

OCRA SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT
(July 1, 2011 - December 31, 2011)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<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	7
B. Issues and complaints are resolved expeditiously and at the lowest level of appropriate intervention.	8
C. Collaborative and harmonious working relationships are fostered	8
1) Memorandums of Understanding	8
2) Meeting with Association of Regional Center Agencies (ARCA)	9
D. Consumer Satisfaction	9
1) Consumer Satisfaction Survey	9
2) Letters of Appreciation	10
3) Cases will be handled in a timely manner	11
E. Coordination of services with the DDS contract manager, stakeholder organizations, and multi-cultural community.	11
F. Self-Advocacy Training.	12
III. TITLE XVII, SECTION 50540 COMPLAINTS.....	13
IV. DENIAL OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS.....	13
V. CONSUMER GRIEVANCES.....	13
VI. CONCLUSION	14

TABLE OF CONTENTS - PAGE TWO

EXHIBIT LIST

	<u>PAGE</u>
EXHIBIT A (Staff Roster).....	1
EXHIBIT B (Statistics)	2
EXHIBIT C (Advocacy Report, Fall 2011; Winter 2012)	2
EXHIBIT D (Outreach and Training Report)	7
EXHIBIT E (Report by Service Level)	8
EXHIBIT F (Memorandums of Understanding)	8
EXHIBIT G (Consumer Satisfaction Surveys).....	9
EXHIBIT H (Board OCRA Advisory Committee/Minutes).....	12
EXHIBIT I (Self-Advocacy Trainings)	13
EXHIBIT J (Title 17 Complaints)	13
EXHIBIT K (Denial of Rights Report)	13
EXHIBIT L (Consumer Grievance Report)	14

I. INTRODUCTION

Disability Rights California, California's protection and advocacy agency, provides state-wide clients' rights advocacy services for regional center consumers pursuant to a five year contract, HD119002, with the California Department of Developmental Services (DDS), through Disability Rights California's Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy (OCRA). Disability Rights California was awarded a new contract, through the state competitive bidding process, effective July 1, 2011. This is the first semi-annual report under the current contract and covers July 1, 2011, through December 31, 2016.

OCRA takes great pride in its accomplishments. The statistics and work product for the past six months, which are discussed throughout this report, give ample evidence of continuing effective advocacy. During the past six months, OCRA resolved over 4,560 issues for consumers. Additionally, OCRA staff participated in 169 trainings presented to approximately 8,088 people.

OCRA currently operates 22 offices throughout the state of California, most of which are staffed by one CRA and one Assistant CRA. A list of the current staff and office locations is attached as Exhibit A and is found on our website at disabilityrightsca.org.

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 A, Paragraph 13 M., of the above-referenced contract. Each of the specific required outcomes is discussed in the following Sections A through F.

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 4,560 issues for regional center consumers during the first 6 months of the fiscal year. The breath of issues in these cases is staggering and OCRA staff remains knowledgeable about the current law in an effort to help consumers and parents understand recent changes and their rights. 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.

1) Advocacy Reports.

Each advocate provides on a quarterly basis a summary of at least one administrative hearing or other 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 Fall, 2011, and Winter, 2012, are compiled and attached as Exhibit C. OCRA is extremely pleased that such outstanding examples of advocacy are available to show the value of the work that OCRA accomplishes. A few examples of the advocacy:

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

Parents of 9-year-old V.R., who has severe intellectual and physical disabilities requiring constant care, received a notice that V.R.'s IHSS hours had been reduced from 239 to 91. The county alleged that the non-provider spouse in a two-parent household was an alternative resource. OCRA helped the father to develop a work schedule chart and had him obtain letters from his employer substantiating his 60-hour work week. A hearing was held at which OCRA successfully requested a continuance, the ALJ agreed to continue aid paid pending, and both parties agreed that

the issue was not how much father was working but whether the regulation upon which the county was relying was valid.

OCRA attended the IHSS reassessment. OCRA reviewed the county file which showed assessments of actual need which did not appear in the county's notice, as well as old notices showing that the county had awarded increasing hours during the past 5 years, consistent with the 239 hours that the county now sought to reduce.

OCRA represented V.R. at a second hearing. On the morning of the hearing, the county representative called to say that the county agreed to reinstate the hours. OCRA then met with the parents and the county at the hearing and agreed to an increase of hours from 239 to 266.

R.B. Gets Benefits Reinstated and \$50,323 Overpayment Cleared.

R.B. works at a courthouse job site through supported employment. He also receives Social Security benefits under the DAC program. R.B.'s mother, who is his representative payee, received a notice that R.B.'s disability had ended and he had incurred an overpayment of \$50,323, because he was allegedly performing substantial gainful employment (SGE) by earning over \$1,000 per month. R.B. and his mother contacted OCRA for help.

OCRA asked R.B.'s supervisor about R.B.'s work and then asked the supervisor to complete the Work Activity Questionnaire, a SSA form that asks about subsidy and working under special conditions. OCRA learned that one of the job requirements is that workers must have a developmental disability. R.B.'s employer certified that R.B. works 40 hours per week and has a job coach for 40 hours per week. R.B. requires extra help and supervision and has fewer and easier duties, and must meet lower production standards than an employee without a disability in a similar job.

OCRA filed an appeal of the disability cessation and ask for expedited reinstatement of R.B.'s benefits. OCRA provided evidence of subsidy and special employment conditions, which meant that R.B. was not performing SGE, is still eligible for benefits, and the overpayment should be cleared. The SSA agreed, reinstated R.B.'s benefits, and cleared the overpayment.

