O. or knew how to feed her. D.O.'s mother finally started keeping D.O. at home when she knew the 1:1 aide was absent.

OCRA represented D.O. at an IEP meeting and obtained the district's agreement to train the two other classroom aides in how to properly feed and care for D.O. Training will include practice in feeding D.O. on days when the experienced aide is present to assist. The IEP team developed a checklist to be used each day to ensure that D.O. gets enough food and water and that her other needs are met. The district also agreed that when D.O.'s usual 1:1 aide is absent, one of the trained classroom aides will be assigned to work 1:1 with D.O. while a substitute aide takes over the regular duties of the general aide. Megan Chambers, CRA, Celeste Palmer, Associate CRA, Regional Center of the East Bay.

Student Gets Appropriate Services.

E.N. is a student with an intellectual disability. E.N. demonstrated significant behavioral challenges and failed to make any educational progress on his IEP goals for a year. OCRA provided direct representation of E.N. at an IEP meeting. The district agreed to a 1:1 instructional aide, a FFA, an assistive technology evaluation, an occupational therapy assessment and a psycho-educational assessment to determine appropriate placement and services for E.N. At a follow up IEP meeting, the behaviorist reported that maladaptive behaviors were extinguished completely as a direct

result of the instructional aide and behavioral interventions. Rita Defilippis, CRA, San Andreas Regional Center.

Student Given 1:1 Aide after Being Bullied.

N.F. has a diagnosis of cerebral palsy. She is mainstreamed in general education in the 7th grade. Her mother contacted OCRA because N.F. was being bullied by three different students. The bullying included pinching that resulted in bruises. In addition, due to staff's negligence, N.F. was being marked absent from classes because she was being taken to the wrong classrooms by the aids.

OCRA advised N.F.'s mother regarding complaint options. OCRA sent the mother all necessary educational resources that would guide her in addressing the bullying incidents on the school grounds. The mother also talked to the school psychologist and informed him of the mother's intent to file a compliance complaint with the California Department of Education against the school due to its failure to secure N.F.'s safety. As a result, the mother was able to secure a 1:1 aide for N.F. Wendy Dumlao, CRA, Alba Gomez, Assistant CRA, San Diego Regional Center.

A.A. Moves to a Less Restrictive School Placement.

A.A. is a 7-year-old with an intellectual disability. A.A.'s school is terminating its full inclusion class and this concerned A.A.'s mother. OCRA suggested that the mother request an IEP meeting to discuss all of her concerns. OCRA then suggested that A.A.'s mother request placement in a less restrictive school, explained what a resource specialist program is and the continuum of placement options. Since A.A. was already receiving help from an inclusion specialist and Adapted Physical Education (APE) at her school, OCRA suggested to A.A.'s mother to also request a 1:1 aide in addition. This would help A.A. to do well in a less restrictive placement. A.A.'s mother went to the IEP and the school agreed to a 1:1 aide, resource specialist, and continued APE. A goal for full inclusion for the next school year was added to the IEP. Jackie S. Chiang, CRA, Lucy Garcia, Assistant CRA, Eastern Los Angeles Regional Center.

School District Agrees to Complete Independent Assessments and Obtain Appropriate Preschool Placement.

B.V.'s parent called OCRA for assistance in obtaining an appropriate preschool placement for their 3-year-old child who was diagnosed with charge syndrome. Charge syndrome is a condition that includes severe hearing loss, vision impairment and intellectual disability. B.V. also requires g-tube feeding and has a heart condition. OCRA reviewed the school district's evaluation reports in the areas of language and speech, psycho-educational, and occupational therapy, and found they were incomplete in that they were not performed by evaluators familiar with charge syndrome or who took into account B.V.'s communication limitations before forming their opinions and recommendation. OCRA represented B.V. at an IEP meeting and advocated for independent education evaluations in these areas and explained why the placement offered by the school district was not appropriate. At the IEP meeting, the school district agreed to fund the independent education evaluations and place B.V. in a modified school program at a preschool in which a nurse was available and curriculum would be individualized for B.V.'s alternative communication needs. Timothy Poe, CRA, Jazmin Romero, Assistant CRA, Frank D. Lanterman Regional Center.

OUTREACH/TRAINING

Capital People First Training in the Community.

San Diego OCRA staff had a successful Capital People First (CPF) training in June, 2011. CPF trainings are done as a result of an agreement between Disability Rights California and the Department of Developmental Services (DDS). Alba Gomez, Wendy Dumlao, and Jeanne Molineaux met with nine residents of Country Hills Health Care & Rehabilitation Center, which is a 304 bed skilled nursing facility. Residents of the facility are all ages with varying types of disabilities. For the training, staff used the materials developed by DDS called "My Own Choice." The materials explain four options for consumers if they desire to live in the community. The facility's staff was extremely supportive of the training and very interested in the materials. OCRA staff agreed to help J.D. and his

wife move from the large facility. J.D. is a person with a developmental disability but his wife is not, so OCRA is exploring options in order to help in the coordination of services between the agencies serving J.D. and his wife. Wendy Dumlao, CRA, Alba Gomez, Assistant CRA, Jeanne Molineaux, Director.

Consumers Enjoy CPF Training in San Francisco.

OCRA conducted a successful CPF training to 20 residents in a San Francisco placement. The training material developed by DDS was used during the training. The DVD, outlining several different placement options, was liked by the residents who enjoyed discussing what they saw on the video. The “My Own Choice” sticker book was easy for many of the residents to follow. Residents also enjoyed brainstorming ideas about where to go for fun. Some residents asked questions about the possibility of living independently.

At the end of the training, the participants were glad to know that advocates were available and their community placement options. Katy Lusson, CRA, Trina Saldana, Assistant CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

ADVOCACY REPORT

OFFICE OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS ADVOCACY

Winter 2011

BENEFITS

IN-HOME SUPPORT SERVICES (IHSS)

A.M. Obtains the Protective Supervision Needed to Live in His Home.

A.M. is a young adult who has autism. He is attending school and wants to remain in his own home but he requires 24-hour supervision. Although A.M. is not able to communicate or direct his activities, and had no safety awareness, the county social worker denied protective supervision under IHSS.

A.M.'s mother filed for hearing. The mother prepared for the hearing by gathering documentary evidence of A.M.'s disability and his need for supervision at all times. She attended the hearing and brought the regional center social worker to testify. Unfortunately, the County did not come prepared. The county social worker never showed up and the county appeals specialist did not know enough about A.M.'s file to put on a case.

Instead of making a decision on the evidence, the judge ordered the County to reassess A.M. At the reassessment, the IHSS social worker asked the mother to obtain a full psychological evaluation. The County gave the mother a deadline in writing to get the evaluation. A.M.'s mother contacted the regional center, who agreed to complete a psychological evaluation. The County sent a new denial letter to A.M. before the deadline to complete the evaluation. A.M.'s mother called the IHSS worker and supervisor and left many messages. No calls were returned. A.M.'s mother then wrote a letter to the state hearings division (SHD) asking for a new hearing. Instead, the mother received a denial of her "rehearing request."

A.M.'s mother contacted OCRA for assistance. OCRA sent a request for an expedited hearing to the SHD and cited procedural violations and communication mishaps. The request was granted. OCRA presented evidence of A.M.'s disability, need for constant supervision, and testimony about how A.M. meets the criteria for protective supervision. OCRA received a favorable hearing decision shortly afterward with an award of a retroactive grant. Katie Meyer, CRA, Luisa Delgadillo, Assistant CRA, Westside Regional Center.

County Reinstates V.R.'s Maximum IHSS Hours.

V.R. received an IHSS notice of proposed action which attempted to reduce her 283 hours to 93.2 hours per month despite a recent hearing decision. OCRA agreed to assist V.R. by contacting the county appeals worker. During the telephone call to the appeals worker, OCRA was able to straighten out the County's confusion regarding the case. The County agreed that the notice was improper and reinstated V.R.'s 283 hours of IHSS services per month. Margaret Oppel, CRA, Matthew O'Neill, Temporary CRA, Gina Gheno, Assistant CRA, Tri-Counties Regional Center.

K.M. Obtains Personal and Related Hours.

K.M.'s mother requested assistance to prepare for K.M.'s IHSS needs assessment because the county social worker verbally informed her that K.M. would not be eligible for any IHSS services. K.M. is dependents on others for all of her daily living needs. The Assistant CRA provided the parent with publications, including the needs assessment chart, and explained how to document K.M.'s needs for the assessment. As recommended, K.M.'s mother filled out the chart and provided documentation at the assessment. K.M. was authorized 72 hours per month of IHSS. Jacqueline Miller, CRA, Cynthia Salomon, Assistant CRA, Regional Center of Orange County.

M.T. Secures Maximum IHSS Hours.

M.T. is a 17-year-old female with autism. She received an IHSS notice of action dated February 18, 2011, reducing 195 hours to 128. 20.5 hours were for protective supervision. The mother believed that M.T. was totally dependent on others in all self-care areas and that

the 195 hours meet her daughter's needs. The mother requested that OCRA help her prepare for hearing.

OCRA agreed to provide technical assistance and advised the mother about the IHSS program and appeal procedures. The mother settled prior to hearing by signing a conditional withdrawal granting 283 hours, starting June 1, 2011. Wendy Dumlao, CRA, Alba Gomez, Assistant CRA, San Diego Regional Center.

J.B.'s IHSS Hours Are Restored.

J.B. was authorized 283 hours of IHSS per month. The county social worker reduced the hours to 195 because she determined that someone other than the parent was providing some of the personal and related service hours. After consulting with OCRA, the parent appealed the reduction because the social worker had incorrectly estimated the hours that J.B.'s care was provided by another person and the social worker had not requested that the person sign the DSS form as a volunteer. In addition, despite a timely appeal, J.B. was denied aid paid pending. The CRA assisted the parent in preparing for hearing by utilizing the time for task chart to show that J.B. had unmet needs, and accurately showing the actual 20 hours that were provided by another person. With the CRA's assistance, J.B.'s parent was able to successfully negotiate with the county representative to restore J.B.'s hours to 283. Jacqueline Miller, CRA, Cynthia Salomon, Assistant CRA, Regional Center of Orange County.

One Year Battle to Receive IHSS Ends in Success.

K. L.'s mother had been struggling for about one year to get IHSS for K.L. K.L.'s mother was unsuccessful in getting a home assessment by an IHSS worker because the mother was continuously denied IHSS for her daughter over the phone. K.L.'s mother was told repeatedly by the IHSS representative that she was the mother and it was her responsibility to watch K.L. K.L.'s mother contacted OCRA for assistance. The CRA explained to K.L.'s mother the IHSS application and appeal process. K.L.'s mother was instructed to complete the IHSS self assessment packet. Once K.L.'s mother was prepared, she called IHSS and was again denied over the phone. This time K.L.'s mother requested a written denial. Within a week, K.L.

was visited at home by an IHSS worker. Recently K.L.'s mother received a notice from IHSS granting K.L. 35 hours of IHSS per month. Aimee Delgado, CRA, Marisol Cruz, Assistant CRA, San Gabriel/Pomona Regional Center.

MEDI-CAL

K.A. and J.C. Retain Medi-Cal with No Share of Cost.

Two months after K.A. and J.C. were married, they received a Medi-Cal Notice of Action informing them that they had a \$1,088 per month share of cost because their income exceeded the allowable amount for the Aged and Disabled Program. K.A. and J.C.'s Medi-Cal social worker informed them that they were not eligible for any other Medi-Cal program that would reduce or eliminate their share of cost. The CRA worked with the regional center benefits specialist to obtain information about K.A. and J.C. to determine if they were eligible for a different Medi-Cal program. The records revealed that K.A. and J.C. were both recipients of Disabled Adult Child Social Security benefits (DAC). The CRA informed the clients that since they were recipients of DAC benefits, they were able to be married and eligible for Medi-Cal with no share of cost. With the permission of the clients, the CRA contacted the Medi-Cal office and advised it of its error, which it agreed to correct. Jacqueline Miller, CRA, Cynthia Salomon, Assistant CRA, Regional Center of Orange County.

SOCIAL SECURITY

OCRA Helps Get Social Security Benefits Reinstated.

W.W. was made eligible for Supplemental Security Income (SSI) when the program started in 1974. W.W. missed an appointment for an evaluation in 2009. Due to W.W.'s failure to participate in the evaluation, his SSI was terminated. W.W.'s benefits were later reinstated and he was awarded retroactive payment in August, 2010. Without notice, W.W. stopped getting checks in November, 2010. Various service providers attempted to get W.W.'s benefits reinstated but to no avail. The providers sought the assistance of OCRA.

OCRA learned that two local offices were involved in W.W.'s case and that one of the offices had miscoded W.W.'s benefit status. The confusion was between the codes "expedited reinstatement" and "payment continuation." OCRA intervened and convinced the local Social Security Administration Office (SSA) of the correct code, which the SSA quickly entered into its computer system. Receipt of the SSI prevented W.W. from losing his trailer space and protected his credit rating. Jim Stoepler, CRA, Redwood Coast Regional Center, Ukiah.

Incorrect Decision Is Reversed and an Overpayment Is Waived.

S.M. is an adult client who had received SSI benefits for 27 of her 30 years of life. She had never been able to work. The SSA terminated her SSI benefits with no written notice. OCRA determined that the termination came about because the client's disability was being reviewed and the representative payee did not submit the documentation that the SSA requested. S.M. made the CRA her authorized representative. The CRA filed a request for reconsideration on the grounds that there had never been a determination about the disability and included proof of S.M.'s continuing disability.

OCRA's request was dismissed. The administrative law judge (ALJ) claimed he had tried to contact the representative payee to no avail, so he had to dismiss the claim. The ALJ had never tried to contact the CRA, who had been the authorized representative for 11 months, had filed for the hearing in the first place, and who had met with the SSA representatives several times.

OCRA filed an appeal with the Appeals Council. Meanwhile, S.M.'s benefits had been reinstated but she had a large overpayment from when she was found not disabled by SSA. Two years after filing, OCRA received a favorable decision from the Appeals Council. The Council ruled that the ALJ incorrectly dismissed the case. The case was remanded back to the local Office of Disability Adjudication and Review (ODAR) for a hearing.

Recently, OCRA received a fully favorable decision made on the basis of the documents submitted. No hearing was held. The new

ODAR judge found that S.M. did meet the listings and that the original ALJ did not have any evidence to support his decision that S.M.'s condition had improved. S.M. is not responsible for any overpayment that resulted from the initial decision. Katie Meyer, CRA, Luisa Delgadillo, Assistant CRA, Westside Regional Center.

SSI Overpayment Waived following OCRA Intervention.

M.M. is 54 and works through a supported employment program. M.M. receives SSI benefits and his mother is his representative payee. M.M. and his mother work together to report M.M.'s wages to the SSA in a timely manner. Despite diligent efforts to report income, M.M. got a notice of overpayment in the amount of \$1,414.00.

M.M. and his mother requested OCRA assistance. They could not understand why the overpayment occurred. OCRA assisted M.M. with the completion and filing of a Request for Reconsideration. The SSA subsequently notified M.M. that he no longer owed the \$1,414.00. Katy Lusson, CRA, Trina Saldana, Assistant CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

SSA Corrects Error.

G.G. is a 38-years-old and has intellectual disabilities, Cornelia de Lange Syndrome, and a heart condition. G.G. requires significant personal support with feeding, bathing, and personal care needs. Her representative payee received a notice of action stating that G.G.'s monthly SSI amount would be reduced by \$241.00. OCRA assistance was requested.

OCRA reviewed the notice and explained to the representative payee that the SSA incorrectly changed G.G.'s living arrangement from the board and care rate when she moved to another address. OCRA advocated for G.G.'s representative payee to follow through with the SSA request to meet with G.G. and to complete the necessary paperwork to correct the problem. G.G. followed through with the meeting and completed the required forms. The SSA received the updated information from the county and reinstated G.G.'s SSI monies to the board and care rate. Leinani Walter, CRA, Christine Hager, Assistant CRA, Valley Mountain Regional Center.

CONSUMER DEBT

OCRA Gets Debt Cancelled and Tax Debt Discharged.

T.H. has a cognitive disability. He was talked into co-signing a car loan for his brother. T.H. did not understand that if his brother failed to make loan payments, he would be responsible for paying back the loan. T.H. could not afford the payments and came to OCRA for assistance.

In 2008, OCRA sent a letter to the lender and explained that because of his disability, T.H. did not possess the requisite capacity to enter into the car loan contract. OCRA requested that the debt be cancelled and it was.

Last year, T.H. received a notice from the IRS that he had a tax increase of \$1,533 from 2008, because the lender filed a 1099 form for \$9,894 because of the cancellation of the debt. T.H. again requested assistance from OCRA.

OCRA wrote a letter to the IRS and also filed forms 1040X and 982 for T.H. Last month, T.H. received a new notice from the IRS stating that he does not owe any additional taxes for 2008. Jackie Coleman, CRA, Alta California Regional Center.

SLS Agency Forgives Debt.

J.W. has lived in supported living for many years. She has support staff that live with her. J.W. received a notice that she could move from her present apartment to another apartment in the same building which would cost her less money. In order to do this, she had to break her lease. Her supported living provider assured her that they would help her with these costs and J.W. moved. Some time after this, the SLS provider asked J.W. to pay back the money it had spent to assist her with the move. J.W. disagreed with this and attempted to negotiate with the agency. She also requested OCRA assistance.