OCRA Advocates against NIMBY-ism.

The regional center informed OCRA that several medically fragile consumers were being discriminated against because of their disabilities. The consumers required advocacy assistance. A new vendor had received a grant for \$90,000 to open a 6-bed home to fulfill unmet placement needs in the foothills area. The home owners association was trying to prevent the project from moving forward. Neighbors began to harass the new vendors with calls, emails, and inappropriate calls to law enforcement.

Threats to prevent the care home from opening in the private community alerted regional center staff, and Area Board 6. The regional center had approved the location and viewed the community as aesthetically pleasing. OCRA attended the home owner's association meeting with the Area Board 6 and regional center with resources and information to share. The regional center notified OCRA that despite efforts to stop the purchase of the home and vendorization of the provider, escrow closed. Six consumers will shortly have an appropriate new home in the community

2) Analysis of Consumers Served.

OCRA handled a total of 4,560 cases from July 1 through December 31, 2011. The complete six-month compilation of data is included as Exhibit B. 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)

The majority of the OCRA statistics remain consistent with OCRA's previous statistics. For example, the largest number of consumers served by age, 1,295 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 701 people served. The ratio of males to females served also remains consistent. For those cases where gender is recorded, OCRA has traditionally served more males than females, with 65 percent of the

consumers served being male and 35 percent being female. This roughly corresponds to the percentage of regional center consumers who are female versus male. As of December 31, 2007, the most current date for which data is available from DDS, 61.30 percent of all regional center consumers were male and 38.70 percent were female.

The percentage of consumers residing in the parental or other family home remains by far the largest number of consumers served with 3,292 consumers in the family home or 71 percent of the cases handled. The next largest group served is those living independently, with OCRA serving 570 people or 13 percent with this living arrangement.

OCRA's statistics on the ethnicity of consumers served from July 1, 2011, through December 31, 2011, 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

This six month period, the OCRA offices handled 883 education matters and 1,517 regional center matters. This continues to represent a change in trend in the last few years in that OCRA previously had fairly consistently handled more special education matters than regional center. This can be accounted for by the many changes in the Lanterman Act which were implemented by the regional centers during the past two years.

Consumers and parents had many questions about the changes which OCRA attempted to answer. OCRA also handled the first six months, approximately 871 cases dealing with income maintenance, which includes Social Security and In-Home Supportive Service, and over 100 cases each in conservatorship, health, housing, and personal autonomy.

Taken together, the problem codes continue to relay the broad areas of law with which OCRA staff need to be familiar.

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, Medi-Cal and Medicare issues, and conservatorships, among other topics.

During the past six months, OCRA staff presented at a total of 169 trainings with a combined attendance of approximately 8,088 people. This is an outstanding performance by OCRA staff.

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 catchment area. To help with this, OCRA appointed an outreach coordinator for the northern and southern offices, Kendra McWright and Beatriz Reyes, respectively. 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 updated 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. The plans were updated this year. 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, 2011, through December 31, 2011, OCRA resolved 4,560 issues for consumers. Of those served, all but 37 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.

If at all possible, OCRA staff fosters 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 also represents an internalized recognition that some of the most effective advocacy takes place at the level of interpersonal relationships and informal advocacy. The success of this philosophy is demonstrated by the number of calls we receive, by OCRA's many successes, and by its recognition as an excellent resource for people with developmental disabilities. Specific examples of collaboration, in addition to those discussed in sections above, are discussed below.

1) Memorandums of Understanding.

OCRA has established Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) with each regional center that address that center's individual needs, concerns, and method of operation. MOUs are updated as needed. All of the MOUs have been provided to DDS. The date of each MOU is listed in Exhibit F.

In general, the meetings regarding the MOUs are productive and 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, Jeanne Molineaux, Director, OCRA, and Bob Baldo, Executive Director of the Association of Regional Center Directors, last met in July, 2010. At that time, several outstanding issues were discussed and it was determined that further meetings would be planned as needed. Since that time, Ms. Blakemore has met with Mr. Baldo on a regular basis regarding many matters, not just OCRA matters, though sometimes issues regarding OCRA have been discussed. The most recent of those meetings was in January, 2012. A new Executive Director has been appointed for ARCA and Ms. Blakemore and Ms. Molineaux will schedule an appointment to meet with that person to discuss the collaborative working relationship as soon as practical.

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

Seven hundred and fifty-seven surveys were mailed out. Ninety-six people returned the survey, which represents a 13 percent return rate of the surveys mailed¹. Of those responding to the questions, 98 percent of the responders felt they were treated well by the staff, 97 percent understood the information they were provided, 96 percent believed their CRA listened to them, 92 percent believed they were helped by the CRA, and 98 percent would ask for help from OCRA again, and 95 percent were helped by the CRA. See Exhibit G which discusses the results of OCRA's survey. These are excellent survey results, for which OCRA is justly proud.

2) Letters of Appreciation.

OCRA staff receive many letters of appreciation from consumers and others. Below are quotes from a few of the letters²:

“I love my son, I am happy to have him home every weekend, but at this point in our lives, we can no longer survive having him full time. We shall always be grateful to you for the help you have giving us. Words cannot express the extent of my gratitude. I shall sing praises to anyone who will listen. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you.”

¹ The return rate for surveys for this period is extremely low. OCRA is not certain of the reason for this but attributes some of the low return rate to the fact that Disability Rights California's move from its former address might have interfered with the return of surveys.

² Quotations are repeated as stated in the letters, except for the deletion of names.