OCRA scheduled a meeting with the SLS provider, the regional center, and J.W. The director of the SLS agency agreed that she had

not been clear with J.W. The SLS agency agreed to forgive the debt. Katy Lusson, CRA, Trina Saldana, Assistant CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

Consumer Fraud Judgments Obtained For Multiple Consumers.

OCRA was contacted by a regional center service coordinator in July, 2010, regarding a consumer, D.R., who was encountering difficulties in getting a local furniture store to fulfill a contract for household furnishings. The furniture store was a vendor used by many consumers with the assistance of their service coordinator or group home staff.

Upon investigation, the CRA learned that there were several adversely affected consumers. In addition to D.R., D.S., K.T., and M.W. all had unfulfilled contracts with the same store. Requests for delivery of furniture or refund went unanswered.

The CRA wrote letters of inquiry on behalf of the consumers. That inquiry received no response. Demand letters were then sent seeking reimbursement, and putting the store on notice of intent to litigate. The store still failed to respond. The CRA next consulted with the regional center's trust department, as it was the representative payee for the consumers.

The regional center removed the store from the approved vendor list. The CRA provided technical assistance for the preparation and filing of small claims cases on behalf of each consumer, and the cases were filed by the regional center on the consumers' behalf. Judgments in the consumers' favor of \$804, \$1020, \$729, and \$1104, plus court costs of \$142.50 each, were obtained. Andy Holcombe, CRA, Lorie Atamian, Assistant CRA, Far Northern Regional Center.

EMPLOYMENT

Consumer Returns to Work Following Negotiated Agreement.

J.M. worked in supported employment for a large grocery store. Despite many interventions by his employment coach, J.M. lost his

temper and cursed at other employees and customers. The store wanted to terminate his employment. He had been on leave for several months when OCRA was contacted.

OCRA worked with involved parties at the store and with the regional center social worker. A beneficial agreement was negotiated which allowed J.M. to return to work. It was agreed that J.M. would receive counseling and additional support as needed. Katy Lusson, CRA, Trina Saldana, Assistant CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

HOUSING

C.B. Retains Larger Apartment and Rent Subsidy.

C.B. is a 28-year-old who lives independently and is the parent of a 3-year-old son. In November, 2010, C.B. received notices from the City Public Housing Authority (PHA) and contacted OCRA. The PHA proposed changes to C.B.'s Housing Assistance Payment (HAP), which is used to calculate the family share of rent, and a reduction to her existing Voucher Payment Standard (VPS), which is used to determine voucher bedroom size. The proposed change to her HAP would have increased C.B.'s rent payment to 80% of her monthly SSI income, making it unaffordable. The PHA also proposed that C.B. relocate to a smaller unit to achieve a more affordable rent. However, C.B. needed to remain in her current, larger apartment to meet her disability and equipment storage needs.

OCRA assisted C.B. and her supported living services (SLS) worker to complete necessary forms requesting a reasonable accommodation. OCRA requested a letter from C.B.'s regional center service coordinator as well as the SLS program director to detail C.B.'s disability and support for the accommodation requests. OCRA coordinated written documentation from C.B.'s treating physician regarding C.B.'s disability, limited mobility, and equipment usage (2 wheelchairs, stander and a walker). OCRA coordinated the submission of documents to the PHA. OCRA also initiated interim rental assistance with a local legal aid agency's rapid re-housing program and C.B. was approved.

The PHA approved both accommodation requests in February, 2011. C.B.'s rent was not increased and she and her son remain in their larger 3-bedroom apartment. Anastasia Bacigalupo, CRA, Christine Armand, Associate CRA, South Central Los Angeles Regional Center.

Interagency Collaboration Prevents Homelessness.

OCRA was contacted by staff from the county department of mental health regarding B.R. B.R. was being evicted and was expected to become homeless. She had applied for regional center eligibility and been found eligible but had not yet had an IPP meeting.

OCRA went to meet with B.R. She was living in an empty apartment and had no food. B.R.'s family had moved out of the apartment the previous week. They had promised to return to the apartment but never did. B.R. was alone.

OCRA requested an emergency IPP. The regional center agreed to an IPP meeting the following morning. At the IPP meeting, OCRA advocated for B.R. to receive emergency housing at a group home and emergency resources in the interim. B.R. moved into a group home within a few days and is now receiving appropriate shelter and food. Yulahlia Hernandez, CRA, Annie Breuer, Assistant CRA, North Bay Regional Center.

PERSONAL AUTONOMY

S.W. Changes His Payee So He Can Be More Independent.

S.W. was referred to OCRA by his supported living agency. The agency was concerned that S.W.'s mother was misusing his SSI. It was also reported that the mother was not paying S.W.'s rent.

When OCRA spoke to S.W. about this situation, he informed OCRA that he had asked his mother to pay his rent and she refused. OCRA counseled S.W. on his options. S.W. was interested in becoming his own payee, so OCRA contacted the regional center. The regional center agreed to become S.W.'s payee. The regional center also

agreed to have S.W.'s supported living agency start working on budgeting with S.W., so that he can become his own payee.

OCRA sent all necessary paperwork to the regional center to change S.W.'s representative payee and also submitted a letter to the SSA on S.W.'s behalf. S.W.'s payee was changed to the regional center in March, 2011. Wendy Dumlao, CRA, Alba Gomez, Assistant CRA, San Diego Regional Center.

REGIONAL CENTER

Regional Center Fills the Gap When EPSDT Services End.

One month before D.L.'s 21st birthday, he received a notice of action letter from IHSS. The notice informed D.L. that his eligibility for 343 LVN nursing hours per month through EPSDT would end on his birthday. D.L. would then only be eligible to receive 35 LVN nursing hours per month in the home through the Nursing Facility/Acute Hospital Waiver Program. This change in nursing services would mean that D.L. would be at risk of being placed into a nursing facility instead of continuing to live at home with his parents. D.L. asked the regional center to fill the gap in nursing hours left when D.L. aged out of the EPSDT program. The regional center denied D.L.'s request stating that Medi-Cal was the generic resource responsible for providing the nursing services. The regional center requested that D.L. appeal the Medi-Cal decision in an effort to obtain more nursing hours. OCRA represented D.L. in a series of meetings with the regional center to negotiate a solution. One day prior to his birthday, D.L. was approved for 70 hours per week of LVN nursing hours paid for by the regional center while D.L. pursues his appeal against Medi-Cal. Eva Casas-Sarmiento, Interim CRA, Abigail Perez, Assistant CRA, Harbor Regional Center.

C.S. Moves into a Home of Her Choice.

C.S. lived in a nursing facility for over a year though she no longer required nursing level of care. C.S. had informed her prior conservator that she wanted to move to a more independent community setting. OCRA agreed to represent C.S. at her regional

center meeting. OCRA contacted the nursing facility staff and former conservator and reviewed all records to better determine what types of medical care or assistance C.S. might need in the community. At the regional center meeting, C.S. identified the types of settings in which she would like to live and the types of day activities she preferred. OCRA and regional center staff worked with C.S. to identify community settings that she could visit that would meet her needs and preferences. C.S. chose a placement in the community where she will have her own bedroom and bathroom and be around people her age with similar interests. C.S. will be moving to her new home in April and will be provided with personal assistant hours to help her with shopping, running errands and participating in other community activities. Timothy Poe, CRA, Frank D. Lanterman Regional Center.

Client Receives Needed Supports to Remain Safely at Home.

E.B. requested assistance from OCRA in securing additional services for him to remain safely in his home and increase his independence in the community. E.B.'s needs for additional supports in his home had changed given the advanced age of his elderly mother who had previously served as E.B.'s primary caregiver.

OCRA agreed to represent E.B. at his IPP meeting and recommended that the regional center fund a comprehensive assessment in order to better evaluate E.B.'s needs at home and in the community. The regional center agreed to fund the assessment and subsequently adopted the recommendations in the assessment, which include funding services in the home to assist E.B. with personal care needs and household chores. In addition, E.B. was approved to receive services in the community to allow him to engage in recreational activities. Ibrahim Saab, CRA, Ada Hamer, Assistant CRA, North Los Angeles County Regional Center.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

District Funds Functional Analysis Assessment and Assistive Technology Evaluation.

B.N., an elementary school student with autism and a significant hearing impairment, had not made meaningful progress in school for three years. B.N. had trouble staying on task and would have behavioral challenges throughout the school day. OCRA requested that the district conduct a functional analysis assessment (FAA) and an assistive technology (AT) evaluation. The FAA found that B.N. was acting out due to his inability to communicate his needs and preferences in the classroom. A behavior plan was developed and within weeks, the student met three out of four of his annual behavior goals.

The district funded an assessment which concluded that B.N. would benefit from many technology devices, including a word processor, to assist BN with staying on task. The district purchased all of these items for B.N. As a result, B.N.'s unwanted behaviors have decreased and he is now making significant progress on his IEP goals. Rita Defilippis, CRA, San Andreas Regional Center.

School District Agrees to All Proposed Resolutions in a Compliance Complaint.

X.M. is a 13-year-old student who was out of school for five months after his mother removed him from an inappropriate placement. During the second month that X.M. was out of school, the district responded to his mother's request for an IEP meeting. The district agreed to fund a number of in-home educational services until a new school placement could be found. The district did not, however, provide the interim services it had promised, and an additional three months passed before X.M.'s mother contacted OCRA.

OCRA wrote a Compliance Complaint for X.M.'s mother to submit to the California Department of Education (CDE), and instructed the mother to provide a copy of the complaint to the school district. Within 24 hours of the district's receipt of the complaint, the Special Education Director contacted X.M.'s mother and agreed to all of the

resolution terms that had been proposed in the complaint. In addition to compensatory services, the resolutions included the provision of 20 hours per week of individual instruction through a non-public agency starting immediately and continuing throughout the summer, and a comprehensive assessment by the California Diagnostic Center to be completed prior to the beginning of the next school year. Celeste Palmer, Associate CRA, Megan Chambers, CRA, Regional Center of the East Bay.

District Provides Student with Augmentative Communication Device.

M.G. needed a sophisticated eye-gaze controlled augmentative communication (AC) device to communicate effectively. His mother and sister, who are monolingual Spanish speakers, had tried to get M.G.'s school district to provide an appropriate device but the district insisted on having M.G. continue to use a switch-operated AC device that did not adequately allow M.G. to communicate his needs and choices, and which M.G. did not like to use.

OCRA attended multiple IEP meetings and persuaded the district to arrange trials of suitable devices so that M.G. could show that he was capable of using a more sophisticated system. Once M.G.'s capabilities were established, the district agreed to rent the appropriate device, but then did not. After continued negotiations, OCRA was successful in obtaining the district's commitment to purchase the device. Due to a number of subsequent delays in the district's fulfilling its commitment, OCRA found it necessary to file a Compliance Complaint with the Department of Education. As a result, the appropriate device was purchased, and M.G. is receiving training and support in its use from the district's AC specialist. Megan Chambers, CRA, Celeste Palmer, Associate CRA, Regional Center of the East Bay.

Parent Reimbursed for Tuition for Private School.

A.M., a student with autism and a significant anxiety disorder, had been on home instruction for three years because of his inability to remain composed in a district special education classroom. A.M.'s mother found a small private school which serves students with special needs, including students with disabilities such as A.M.s. The

district did not have a current contract with the private school. The parent contacted OCRA, who negotiated with the district for reimbursement of the tuition. The district agreed to reimburse the parent as the district did not have a placement to meet the student's needs. Rita Defilippis, CRA, San Andreas Regional Center.

Assistive Technology Secured.

S.G. is a child with autism. In school, S.G. had difficulty with reading and verbal communication. S.G.'s mother had requested Kurzweil assistive technology the previous year. Kurzweil is assistive technology that uses text-to-speech software. It provides complete reading, study skill and writing support for the student. The school responded to S.G.'s mother's request with an informal denial. The school told S.G.'s mother that it did not have that software.

S.G.'s mother contacted OCRA for advice on how to proceed. OCRA suggested that S.G.'s mother request an assistive technology assessment and an IEP to discuss S.G.'s need. OCRA agreed to attend the IEP. S.G.'s mother requested an assistive technology assessment in writing. The school approved S.G.'s use of this software and agreed to train staff on its use, without an assessment. Wendy Dumlao, CRA, Alba Gomez, Assistant CRA, San Diego Regional Center.

District Returns A.A. to His Original Placement.

A.A. is a student with autism who was suspended for behavior related to his disability. The district placed the student on home instruction indefinitely, without first holding a manifestation determination. The manifestation determination decides if a student's actions were a result of his or her disability. A.A.'s parents contacted OCRA, which represented the student at an IEP meeting. The district promptly returned A.A. to his original placement and agreed to fund an FAA to develop a positive behavior intervention plan. Rita Defilippis, CRA, San Andreas Regional Center.

S. B. Receives Assessments Tailored to Her Individual Need.

S.B. is a 5-year-old girl who is non-verbal. S.B.'s mother contacted OCRA for advocacy assistance after removing S.B. from school due to alleged abuse by her teacher. After advising S.B.'s mother on the alleged abuse issue, OCRA agreed to review records. OCRA found that the school district had failed to provide any related services to S.B. OCRA agreed to provide technical assistance to S.B.'s family in preparation for upcoming IEP meetings. In an attempt to obtain appropriate services for S.B., OCRA wrote a letter on S.B.'s behalf which requested that the school district conduct a psychological assessment using instruments designed for non-verbal children, a speech assessment, an occupational therapy assessment, an AT assessment, and an inclusion assessment to determine a placement in the least restrictive environment. S.B. is now in a new placement and the school district is in the process of completing all of the assessments requested by S.B.'s family. Veronica Cervantes, CRA, Matthew O'Neill, Temporary Assistant CRA, Inland Regional Center.

OCRA Convinces the School District to Fund a 1:1 Aide.

R.R. is a 16-year-old high school student who eloped from school and was found by police wondering the streets five miles from the high school campus. This was the second time in a year that R.R. had eloped without school officials knowing where he had gone. OCRA represented R.R. at an IEP meeting where the school agreed to fund a 1:1 aide for R.R. pending the outcome of a Special Circumstance Instructional Aide (SCIA) Assessment. OCRA represented R.R. at the follow-up IEP meeting where the IEP team discussed the SCIA results. The IEP team agreed it was necessary to continue funding the 1:1 aide.

The members of the IEP team also created a school wide color coordinated hall pass system that would not only be used for special education students but for all students on campus. The new pass system would be incorporated into school policy in order to prevent what happened to R.R. from happening to anyone else. Mario Espinoza, CRA, Kern Regional Center.

School District Agrees to Cancel SARB Hearing.

J.R. is a student with autism. He was getting sick a great deal, having significant challenges, and missing school. J.R.'s doctors were attempting to find the correct combination of medications in order to address J.R.'s behaviors. J.R.'s mother attempted to provide explanations to the school regarding a 2-month absence. Despite her efforts, the school district initiated a SARB hearing. OCRA was contacted for assistance.

OCRA spoke with J.R.'s physician and the special education director at J.R.'s school and assisted with the drafting of a letter to the school which outlined the medical basis for the behaviors and illness. Following review of the letter by the school district, it agreed to a period of home schooling while medication trials were initiated. Katy Lusson, CRA, Trina Saldana, Assistant CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

B.B. Is Provided with Behavioral Supports in the Classroom.

B.B.'s parent called OCRA for assistance in obtaining behavioral supports from the school district after receiving a phone call from the school that B.B. was being suspended. OCRA represented B.B. at an IEP meeting advocating for behavioral services to address B.B.'s disruptive behaviors. At the IEP meeting, the parent learned that for several weeks B.B. had been denied participation in weekly school community outings. Instead, B.B. was required to sit in the administrative offices with no structured educational services. OCRA also obtained information at the IEP meeting that different teachers were using different approaches to try to compel B.B. to behave. There was no consistent positive behavioral plan. OCRA convinced the IEP team to fund a comprehensive FAA. The school psychologist also agreed to train staff to implement positive behavioral interventions on a temporary basis until a more comprehensive behavioral plan was developed. B.B.'s behavioral incidents have decreased and she is again joining her classmates in community outings. OCRA will represent B.B. at a follow-up IEP at which time the assessment will be reviewed and a more comprehensive behavioral plan will be developed. Timothy Poe, CRA, Frank D. Lanterman Regional Center.

P.L. Obtains a Change In Classroom Placement and an Assistive Technology Assessment.

P.L.'s mother contacted OCRA regarding the many difficulties P.L. was having in his current classroom placement. The mother felt that P.L. was extremely unhappy in his classroom placement. When he arrived home from school each day he was angry and engaged in self-injurious behaviors. P.L.'s mother informed OCRA that she needed assistance in getting a change in classroom placement for P.L. OCRA reviewed P.L.'s records. It was apparent that P.L. was placed in an inappropriate classroom and that he did not have a way to communicate with his classmates and teachers.

OCRA attended two IEP meetings on P.L.'s behalf. During each meeting, OCRA presented reasons why a change in classroom placement was necessary. Additionally, OCRA requested an assistive technology assessment to be conducted to determine how to address P.L.'s communication needs. OCRA also discussed a more appropriate behavior plan as it was necessary to provide a different type of intervention strategy. As the result of OCRA's advocacy, the school district offered a change in classroom placement and to conduct an assistive technology assessment. Jackie S. Chiang, CRA, Lucy Garcia, Assistant CRA, Eastern Los Angeles Regional Center.