“She was able willing to guide me through the whole process, review all my documents, gave me lots of tips and strategies. Because of her hard work, I received a big compliment from the judge who told me at the end of the hearing. I was really impressed by your preparation of the case.” I am grateful that Eva helped me during my time of need”. I just want you to know that you have a great worker there in your office. She deserves to be recognized and praised.”

“This is all because of organizations like yours and Valerie’s at Kern Regional Center. I couldn’t have done it without Valerie’s help, as the people in charge wouldn’t even answer my phone calls or my emails. Thanks you all so very much.”

“Thank you very much for all your help, support and encouragement.”

“I am convinced that the meeting would not have gone nearly as smoothly as it did without your help. Just so you know, I met ___ from IRC yesterday and I very much liked her. Things are going great as far as initiating the agency switch and it would not have been possible without your considerable assistance. Thank you very much for all your help. Your knowledge and experience has been very helpful and it was very reassuring to have you with us at the IEP meeting.”

“Buenas tardes Eva Muchas Gracias por tan linda presentacion los padres quedan encantados con Usted en las notas que medieron.... Muchas gracias por su apoyo” (“Good afternoon Eva .Thank you very much for your wonderful presentation the parents were pleased with you in the notes they gave me. Thank you very much for your support....”)

“Every day I am grateful for you being in our lives! Your ability to calm me down when it comes to the most important thing in my life is like no other. I have more courage knowing you’re on my side! You are an amazing person. I hope you know if you ever need anything feel free to call me anytime! Thanks again for being there for me during the tough times with the school. You are a true blessing and I am honored and inspired to know you.”

“Thank you, thank you and thank you for your insights and reflections.”

“The judge ruled that ___ requires Protective Supervision. Done good, eh? Couldn’t of made headway of the law and procedures without your generous help and great booklet explaining the labyrinth of IHSS.”

“We hope that you enjoy the calendar as much as we enjoyed having your agency represented at the Transition Fair. As stated, your services are vital to the community and we hope to have your participation again in the next Transition Fair event.”

“I want to thank you for conducting such a wonderful training session: everyone really appreciated it: thanks again for your leadership.”

“I also wanted to thank you for agreeing to attend the IEP for ___ I truly appreciate it. Please tell Mr. Espinoza thank you for his help as well. I believe his coaching helped me very much. We got what we wanted because of all your help. So again thanks to you both.”

“Para: DRC Beatriz & Veronica- siempre vamos a estar agradecidos de estos anos. En nombre de __ & __ gracias. __ & __ Padres de estos dos ninos especiales.” (“For: DRC Beatriz & Veronica- We will always be grateful for your support over the years. In the name of ___ & ___ Thank you. ___ & ___ Parents of two special children”.)

”I informed them that I spoke to OCRA and Mr. Poe and the information he provided and I informed them that I believed that ___ was eligible for Protective Supervision. I just wanted to let you and Mr. Poe know what happened and to thank you for all of your help and assistance because I do not believe I would have gotten the service hours for ___ without your help. Thank you again. “

“I am very grateful to Office of Clients’ Rights Advocacy Disability Rights California for all the help I got. You can not do it without HELP, I know I tried!”

“Thank you so much for your much needed help and support. The services you provide are very necessary.”

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 close 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 show that 92 percent of all callers to OCRA received a call back within two days during the first half of this fiscal year. 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. The OCRA Advisory Committee, which is a standing committee of Disability Rights California's Board of Directors, meets twice a year at various locations throughout the state. Attached as Exhibit H is a list of the members of the Board OCRA Advisory Committee effective December 31, 2011.

Public members of the Advisory Committee are nominated by current Advisory Committee members and confirmed by appointment by Disability Rights California's Board of Directors. In the selection process, the committee and board consider geographical diversity, both rural and urban and north and south, type of developmental disability represented, and ethnic background, in addition to the qualifications of the individual applicants.

The Board OCRA Advisory Committee is a knowledgeable, constructive, and helpful group of volunteers who continue to provide valuable guidance to the OCRA staff. The meetings are lively and informative and provide a forum for exchange of ideas and information. Minutes for the meeting held on September 23, 2011, are attached as Exhibit H.

DDS staff is invited and encouraged to participate in any of the meetings set for 2012. They are:

March 2, 2012	San Diego
September 21, 2012	Los Angeles

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 per year. 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. Many offices provide more than one training. OCRA far exceeds the mandatory self-advocacy training requirement.

To date, OCRA has developed more than five separate packets of information for OCRA staff to use in the mandated trainings. Samples of the packets were previously provided to DDS and are contained in OCRA's Annual Report provided to DDS on September 1, 2007. In December, 2008, DDS sponsored a training on consumer emergency preparedness for OCRA staff. Staff uses the materials from this training as an additional self-advocacy training. Additionally, as one of the stipulations in the *Capital People First* law suit, DDS developed materials for OCRA staff to use in a consumers' rights self-advocacy training. Self-Advocacy Trainings held to date this year are listed in Exhibit I.

III. SECTION 50540 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 the Welfare & Institution Code, Section 4731. However, the later law offers

more consumer protections. There was one Title 17 complaint filed during the last six months, the log for which is attached as Exhibit J.

IV. DENIAL OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS

CCR, Title 17, sec. 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 of each January, April, July, and October. OCRA is including the reports concurrently with the contractual date to provide OCRA's semi-annual report. 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 and, 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. The grievance procedure is also posted on Disability Rights California website.

There were four first level grievances filed by consumers or their families against OCRA during the last two quarters and three continued to the second level. Findings by Disability Rights California upheld the actions of OCRA in all but one grievance. Information concerning the grievances has previously been submitted to DDS. Attached as Exhibit L is a chart detailing the grievances filed against OCRA during this time period.

VI. CONCLUSION

OCRA's statistics show its staff's continuing commitment to the protection of the rights of people with developmental disabilities. OCRA handled

4,560 cases the last six months. Additionally, OCRA provided 169 trainings to over 8,088 consumers, their families and interested people. OCRA continues to meet 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 January 30, 2012* - Change is italicized.

ALTA CALIFORNIA REGIONAL CENTER

Jackie Coleman - CRA

Ramona Landeros - Assistant CRA

Esther Lee - VOLUNTEER

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy

1831 K Street

Sacramento, CA 95811

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

Email: Jackie.Coleman@disabilityrightsca.org

Ramona.Landeros@disabilityrightsca.org

Esther.Lee@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Tim Poe

CENTRAL VALLEY REGIONAL CENTER

Margie Oppel - CRA

Kay Spencer - Assistant CRA (part-time)

Maricruz Magdaleno - Temp Assistant CRA

567 W. Shaw Avenue, Suite C-3

Fresno, CA 93704

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

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

Kay.Spencer@disabilityrightsca.org,

Maricruz.Magdaleno@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Kathy Mottarella

EASTERN LOS ANGELES REGIONAL CENTER

Jackie (Chiang) Dai - CRA

Lucy Garcia - Assistant CRA

Maria Santoyo-Borjas - Temp 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

Maria.Santoyo-Borjas@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Irma Wagster

FAR NORTHERN REGIONAL CENTER

Andy Holcombe - CRA

Lorie Atamian - Assistant CRA

1280 East 9th Street, Unit E

Chico, CA 95928

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

E-mail: Andrew.Holcombe@disabilityrightsca.org

Lorie.Atamian@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by 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 - Temp Administrative Assistant (part-time)

3200 North Sillect Ave.

Bakersfield, CA 93308

Phone: (661)327-8531, Extension 313

Fax: (661)322-6417

E-mail: Mario.Espinoza@disabilityrightsca.org

Valerie.Geary@disabilityrightsca.org

Wanda.Arreola@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Kathy Mottarella

FRANK D. LANTERMAN REGIONAL CENTER

Tim Poe - CRA

Jazmin Romero - Assistant CRA

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy

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

Physical Address is:

25 Executive Court

Napa, CA 94558

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

Matthew O'Neill - Temporary CRA (part-time)

525 Second Street, Suite 300

Eureka, CA 95501

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

Fax: (707) 444-2563

E-mail: Matthew.ONeill@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 Gail Gresham

REGIONAL CENTER OF THE EAST BAY

Arthur Lipscomb - 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

Arthur.Lipscomb@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

Kendra McWright - CRA

Gina Gheno - Assistant CRA

520 East Montecito Street

Santa Barbara, CA 93103

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

Fax: 805-884-7219

E-mail: Gina.Gheno@disabilityrightsca.org

Kendra.McWright@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Kathy Mottarella

VALLEY MOUNTAIN REGIONAL CENTER

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
1831 K Street
Sacramento, CA 95811
Telephone: (916) 504-5820
Toll-Free: (800) 390-7032
Fax: (916) 504-5821/TTY: (877) 669-6023
DIRECT DIAL NUMBER: (916) 504-5820

Los Angeles OCRA

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
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) 504-5942

Supervising Clients' Rights Advocates:

Gail Gresham Sacramento
Email: Gail.Gresham@disabilityrightsca.org
(916) 504-5946

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

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

Kathy Mottarella Santa Barbara
Email: Katherine.Mottarella@disabilityrightsca.org

Support Staff Sacramento:

Alice Ximenez, Office Manager II

(916) 504-5943

Email: Alice.Ximenez@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Jeanne Molineaux

Sacramento

Vanessa Ochoa-Alcaraz, Administrative Assistant I

(916) 504-5941

Email: Vanessa.OchoaA@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Alice Ximenez

Sacramento

Support Staff Los Angeles:

Maria Ortega, Office Manager I

(213) 427-8761, Extension 3670

Email: Maria.Ortega@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Alice Ximenez

Los Angeles

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

1.	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.	Garcia, Lucy	ELARC
19.	Geary, Valerie	KRC
20.	Gheno, Gina	TCRC
21.	Gomez, Alba	SDRC
22.	Gresham, Gail	OCRASAC
23.	Hager, Christine	VMRC
24.	Hamer, Ada	NLACRC
25.	Hernandez, Yulahlia	NBRC
26.	Holcombe, Andy	FNRC
27.	Hornberger, Katie	HRC
28.	Landeros, Ramona	ACRC
29.	Lee, Esther	ACRC (Volunteer)
30.	Lipscomb, Arthur	RCEB
31.	Lusson, Katy	GGRC
32.	Magdaleno, Maricruz	CVRC (Agency Temp)
33.	McWright, Kendra	TCRC
34.	Melendrez, Mary	SCLARC
35.	Meyer, Katie	WRC
36.	Miller, Jacqueline	RCOC

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

Updated as of January 30, 2012.