Outreach and Training

Residents at Sierra Vista Learn about Living Options.

On March 10 and 18, 2011, OCRA presented "My Own Choice" trainings to residents at Sierra Vista Rehabilitation Center in Highland. The residents learned about living options and making choices for their future. The training materials included a "My Own Choice" workbook, sticker booklet, and a DVD, all of which were developed by the Department of Developmental Services.

The residents were excited about discussing their preferences and enjoyed asking many questions. Staff worked individually with each resident. The residents hope to share their workbooks with friends,

family, and regional center service coordinators. Veronica Cervantes, CRA, Katie Hornberger, Supervising CRA, Inland Regional Center.



Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
567 W. Shaw Avenue, Suite C-3
Fresno, CA 93704
Tel: (559) 271-6604
TTY: (877) 669-6023
Fax: (559) 271-6606

*Serving Consumers of
Central Valley Regional Center*

www.disabilityrightsca.org

MEMORANDUM

TO: Jeanne Molineaux, Director

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

RE: Annual OCRA Outreach Report
June 2010 - June 2011

DATE: August 15, 2011

Each year there is a high demand for OCRA to present outreach to our communities. During the past fiscal year, OCRA has presented more than 422 outreach presentations in the categories of: General Outreach, Targeted Outreach, and Self-Advocacy Outreach. This year, in addition to the requirement of providing general, target and self-advocacy outreach, many offices were also responsible for presenting the My Own Choice presentation in fulfillment of Disability Rights California's obligations under the *Capital People First* settlement. The remainder of this report discusses in detail the work performed in each of the above mentioned categories.

Self-Advocacy Trainings

While each OCRA office is expected to conduct at least one self-advocacy outreach presentation per year, many of our offices have gone beyond the minimum requirements. These presentations focused on topics such as: Emergency preparedness, clients' rights, voting rights, money management, and community living options. Below is a description of a few of the presentations provided by OCRA.

Clients' Rights Training to Cole Vocational Day Program: We conducted a Self-Advocacy Clients' Rights BINGO training for consumers at Cole Vocational Services Day Program in Modesto, as a result of

consumers requesting help with protecting their rights within the day program services. Consumers enjoyed the game and multiple outreach prizes and treats. Day Program staff also assisted consumers in playing a BINGO game and answering questions about clients' rights. Staff also learned how to advocate for and protect the rights of consumers during the training. This training positively impacted staff and consumers who learned important information about clients' rights, based on questions asked by staff and consumers.

Clients' Rights Training to Independent Community Resource: This outreach was unique because we were asked by Independent Community Resources, an independent living agency, to provide training to their consumers on Clients' Rights. We played Clients' Rights BINGO, and they loved it. This outreach was impactful for the clients because many of them were hearing of their rights for the very first time. Consumers had questions and participated in discussion during the training.

Statewide Outreach Presentations (General Outreach)

OCRA is required to conduct at least 160 outreach presentations per contract year. As described above, these presentations are divided into three categories, one of which is general outreach. A description of a few of these presentations follows.

Beyond Potential Inc.: The Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy for San Andreas Regional Center conducted a training at Beyond Potential Inc., an adult day program in Santa Clara County. The purpose of the training was to assist clients with developmental disabilities to understand their legal rights. Rita Defilippis, CRA, and Filomena Alomar, Assistant CRA, first discussed basic clients' rights and then followed up with a bingo game. 50 clients participated and thoroughly enjoyed the game and prizes.

Westside Regional Center Staff Resource Fair: During the staff resource fair we were able to talk to many of the service coordinators from Westside Regional Center who requested information about IHSS, SSI, special education, and benefits in both English and Spanish for WRC consumers. It was a great opportunity to encourage service coordinators and service providers to assist their consumers with advocacy needs based on the knowledge and information we provided to them. Through our outreach efforts at this event, we have also introduced our services and have been

contacted by many new consumers and their families who were referred by service coordinators and service providers.

Targeted Outreach

OCRA, as a priority, seeks to connect with traditionally underserved communities. By comparing OCRA's statistics of consumers served and similar statistics for each regional center, our offices choose a targeted community and focus much of our outreach in these areas. The examples below discuss two of these outreach presentations.

Luna Parent Support Group: This year our office provided training on Social Security benefits to Spanish speaking Latino parents who participate in the Luna Parent Support Group (Luna). In the last five years OCRA has provided various trainings to the group, regarding regional center services and special education. Luna requested we provide a presentation regarding Social Security, because many Spanish speaking parents in our community were struggling to obtain and maintain benefits for their children. OCRA discussed eligibility for Social Security benefits and appeal rights. Our office enjoys providing outreach to this support group because we are able to better understand issues that Latino families are encountering in our community. We look forward to providing more legal trainings for Luna in the future.

Padres Unidos Por El Autismo Support Group: The training given to the parent support group Padres Unidos por el Autismo, was a great training. It was unique in the sense that it was a small parent group which allowed both Eva Casas-Sarmiento and Abby Perez the opportunity to really connect with the parents. It helped the parents open up to us and express their concerns and worries as well as any questions. Because it was a small group, it allowed for more time to address all of the questions everyone had, which made the parents all feel heard and understood.

Conclusion

As an organization, OCRA is proud to report the above statistics and report that we have surpassed all of our goals. We look forward to the 2011-2012 outreach plan year.

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

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
 Annual Report - July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011
 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	
1 - Information/Referral	68	85	188	60	176	200	124	69	118	60	49	81	88	62	108	111	39	114	91	239	256	2386	
2 - Rights Information/Consultation (RC/Generic)	278	118	136	39	42	45	336	125	152	224	166	221	242	108	48	413	106	316	316	83	304	3818	
3 - Rights Information/Consultation (Other)	12	171	152	185	21	38	3	177	67	117	45	125	54	14	125	4	194	6	127	67	23	1727	
4 - Abuse/Neglect Investigation	11	2		8	2			5	1	8					1	1	2					1	42
5 - Special Education Compliance Complaint	2							1			1	4		2	1		3			2	3	19	
6 - IEP	1	24	6	10	2	2	1	30	3	5	8	1	4		13	7	5		1	13	3	139	
7 - IPP/IDT		7		2		5	1	4		9	13		2	1	3	4	6				2	1	60
8 - W&I 4731	1		1			1		2			4		1		1		1				1	13	
9 - Technical Assistance	32	1	33	13	60	11	1	29	3	13	9	6	38	9	12	7	23	15		9	7	331	
10 - Evaluation and Assessment	27	47	29	39	87	5	7	33	17	50	5	29	14	1	5	8	7	2	5	2	17	436	
11 - Informal Regional Center / Provider Problem Resolution	3	3	3	4	14		19	4	7	2	8	24		1	15	4	7		2		8	128	
12 - Informal Generic Service Agency Problem Resolution	3	1	4	5	5	1	6		6	3	4	27			26	5	3				35	134	
13 - Case Settlement Prior to Informal Meeting, Mediation or Hearing	1		2	1		1	3		2	1	1			1	1		1					2	17
14 - Direct Representation in RC "Voluntary Informal Meeting"	2	1		2	1	2		1	1						1					1		12	
15 - Direct Representation in Mediation / RC Fair Hearing	1		1		3	3	3				2				1	2	8				3	27	
16 - Direct Representation in an Appeal for Generic Services		3	5	1					1	1	4	2	4	2		2	9		2		11	47	
17 - Court Litigation	1	2	1					1							1							6	
Grand Total	443	465	561	369	413	314	504	481	378	493	319	520	447	202	362	567	414	453	545	418	674	9342	

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 5/2009.
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 9/1/10.
Redwood Coast	MOU dated 12/2009.
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 California
OCRA Advisory Committee

From: Jeanne Molineaux, Director

Date: July 18, 2011

Re: Consumer Satisfaction Survey
July 1, 2010, through June 30, 2011

Attached are the results of the last fiscal year Consumer Satisfaction Survey. The surveys were sent out for the period of July 1, 2010, through June 30, 2011. Every fourth closed case was randomly selected from OCRA's computer intake system to receive a survey, which included a self-addressed stamped envelope.

Two thousand nine hundred ninety-four (2,994) were mailed out. Five hundred two (502) people returned the surveys. This represents a 17 percent return rate. Of those responding to the questions, 96 percent of the respondents who answered the questions felt they were treated well by the staff, 93 percent understood the information they were provided, 93 percent believed their CRA listened to them, 94 percent would ask for help from the Clients' Rights Advocate again, 91 percent were helped by the CRA, and 86 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.	469	19	11
2. My call was returned within two (2) days	417	66	16
3. I could understand the information I got.	457	33	10
4. My Clients' Rights Advocate listened to me.	457	31	13
5. I was helped with my question/problem by my Clients' Rights Advocate.	446	44	18
6. I would ask for help from the Clients' Rights Advocate again.	449	32	15

Comments: ¹

- Wendy Dumlao is great!!
- Gracias a ustedes por brindar su ayuda y apoyo cuando nuestros hijos con necesidad especiales lo necesitan.
(Thank you for offering your help and support when our special needs children need it).
- I was extremely satisfied with the help I received from Rita.
- Heriberto Herrera is very nice.
- She is the best.
- Que sigan saliendo a dar charlas para que las familias sepan que existen estos servicios gratis.