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Semi-Annual Report - July 1, 2011 through December 31, 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
0-3		6	14	1	9	12	6	4	17	3	6	14	6	1	7	14	4	14	8	10	13	169
4-17	42	77	109	32	23	52	61	72	63	60	65	68	50	48	82	72	57	69	52	62	79	1295
18-22	19	28	33	16	29	22	28	32	16	38	31	34	18	8	17	24	27	18	26	36	38	538
23-40	29	24	35	61	35	23	43	32	26	48	33	45	19	34	19	20	30	17	28	46	54	701
41-49	17	9	13	17	13	8	12	15	3	14	18	9	10	17	8	10	13	7	7	19	31	270
50+	13	10	9	17	20	4	6	12	8	13	9	15	9	17	8	2	6	7	13	21	16	235
Total	120	154	213	144	129	121	156	167	133	176	162	185	112	125	141	142	137	132	134	194	231	3208

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Semi-Annual Report - July 1, 2011 through December 31, 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	1				4					1		146										152
Alpine	2																					2
Amador																				7		7
Butte				114																		114
Calaveras																				7		7
Contra Costa	3	1								1		98			1							104
Del Norte				1										7								8
El Dorado	3																					3
Fresno		91						1				1										93
Glenn				1																		1
Humboldt														39							1	40
Imperial																	11					11
Inyo								1														1
Kern		2						237	1				2									242
Kings		14																				14
Lake				1										41								42
Lassen				4		1																5
Los Angeles	4	1	310			179	1	2	213		218		2			192		187			319	1628
Madera		19			1																	20
Marin					80																	80
Mendocino														58								58
Merced	2	18																				20
Monterey															11							11
Napa		1								61												62
Nevada	1																					1
Not Selected		1																				1
Orange													212				1					213
Placer	15			1																		16
Plumas				1																		1
Riverside	1							94								3						98

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Semi-Annual Report - July 1, 2011 through December 31, 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	94																					94
San Bernardino			2		1		113		2							3	4	2	1			128
San Diego									1							1	177					179
San Francisco	1				62																	63
San Joaquin	1											1									127	129
San Luis Obispo																			8			8
San Mateo					71																	71
Santa Barbara																			61			61
Santa Clara					4					1					140							145
Santa Cruz		1													13							14
Shasta				46																		46
Siskiyou				3																		3
Solano	2				1					117												120
Sonoma	1	3			1					113		1										119
Stanislaus	2	1																		98		101
Sutter	3																					3
Tehama				18																		18
Tulare	2	52																				54
Tuolumne		1																			15	16
Unknown			2												1							3
Ventura									1							1			110			112
Yolo	7								2	2												11
Yuba	7																					7
Total	152	206	314	190	225	180	208	241	220	296	218	247	216	145	166	200	193	189	180	254	320	4560

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Semi-Annual Report - July 1, 2011 through December 31, 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	27	8	7	16	38	3	8	11	11	18	6	11	13	2	1	4	3		13	6	14	220
Autism	24	47	111	25	23	48	59	48	61	38	53	65	49	25	58	55	51	52	48	55	88	1083
Cerebral Palsy	13	11	13	17	10	10	12	5	12	25	15	32	11	7	15	11	22	15	15	21	24	316
Dual Diagnosis - 5th Category	5	1		1		1	1		2	4		1	1	2			1		3	1	1	25
Dual Diagnosis - Autism	2	1	2	1	3		5	1	1	3	2	2		2	2		2			4	5	38
Dual Diagnosis - Cerebral Palsy	1			1	1	1		2	1	1	3	1	2	1	2		1					18
Dual Diagnosis - Epilepsy				2				1		1	2				1		1	1		2		11
Dual Diagnosis - Mental Retardation	7	5	3	7	9	2	4	5	5	11	14	8	1	7	4	1	4	2	4	7	9	119
Early Start	1		7		1	11	5	2	13	2	3	7			3	7		13	2	1	11	89
Epilepsy	3	13	6	14	5	1	17	5	3	3	4	8	3	5	7	5	7	6	7	20	17	159
Mental Retardation	47	67	75	73	48	46	67	96	29	87	59	68	22	72	53	57	62	40	51	124	98	1341
Unknown	13	18	24	5	1	13	21	12	11		13	6	26	15	21	15	6	16	16	6	4	262
Grand Total	143	171	248	162	139	136	199	188	149	193	174	209	128	138	167	155	160	145	159	247	271	3681

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Semi-Annual Report - July 1, 2011 through December 31, 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	2	1		6	1	1	1	1	1	1				2	3				2	1		23
Asian	5	2	23	2	11	8	4	2	4	1	2	11	14	3	19	1		9		4	3	128
Black or African American	20	12	4	4	16	11	14	7	5	24	13	40	3	2	4	38	9	10	3	22	45	306
Hispanic / Latino	19	65	136	12	24	41	56	77	54	54	45	45	27	17	44	92	52	66	48	43	84	1101
Multiracial	7	12	13	6	6	7	12	5	11	1	7	13	2	1	10	4	2	18	5	10	11	163
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	3		6		3	4	2		2	3	1	5			5		2	1	3	6	3	49
Unknown	3	1	3		4	3	7		19	1	16	2	6	3		1		1	10		4	84
White	61	61	28	114	64	46	60	75	37	91	78	69	60	97	56	6	72	27	63	108	81	1354
Grand Total	120	154	213	144	129	121	156	167	133	176	162	185	112	125	141	142	137	132	134	194	231	3208

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Semi-Annual Report - July 1, 2011 through December 31, 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	42	49	73	58	40	35	51	56	38	60	61	65	38	56	47	46	45	46	48	73	80	1107
Male	78	105	137	86	89	86	105	111	94	115	101	120	73	69	93	96	92	86	86	120	149	2091
Unknown			3						1	1			1		1					1	2	10
Total	120	154	213	144	129	121	156	167	133	176	162	185	112	125	141	142	137	132	134	194	231	3208

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Semi-Annual Report - July 1, 2011 through December 31, 2011
Report by Living Arrangement

	ARC	CVRC	ELARC	FNRC	GGRC	HRC	IRC	KRC	LR	NBRC	NLARC	RCEB	RCOC	RCRC	SARC	SCLARC	SDRC	SGPRC	TCRC	VMRC	WRC	Total	
Adult Residential Facility	3	2	2	7			10	2	4	1	2	13	4	1	4		5		3	25	5	93	
Board and Care	5			1			8					1				1	3		1	6		26	
Childrens Group Home				2							1		3						1	9		16	
Community Residential Home	1				3			1	2	2	2				2					4	2	19	
Detention Center							5															5	
Developmental Center	2									1	2		2				1					8	
Foster Care	1	1		1		1	2	1			3	1		2		1		1		2		17	
Foster Family Home	2	1			3					6			1			1	1			4		19	
Halfway House				1																		1	
Homeless		1	1	2	2		1	1		6				2		1	2		1	1	2	23	
ICF DD							1												1		1	3	
ICF DD-H					3						1		1				2	1		1	3	12	
ICF DD-N		2									1	2										5	
ICF/MR/Nursing Home					1					1				1					1			4	
Independent Housing	25	19	11	86	19	2	20	57	10	36	22	28	27	28	20	10	19	11	30	36	54	570	
Intermediate Care Facility/Nursing Home					1												2				1	4	
Jail			1		2	1			1	5	1	1					8					20	
Large Group Home (more than 3 beds)	13	11	5	5	15	11		9	3	24	6	6	5	7	3	1	5	6	2		2	139	
Legal Detention			1																			1	
Municipal Detention Facility/Jail					2																	2	
Nursing Home		1																			1	2	
Other	4	5	2		4	10	1	4	1			2	3	1			3	1	1			42	
Other Federal Facility	1					1										1					1	4	
Parental or Other Family Home	85	157	282	73	126	151	159	154	189	197	168	169	164	81	136	172	144	163	128	159	235	3292	
Prison									1												1	2	4
Private General Hospital Emergency Rooms																	1					1	
Private Institutional Hospital/Treatment Facility	1		1		6			2	1										2			13	
Private Institutional Living Arrangement								1	2						2		4				1	10	
Private Institutional School		3								1		1				1						6	
Psychiatric Wards of Public General Hospitals																	1					1	
Public Institutional Hospital/Treatment Facility					1	1		1		1		1										5	
Public Institutional Living Arrangement	1										1				1							3	
Public Residential School																					1	1	
Semi-independent Home or Apartment	3	2	1		27			2	1	5		2	6	4	1				1	4	4	63	
Small Group Home (3 beds or less)				2	2	2		4	1	5	1	2		4		1		6	5		1	36	
Specialized Nursing Facility/Nursing Home								1	1	3		1					2			1	2	11	
Supervised Apartment	5		1	10	8				2	2	2	13		9					3		2	57	
Unknown		1	6				1	1	1		5	4			2					1		22	
Grand Total	152	206	314	190	225	180	208	241	220	296	218	247	216	145	166	200	193	189	180	254	320	4560	

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Semi-Annual Report - July 1, 2011 through December 31, 2011
Report by Problem Codes

		ARC	CVRC	ELARC	FNRC	GGRC	HRC	IRC	KRC	LRC	NBRC	NLARC	RCEB	RCOC	RCRC	SARC	SCLARC	SDRC	SGPRC	TCRC	VMRC	WRC	Total	
4731 Complaint	4731 - Regional Center	5	1				1	1	1	1	3	4						3				1	21	
	4731 - Service Provider	1						1	5								2	3				1	13	
4731 Complaint Total		6	1				1	2	6	1	3	4					2	6				1	34	
Abuse	Emotional / Psychological Abuse					1		1													1		2	
	Exploitation / Coercion										1					1						1	3	
	Financial Abuse		1			2		1	2		6		2		5	2					1	1	24	
	Inappropriate Medical Treatment							1								1							2	
	Other Abuse	1				1			2	1		1	2	1							1		12	
	Physical Assault	1	1		1	1				1		2					3				2		12	
	Physical Neglect						1				1		1				2		1				7	
	Physical Restraint / Seclusion	1										1											2	
	Sexual Assault					3				1		4			1		1						1	11
Verbal Abuse				2							1												3	
Abuse Total		3	2		3	9		3	6	1	14	3	5	2	6	9		1		5	1	5	78	
Assistive Technology	Assistive Technology - California Children's Services (CCS)											1											1	
	Assistive Technology - Medi-Cal					1																1	2	
	Assistive Technology - Medicare	1													1								1	
	Assistive Technology - Other AT				1																		2	
	Assistive Technology - Regional Center									1		1							1	2	4		9	
Assistive Technology Total		1			1	1				1		2			1				1	2	5		15	
Consent	Capacity / Incapacity of Client							2				1				1							1	5
	Informed Consent										1	1				1								4
	Other Consent																					2	2	
	Substituted Decision Making (Ex. DPAHC)														1								3	4
	Withhold Consent																						1	1
Consent Total								2			1	1			3			1				2	6	16
Conservatorship	Alternatives to Conservatorship		2	3	1	5	1	3	14	2	9	1	6	3	2	1	3	4	6	10	3	9	88	
	Change Conservatorship						1						1		1		3			1			7	
	Conservatee's Rights	2			2		1		1		1	12			1			2				4	26	
	Conservator's Duties																	1		1	2	1	5	
	LPS Conservatorship											1	3										4	
	Opposition to Petition	2	1	1					1		1		3									3	12	
	Petition			6				2	1			2			1							2	14	
	Termination of Conservatorship														1							4	7	
Conservatorship Total		4	3	10	3	5	3	5	17	2	11	16	13	4	5	1	6	7	6	12	18	12	163	
Criminal Justice / Forensic Mental	Competency							1		2													3	
	Criminal Justice Issues - Rights					4				1	1		1	3		1		2				2	15	
	Diversion			1		2	1	1					1								1		7	
	Jail			2			1					1											5	
	Juvenile (Detention and Probation)								1														1	
Other Criminal Justice						5			1											1			7	
Criminal Justice / Forensic Mental Health Issues Total				3		11	3	3	2	1	1	1	2	3		1	1	2			2	2	38	
Discrimination (Other than Employment)	Civil Rights (Race, Religion, Sexual Orientation)											1	1									1	1	2
	Higher Education (Public and Private)	1						1				1	1					1					5	
	Insurance Discrimination					2																	2	
	Other Discrimination			1				1		1				1				1					5	
	Public Accommodations (Hotels, Restaurants, Etc.)	1			1	1																	3	
Transportation (Public and Private)										2											1		3	
Discrimination (Other than Employment) Total		2		1	1	3		2		3		1	1	1				2			1	1	20	
Education	Education - Adult Education Programs	4	5		1					1	1		1										13	
	Education - After School Programs			1																	1	1	4	
	Education - Assessment		4	5				1			2		3	1		1	1	2				1	21	
	Education - Assistive Technology	1		1					1		1		3										7	
	Education - Behavioral Intervention, Services and Supports	1	7	3		1	1	3		2	2	3	2			9	4	2	2		5	1	48	
	Education - Compliance Complaint	1	1	3	1	2				4		5	3	7		1	2	5	1	5		3	45	
	Education - Discipline (Suspension / Expulsion / Other)	2	4	2	4			2	5		3	1	3		1	2		1	1	1			32	
	Education - Discrimination		2									1											3	
	Education - Due Process Appeals		3	8	1			1	1	4	5	6	2	1	1			2	1	4		1	3	44
	Education - Early Intervention (Part B / Over Age 3)																	1					1	2
	Education - Eligibility			3				1			2	1		3		1					1			12
	Education - Extra Curricular Activities	1															1							1
	Education - Full Inclusion (Except Pre-School)		1	2		1							2											6
	Education - Higher Education	2						3					1				1							8
	Education - Home / Hospital Instruction		1	2				1	1		1			1										7
	Education - IEP Development	6	17	15	8	9	22	9	8	13	10	9	7	11	4	23	12	4	22	6	12	3	230	