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.

(That you continue to come out and give “chats” to families so that they know that these free services exist.)

- As parents, I am so glad there is a place like your guys’ that can really help us and that means a lot. Thank you so much. Especially during these difficult economic times.
- Lo que queria decir a mis defensoras es muchisimas gracias porque si no uviera sido por ellas yo no podia hacer nada . Muchas gracias. (What I want to say to my advocates is thank you very much. If it wasn’t for them I would not be able to do anything. Thank you, again.)
- Very Helpful and informative- great service.
- Solo dar las gracias por su apoyo. (Only to give thanks for your support).
- I receive the information that I needed
- Thank you for your help.
- Wendy Dumlao is AMAZING!!
- Muchas gracias por todo, cambiaron muchisimas cosas con respect a mi nino en la escuela. (Thank you very much for everything, you changed many things in regards to my son’s school).
- Aimee was so helpful she prepared me well for my hearing with the regional center. She organized my evidence and gave me tips on how to talk to the judge and what to emphasize. She was patient with my questions and very direct and confident.
- Solo quiero agradecer mucho por sus servicios. Ya que mi situacion cambio gracias a la representacion de OCRA.) (I only want to show much appreciation for your services. My situation has changed thanks to being represented by OCRA.
- The experience was very good. I got great service! Thanks!
- Que si yo no tubiera a la Sra. Celeste Palmer como mi advocacy, jamas ubiera podido lograr todas las metas y progreso de mi hija. Muchas Gracias. (That if I didn’t have Mrs. Celeste Palmer as my advocate we would have never been able to meet all the goals and made all the progress that my daughter has made. Thank you very much.)

- They can help for answer the question, but we need them can get in the IEP, They refused we need more involve from them.
- The staff bend over backwards to help you. Glad to have them around. Have recommended to other.
- She very very very very very good good good good.
- La persona que me atendio me brindo toda la ayuda que yo necesite, por hoy estoy bien satisfecha y claro que volveria con ella.
(The person that helped me gave me all of the help I needed. As of today I am very satisfied and of course I would come back again.)
- I want to thank you for all you have done.
- Lo que el defensor dijo que hiba recibir el nino no se le dieron . Lo mismo que tenia antes eso mismo tiene hoy.
(What the advocate told me the boy would receive was not given. The same as what he had is what he has now).
- With your help we were able to obtain both a new ___ worker and supervisor. We are meeting with the new worker this month and will see if the new plan for my son is more reasonable to his needs. Thank you for your assistance.
- Their call back delay is only because they are so inundated with cases.
- The staff was very encouraging and extremely helpful.
- Fue muy amable, Gracias, que Dios la bendiga.
(You were very kind. Thank you and may god bless you.)
- This office has staff that is awesome!
- Estoy muy satisfecha con Disability Rights.
(I am very satisfied with Disability Rights.)
- The advocate was very supportive and gave me appropriate referrals she seemed to genuinely care about the case, about the issues I was facing. I was hoping to possibly get direct representation with my matter in the future but was told representation was not available I do hope that OCRA will consider representing clients more at mediations and hearings especially in the difficult times.
- Wendy was very efficient +knowledgeable: The summary of “things to say/do” was very helpful.

- No vino la psicóloga mi hijo no tiene ningún servicio en casa.
(The psychologist didn't come; my son has no services in the home).
- Great Job. Valerie & Mareo in getting my grandson in to _____. We will always be very grateful to them and the Office of Client's Rights Advocacy. Thank you so much again.
- Helped me a lot with my problems.
- They offered great help and didn't beat around the bush.
- Que si los vuelvo a necesitar les vuelvo a llamar.
(That if I need it I will call again).
- Aimee & Marisol were both wonderful! Very professional. I can't say enough good things about them!
- Now, with the help of Megan everything is less stressful! She is great as before when I talked to the attorney too.
- I was extremely satisfied with the help I received from Rita.
- Yulahlia Hernandez provided exemplary assistance.
- Solo agradecer me fueron de mucha ayuda.
(Only to be thankful, they were of much help to me.)
- I greatly appreciate your organization, your staff is very understanding and supportive I received so much information about the rights my children have that I feel more knowledgeable and empowered to help their needs. Having children with special needs has been an emotional journey for me and navigating through the regional center and education process has been confusing and heartbreaking at times, With OCRA's help I feel more grounded and educated about disability rights. Thank you a million times over!!
- Me dijeron que me iban a mandar papeles, nunca llegaron.
(They said they were going to send me paper, and they never came.)
- Among the best, clearest most helpful information in years!
- Excellent experience. Thanks!
- The experience was very good I got great service. Thanks!
- Very personable and easy to understand what was explained.
- Louisa was so nice and helpful.
- The way I was treated by _____ was not right but I feel my clients' rights advocate helped me.

- OCRA realizes that they had given me the wrong answer and called back the following day. Excellent follow-up.
- The advocate was very thorough and enlightening I've used this program since 2004 it has always been tremendous resource.
- So thankful!
- I try to resolve issues without CRA however there are times when I need that support and advice. I really appreciate
- Todo la informacion fue de suma importancia para mi y pude obtener los servicios de terapia para mi hijo. El trato de Kathy y Gaby es excelente.

(All of the information was of major importance to me and I was able to obtain the therapy services for my son. The way we were treated by Kathy and Gaby was excellent).

- Excellent help! I wish there were more of you!
- Invaluable help! Professional and friendly!
- Thank you for providing this service.
- One of the best uses of funds to help people with developmental disabilities/challenges.
- Trina & Katy Lusson was extremely helpful! Thank you!
- Jasmin & Mr. Poe were very helpful!
- Without the help of Wendy Dumlao and other OCRA we would have to put our son in an institution where they most likely would kill him by over medicating him. Our Son's case is extremely serious. He is the poster child of how in home care can work despite the most severe cases. To see how well we're using home health nurses we can now pay for with OCRA win on our behalf-go to you tube type in "severe autism", you'll find dozens of videos Some shocking some heartbreaking Some inspirational. The bottom line is- our case shows the world of people who think people like my son "can't make it outside institutional care".-that it's indeed possible-with the right level of staffing and support. We are forever grateful to OCRA staff. Your organization has done more for our family than 18 years of any army of professionals. You guys ROCK!! We love you Thank you__Family.

- At first the intake person didn't want to take our case/call but after some persuasion she gave the message to the attorney. She was great. A wealth of knowledge and information/She wasn't able to represent us at our particular hearing but with the time and explanation she gave us we felt prepared and confident to proceed and ultimately we were victorious...so thank you!!
- More FAQ's on the website would be helpful
- I represented myself against ___ and lost I have Aspergers Syndrome.
- Thank you very much!
- Services rendered have always been great whether or not the problems still exist.
- Agradezco mucho la atencion que me brindaron.
(The attention that we were given was very appreciated).
- Jackie Chiang has helped many people a lot of Chinese parents don't know English. She can use Chinese to help them.
- I can honestly say Tim Poe was excellent.
- I think OCRA is a good resource to parents with a child with disability, but they need more people on the Board it seems they don't have enough! Thank you!
- How much we were pleased with Wendy Dumlao.
- To continue to advocate, monitor cuts in programs and services for disabled also to help them navigate the system.
- Thank you so much Filomena.
- Ojala y siempre haya defensores de los derechos de los ninos discapacitados para que los puedan ayudar a ellos y a los padres.
(I hope that there will always be advocates for children with disabilities so they can always be helped as well as their parents.)
- There is a great need to have more advocates help people/students in need of assistance.
- Aimee Delgado was extremely helpful.
- Wendy Dumlao was well prepared for our case. She did a lot of research. She jumped in there with the big boys.

- Es mucho trabajo para un solo defensor y un asistente. Gracias por el apoyo; pueden llamarme si es necesario.
(It is a lot of work for a single advocate and one assistant and thank you for all of your support; you can call me if necessary.)
- You need to ask more detailed questions.
- We are very Grateful for all the help our advocates did for us. Thanks you.
- Fueron muy amables todo el tiempo, supieron como ayudarme gracias.
(They were very kind the entire time; they knew how to help me.)
- I really need help with my problem and it seems very complicated and seems too hard for anyone to help me.
- The problem was resolved but if it didn't I would have needed additional assistance.
- Christine Armand is Awesome.
- Amazing Help! Thank you!
- They couldn't help me.
- Que cuando la defensora de Derechos al cliente salgan a entrenamientos o vacaciones haya mas asistencia para cubrirlosy el servicio no sea lento en ese entonces. Mas asistencia en espanol.
(That when the advocate of clients' rights goes to a training or on vacation, there be more assistance to cover them and for it not to be that slow in that instance. More assistance in Spanish).
- The service is great, communication is nice and comfortable.
- I have recommended them to several people LOVE them!
- The day program provider gave me an unreasonable time to little information I made my decision before I got help from the CRA needs to make themselves more obvious and send a flyer explaining your services what you do or don't do You need to advertise market your organization.
- Mario and his staff were very efficient, informative and knowledgeable.
- Wendy and Alba were very helpful.

- The office needs to have a local number for all. 800# It gets expensive to call and collect did not work last time I called. The CRA needs more help and attorneys since ____ always keep the clients from getting appropriate services they're too busy to handle all the complaints and due process hearings needed to fight ____.
- Si no existiera este servicio me hubiese sido muy difícil poder ayudar a defender los derechos y servicios para mis hijos. Gracias!
(If your services did not exist it would be very difficult to help and defend the rights and services of my children.Thanks).
- Wonderfully helpful. Solved my difficult situation in just a few days.
- Great help- able to get ____therapy because of services provided.
- We were very disappointed He was a very little help in helping us prepare our case. We were informed a week before our hearing that he would not be present and was of little help in preparing our case. My husband and I did it all on our own.
- Besides the receptionist everyone was extremely helpful and knowledgeable.
- Absolutely nothing was done.
- Great help! It worked!
- Estoy agradecido por todo en question a mi niño ____.
(I am grateful for everything in regards to my child____).
- Everything is ok! Thank you so much.
- Staff was so understanding and patient and very professional.
- I appreciate your help thank you!
- Estoy muy satisfecha con los servicios que me ofrecieron. La abogada soluciono mi problema.
(I am very satisfied with the services that I have been offered. The attorney solved my problem).
- I appreciated your help very much.
- Thank you!
- Thank you.
- Quiero que se encuentre la forma de obligar al distrito ha que pague una escuela privada para mi hijo ____el distrito no tiene el personal capacitado para cuidar a mi hijo. Ellos lo han maltratado físicamente.

(What I want is for there to be a way to force the school district to pay for private school for my son____. The school does not have capable personnel to take care of my son. They have mistreated him physically.)

- Am very satisfied for my problem being solved.
- Excelente.
(Excellent).
- Wonderful! Helpful!
- This is very useful service almost invaluable.
- Solo dar las gracias por tener gente como el Sr.Mario Espinoza y su personal ya que han estado al pendiente ayudandome en la escuela de mi hijo.

(I only want to give thanks for having people like Mr. Mario Espinoza and his staff. They have been there to help me with my son's school".

- I needed some help with legal terms but with translation, I did.
- OCRA has been there for the 4-5 years. Thank you!
- I am sincerely grateful for Lucy's savvy skill and patience. We couldn't have succeeded without her, much thanks.
- Hasta hoy estoy muy bien y he recibido la ayuda necesaria, gracias.
(To this date I am very good and receiving necessary help, Thank you.)
- They referred me to another agency who didn't call back I know they have people there staff that could help they are busy with other cases it was frustrating.
- So very professional Ms. Katie Meyer is outstanding.
- Excellent staff-they really cared about my daughter's best interest. A Rare concept these days.
- Son ustedes un equipo fabuloso y mis super heroes. Gracias." Yo y____ les damos las gracias. Un million de bendiciones para ustedes.
(You all are a fabulous team and my super heroes. Thank you. ____and I give you thanks. A million blessings to all of you.)
- I didn't enjoy services.
- I want her to visit me again.
- We received excellent advice guidance and assistance.

- A quien corresponda: Para mi es un gran placer escribir estas lineas para manifestar la excelente atencion y asesoramiento del Sr. Matt Pope y de la Sra. Lucy Garcia. Ellos han sido para mi una luz de esperanza en este dificil camino ellos me han ayudado a vencer el miedo a abogar por los derechos de mi hija. Sus palabras de aliento y su asesoramiento han alentado a lograr tener el valor suficiente y la tenacidad ara rebatir un argument y decir no ente una injusticia pero sobre todo con el concocimiento legal que adquerido de estas 2 grandes personas. Podria escribir un libro completo manifestando mi experiencia con derechos al clientes, pero quiero finalizar agradeciendo con el Corazon en la mano a el Sr. Matt Pope y a la Sra. Lucy Garcia por este trato calido y amable que he recibido a cada momento ellos estan en un lugar muy especial de mi Corazon. Y tambien quiero aprovechar para agradecerle a Office of Client's rights advocacy Disability Rights California. Gracias por otorgoarnos este servicio tan valioso.

(To whom it may concern: For me it is a great pleasure to write these lines to express the excellent attention and advice of MR. Pope and Ms. Lucy Garcia. They have been to me a light of hope in these difficult roads. They have helped me to overcome my fear of advocating for the rights of my daughter. Their words courage and advice have encouraged me to have enough strength and the tenacity to resist an argument and say no to injustice, but most of all with the legal knowledge that I have acquired from those two grand individuals. I can't write a book expressing my experience with client's rights. But I would like to finalize my appreciation with my heart in my hand to Mr. Matt Pope and Ms. Garcia for this treatment so kind that I received at every moment. I would like to also take advantage of this letter and appreciate OCRA thank you for granting this very valuable service.)

- Disability Rights is critical for many families right now, we need to start doing class action suits in regards to cuts in respite and especially educational consult services to get needs met for consumers.

- Los abogados haven un buen papel pero creo que se necesitan mucho mas para rodas las personas con discapacidades, es una pena, pero es la verdad.
(The attorneys play a great role, but I think they need more, for all people with disabilities, it's a shame but it's the truth).
- Thank you for your time and help.
- Ms. Delgado provided the services with very pleasant personality and good manner as always. Glad to have her help me with my son's case.
- Rita es siempre de mucha ayuda para mi.
(Rita is always very helpful.)
- Valery Geary Excellent office staff member!
- This Office of clients' Rights Advocacy is excellent! I wish it will be developing more and protecting clients' rights forever; I loved and appreciated this office.
- All they are nice and very good to help_____.
- Que no se tarden tanto para dar soluciones a los casos.
(That they not take long to find solutions to cases).
- Doug Harris = knowledgeable+ fantastic....
- Yo lo recomendaria al que necesite ayuda.
(I would recommend to those who need help.)
- I have not heard anything back I am still working to see a lawyer or arbitrator.
- Needed help with fair hearing to get day program got no help at all. Did receive several calls weeks after the issue was already settled.
- Que la Senora Celeste Palmer es una persona muy valiosa como profesional y como ser humana que Dios la bendiga y la siga usanda por el lindo trabajo que ella hace, y que otras personas sigan su ejemplo , muchas gracias.
(That Mrs. Celeste Palmer is very valuable person as a professional and like a human being. May God bless her and may he continue to use her for the beautiful work she does and that other people follow her example, thank you very much.)
- Fast and Great service.

- I never received info I asked for regarding protective supervision through IHSS.
- Que si pueden explicar mas o sea mas informacion y que se pueda entender mas en Espanol.
(If they could explain more or give more information and they be able to understand Spanish better).
- Thank you very much to atty. Meagan.
On this same matter, they helped my daughter twice
- Son muy utiles sus concejos. Nos ayudan en nuestro idioma. Muy importante que existe agencias que ayudan a los derechos de los ninos discapacitados.
(Their advice is very useful. They help us and in our language. Its is very important that agencies exist that help with the rights of children with disabilities).
- ___refused to pay for OCRA services in retaliation for filing complaint. OCRA will not advocate for anyone unless they are authorized by ____.
- Agradezco el profesionalismo con que DRC nos ayuda siempre que le llamamos. Son precisos con la informacion.
(I appreciate the professionalism with which DRC always helps us when we call. They are precise with information).
- Office too busy to help. Took a long time to reach someone.
- Yo los recomendaria porque son amable y le ayudan mucho. Cosa que uno no saben ellos les explican, o que no se entiende.
(I would recommend because they are kind and they help a lot. The thing is that when one doesn't know or understand, they explain).
- Asked to receive info by email Difficult to get Q's answered needed to make advanced call appointments which was difficult for me just wanted a few Q's answered.
- I called 3 times leaving messages today they called me back.
- Mi defensora fue muy atenta rapida y amable. Muchas gracias
(My advocate was attentive fast and friendly. Thank you very much.)
- Excellent help! I wish there were more of you!

- We have 3 children with disabilities. We want to be continuous to appeal to the next level court that be fair for my family. No one is helping us to do the petition for writ of mandate and low income.
- Gracias.
(Thank you.)