	Education - Least Restrictive Environment			3	2	1	1		1			1		2	1	7	5	1	1			4	5	1	36
	Education - Mental Health Services (AB 3632)					1								1											2
	Education - Non-Public School Placement	2	1	1			1	1	1	2		1	1	2	1	1	1	1					1	1	19
	Education - Other Education	1	7	8	1	1	3	1	5		1	1	2	4		6			4	6	6	1		58	
	Education - Personal Injury (Tort Claim)	1	1	1	7	2			2			1	1	2	1		1		2	2				24	
	Education - Preschool Programs and Full Inclusion			1	1												1			2	3	1		9	
	Education - Public School Placement	2	5	12	1	3	2	1	8	4	4	5	5	7	3	11	6	1	8	1	2	4		95	
	Education - Related Services (Ex. OT / PT / S&L / 1:1 / Medication)		10	9	1	2	3	6		3	7	5	14	4	1	2	4		9	1	3	4		88	
	Education - Residential Placement			1						1						1								3	
	Education - Transition Planning (Any Age)		4	2		4				1	1	1		5	1	2	1	1					2	25	
	Education - Transporation	4	1	5						5	2		2	3		2	7	1	2				7	41	
Education Total		28	79	94	21	25	33	33	41	31	48	38	67	36	23	73	42	15	57	25	51	23		883	
Employment	Employment Discrimination: General / Hiring				2			1							1	1					1			9	
	Employment Discrimination: Reasonable Accomodations		1			2	1		2	1	1			2					2			2		14	
	Vocational Rehabilitation Services	1		1	1			1		2							1			2				9	
	Wrongful Termination	1		2	1							1					1		1			1		10	
Employment Total		2	1	3	4	2	1	2	2	3	1	1		2	1	1	1	1	2	4		8		42	
Family	Adoption				1																			2	
	Child Support		1	1					1		2						1							7	
	Custody Issues		3	1	1	1	1	2	3			1		1	2	1	2	2				2	3	26	
	Dissolution / Annulment							1														2		3	
	Domestic Violence			1							1													2	
	Family Support Services			2		1															1	1		5	
	Foster Care	1						1																2	
	Guardianship of Minors										1		1					1						3	
	Marriage				1							1						1						4	
	Parental Rights		2		3		1	1	1		1	1			1									10	
Family Total		1	6	5	6	2	1	5	5		5	3	1	1	3	2	5	2				5	6	64	
Finance	Debtor / Creditor Issues	5	3	3	4	4	1		4			1	5	1		5	1	4		1	3	1	2	48	
	Estate Planning										1	1									2		3	7	
	Special Needs Trust	1		1		5		2		2	4	2									1	4	7	29	
Finance Total		6	3	4	4	9	1	2	4	2	6	8	1		5	1	4		1	6	5	12		84	
Health	CCS Eligibility										1													1	
	CCS Services										1		1		1		1				1	1	1	6	
	In Home Nursing					2				1					1		1				1			6	
	Medi-Cal Eligibility	1		8	1	3	1		2	2	3	1	3	1			2			6			12	46	
	Medi-Cal Services	1	2	1	2	3		5	2	6	6	4	2	11	1	1				2	1	1	10	60	
	Medi-Cal Share of Cost / Co-Payment				2	1		1		3	12				1	1		1	1	1	1	1	3	28	
	Medical Treatment	1		1	7		2	5		1	3	12		1	1				1		4	1	1	24	
	Medicare			1	1					1					1						1	1	2	8	
	Medi-Medi			1	1	1	1													1	1	1		7	
	Other Health	2	1	1	1	2	1		2		2	1	1			2						1	2	19	
	Private Insurance	3			1	1				2		2								1	1			18	
Health Total		8	3	12	8	16	9	3	14	7	13	14	22	5	13	5	5	5	3	12	10	36		223	
Housing	Eviction	1	1	1	5	5	2			1	1	1	3	1	2	1	2	1						9	37
	Foreclosure	1	1		3					1														6	
	Habitability				3	3			5		1	2	1				1		1	1	3			21	
	Housing Discrimination (Zoning / Covenants)						1				1													5	
	Landlord and Tenant Rights	2	1	1	25	1		7	2	3	1			2	6	2	4	1	2	1	2	8		71	
	Mobilehome Law		1																					2	
	Property Rights		1	1	1	1	1		3			1	2			1				1			2	15	
	Reasonable Accomodations			1	2	3				1		2	2		1							1	1	14	
	Section 8	1		1	2					1	2	1	1	4	2	1			1		1	1		19	
	Subsidized Housing	1		1	1			2		2														7	
Housing Total		6	5	6	42	13	4	7	13	7	7	7	9	7	13	4	8	2	4	3	7	23		197	
Immigration	Citizenship (Application / Interview)			1			1	1		1	3												3	10	
	Other Immigration	1		2			1				1											1		6	
	Public Charge																					1		1	
Immigration Total		1		3			2	1		1	3	1									1	1		17	
Income Maintenance	AAP					1															1			3	
	IHSS Eligibility	2	2	5	1	3	5	3	1	13	4	5	4	9		1	8	11	7	6	2	8		100	
	IHSS Hours	7	5	12	4	2	2	14	2	9	2	3	4	12	4	1	9	9	5	2	4	9		121	
	IHSS Protective Supervision	3	2	12	9	1	3	6		12	4	15	5	3	2	3	1	14	2	1	1	10		109	
	IHSS Share of Cost	1									1	2	1											6	
	Other Income Programs				2				1		4		1			1		3						12	
	SSA - Child Benefits			1						7														8	
	SSA - DAC			1	2					2			2		1									16	
	SSA - SSDI			1	1	2	1	2		1	2	1	1								3			21	
	SSI - Eligibility	4	14	11	7	19	6	5	5	2	28	11	10	10	2	3	9	4	5	12	16	21		204	
	SSI - Other	1	4	8	3	6	4	3	11	1	1	1	2	4	3		6	4	1	10	5	27		105	
	SSI - Overpayment	3	9	8	4	19	6	2	6	7	4	3	5	5	2	3	6	1	4	10	11	18		136	