DISABILITY RIGHTS CALIFORNIA BOARD
OCRA ADVISORY COMMITTEE
July, 2011

Committee Members:

Billy Hall	(Glendale)
Jean Townsend	(El Cajon)
Lakisha Burke	(Sacramento)
Izetta Jackson	(Oakland)
Amy Kalivas	(San Diego)
Dianne Millner	(Oakland)

OCRA Advisory Committee Minutes Friday, February 25, 2011

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

Staff: Cara Armstrong, Catherine Blakemore, Jackie Chiang, Maxine Dalaza, Kendra McWright, Jeanne Molineaux, and Alice Ximenez

Facilitators: Jennifer Estabillo and Lina Romine

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

Agenda Review: Members M/S/C (Millner/Hall/Ybarra) to change order of agenda.

September 24, 2010 Minutes: Members M/S/C (Millner/Hall/Ybarra) to approve minutes of last meeting.

East Los Angeles Regional Center Update: Jackie Chiang, Clients' Rights Advocate, discussed her transfer in February from Lanterman Regional Center office to East Los Angeles Center office. The new office is very different in that she now has a heavier caseload and the trend of East Los Angeles Regional Center's heavy interaction with OCRA continues. Jackie discussed a case regarding special education where a client continued coming home from school with injuries. A series of meetings were held with school and then OCRA was contacted. OCRA reviewed with family, the behavioral support publications from Disability Rights California. A Special Circumstances Instructional Assistant (SCIA) was requested and offered to the client. A question was asked as to clarification on what a SCIA is. This is another name for a health assistant. It was determined that the school was not implementing and using proper strategies or locking wheelchairs.

Central Valley Regional Center Update: Kendra McWright, Clients' Rights Advocate, discussed the various OCRA offices that she has held positions in including Regional Center of the East Bay, Valley Mountain Regional Center, Tri-Counties Regional Center and Central Valley Regional Center. Kendra discussed a special education and regional center case where the parent is monolingual Spanish and the child had no schooling for 3 years. The child is Autistic and non-verbal. After going back and forth with

the school, the child was given 1 hour of schooling per week which then increased to 2 hours per week. Once OCRA got involved, an emergency IEP was held and the school district acknowledged that at least 1 hour, 5 days per week is needed for child.

At this time, it has been determined that it is a failure of the school and regional center and a psychologist is currently being requested to see child. Another IEP is forthcoming. A question was raised as to how the parent knew to call OCRA. The regional center caseworker told the parent to call OCRA.

With Kendra's new permanent placement at Central Valley Regional Center office, she inherited 11 regional center eligibility cases. A question was raised about eligibility requirements. Requirements for regional center services include but are not limited to; intellectual disability, autism, cerebral palsy, and 5th category (similar to intellectual disability). A question was raised as to whether multiple sclerosis qualifies for regional center services. The disability has to have occurred before age of 18 years old. A question was raised asking if being blind qualifies for regional center services. It does not by itself. A question was raised about reimbursement for experts and Jeanne explained that OCRA does not receive attorney fees in regional center eligibility cases, only for special education cases. Parents who have insurance are also asked to help pay attorneys fees as well.

Benefits Report: Catherine Blakemore shared information regarding the Western Center report on budget issues. See handout. Cathy explained that this is possibly a June ballot issue and we will know by March possibly. If it is not approved as June ballot issue, we are looking at a proposed 12.5 billion in cuts. A question was raised asking if \$5.00 co-pay will apply to weekly vision appointments. Cathy will follow up on this question at a later time. A board member talked about receiving an IHSS letter regarding cuts and Cathy explained that most likely this would not be given back as originally promised in the IHSS letter. And, a Healthcare Certification will now be required to get IHSS. Cathy explained that DDS is putting together workgroups to develop potential deduction ideas. A board member discussed how these cuts would affect his IHSS personally. In response, another board member explained how working together with IHSS and ILS workers have filled his support needs.

RFP Process: Jeanne Molineaux gave an update and status of new OCRA contract. The process started last summer. OCRA staff started gathering support letters early in the process so they would be ready when the RFP was posted in November. OCRA received a positive response and support from regional centers as it received 14 regional center letters. Letters were also received from all but one Area Board. At this time Department of Developmental Services is working on provisions requested by Disability Rights California. The final contract should be signed within a month or so.

Capitol People First Trainings Status and Implementation: Jeanne Molineaux gave update on implementation of the facility trainings. Training started 9 months ago. Billy Hall was asked to participate in these trainings and he will be contacted within two weeks. Jeanne conducted CPF training in Citrus Heights location recently, in a 36-resident facility. The training was well received by residents. The Department of Developmental Services sticker books and DVD were used. A question was raised as to which facilities were being visited and board members expressed interest in participating.

Recruiting Public Membership: Members M/S/C (Jackson/Millner/Ybarra) that committee be formed to choose and interview at least 4 public members applications. Billy Hall, Eric Ybarra, Jeanne Molineaux and Alice Ximenez will sit on committee to choose two new public members. Application screening will be done by teleconference. After review by the committee, the final choices will be given to the executive committee to make final approval of new members.

The meeting adjourned at 12:29 p.m.

ATTEST,

Eric Ybarra, Chair

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Self-Advocacy Trainings
July 1, 2010 – June 30, 2011

Self-Advocacy Trainings held:

Alta RC
Central Valley RC
East LA RC
Far Northern RC
Golden Gate RC
Harbor RC
Inland RC
Kern RC
Lanternman RC
North Bay RC
North LA RC
RC of the East Bay
RC of Orange County
Redwood Coast RC
San Andreas RC
San Diego RC
San Gabriel Pomona RC
South Central LA RC
Tri-Counties RC
Valley Mountain RC
Westside RC

**OFFICE OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS ADVOCACY
ANNUAL REPORT
JULY 1, 2010 – June 30, 2011**

TITLE 17 REPORT

TITLE 17 LETTER	REGIONAL CENTER	COMPLAINT (INITIALS)	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	STATUS	OUTCOME
9/22/10	Alta California Regional Center	G.M.	Various denials of rights by care provider	Closed	Some allegations upheld; some denied; some not substantiated.
11/12/2010	Alta California Regional Center	G.M.	Various denials of rights by care provider and regional center	Closed	Some allegations upheld; some denied; some not substantiated.
11/12/2010	Alta California Regional Center	G.M.	Various denials of rights by care provider and regional center	Closed	Some allegations upheld; some denied; some not substantiated.
5/4/2011	Regional Center of Orange County	A.G.	R.C. failed to hold IPP as required	Closed	IPP scheduled.

**OFFICE OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS ADVOCACY
ANNUAL REPORT
(July 1, 2010 – June 30, 2011)**

DENIAL OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS

Regional Center	Good Cause	Right(s) Denied	Date Denial Began	Date of Review	Date of Restoration
HRC10-06	I	V, T	7/23/10	8/20/10	8/20/10
HRC10-07	I, O	V, T	5/13/11	6/29/11	Ongoing Review
IRC10-01	I	P	5/11/10	7/2010	7/2010
KRC11-01	I	P	4/20/11	5/28/11	Client moved to psychiatric unit.
SARC11-01	O	P	5/12/11	6/2/11	6/2/11

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, 2010 – June 30, 2011**

CONSUMER GRIEVANCES WITH CONTRACTOR

DATE OF RESOLUTION LETTER	COMPLAINT (INITIALS)	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	STATUS	OUTCOME
8/27/10	E.E.	Failed to Represent at I.E.P.	Closed	OCRA actions upheld
9/1/10	C.F	1 st Level - Failed to Represent in Negligence action.	Closed	OCRA actions upheld
10/2/10		2 nd Level Complaint- Failed to Represent in Negligence action.	Closed	OCRA actions upheld
9/23/10	C.H.	Failure to Represent at SSI hearing.	Closed	OCRA actions upheld
11/1/10	C.A.	Failure to Represent at Conservatorship hearing.	Closed	OCRA actions upheld
5/16/11	R.H.	Information contained in OCRA retainer was overbroad	Closed	OCRA deleted undesired language from retainer
5/18/11	K.B.	Failure to obtain records	Closed	OCRA obtained records
6/16/11 Date Grievance Filed	O.K.	Failure of OCRA to represent appropriately at IPP	Closed	Client obtained desired placement through OCRA actions

**OCRA Attorney's Fees
Fiscal Year
July 1, 2010 – June 30, 2011**

Date:	From:	Subject:	Case #:	Amount:
July 2010	State of California	Special Education	895508	\$9,063.15
July 2010	State of California	Special Education	895508	\$ 155.87
March 2011	Department of Health Care	Special Education	895508	\$9,989.02
March 2011	School District	Special Education	931131	\$5,400.00
	Total For FY 2010 - 11			<u>\$24,608.04</u>