	SSI - Representative Payee			1	1	4	1		1			6			1			1	2	1		7		26	
	State Disability Benefits			1					1			1			1									4	
Income Maintenance Total		21	38	60	37	54	27	36	27	54	57	41	35	14	12	41	49	25	45	46	107	871			
Legal Referral	Civil (General)	1			8		1	1	4	1	4	4	2		4	1	1			2	45	46	1	3	38
	Criminal (General) - Rights			1	1					1	2	2			1			1	1					10	
	Juvenile Dependency																						3	3	
	Personal Injury				2	2	1	2				1	2		1	1	3		1			3	1	20	
	Public Defender				2																			2	
	Small Claims									1		1											1	3	
Legal Referral Total		1		1	13	2	2	3	4	3	6	8	4		6	2	4		4	1	8	4	76		
Mental Health Issues	Mental Health - Complaint	2																					1	3	
	Mental Health - Eligibility														1									1	
	Mental Health - Involuntary Commitment	1					1				1													3	
	Mental Health - Service, Supports and Treatment	1		1	2		1	2	1	1			1	1	1						2			14	
Mental Health Issues Total		4		1	2		2	2	1	2		1	1	2							2	1		21	
Placement	Discharge Planning					1			1															2	
	Facility Conditions					1																		1	
	Facility Evictions																							5	
	Health Facilities														1									1	
	Move from Institution to Community	1	1			2			1	1												1		7	
	Support Services Needed for Placement	2	2			2							1		3									12	
	Unit / Facility / Institution Transfer	4			2	2			4	1			1								2			18	
Placement Total		7	3		8	2		6	2			2		3	1		2		3	2	5			46	
Privacy/Personal Autonomy / Choices	Community Activities	1				2	1				1			1	4						3			13	
	Least Restrictive Environment			1		3		2	1			2		4							2			17	
	Other Privacy / Personal Autonomy / Choices	3		7		7	5	5	6	1	5	1	2		1	7					3	2	29	1	85
	Personal Property	1				1	1		1		1		1	1	1	1					1			11	
	Privacy		1					1				1		2							1			6	
	Religion					1																		1	
	Sexuality					1					3			1	1									8	
	Telephone					1		1			1		1		1									5	
Privacy/Personal Autonomy / Choices Total		5	1	8	1	15	7	9	8	1	11	1	6	2	14	9		10		2	33	3		146	
Records	Breach of Confidentiality						1					1	3											5	
	Denial of Access	2																						2	
	Erroneous Information			1																		1		2	
Records Total		2		1			1					1	3									1		9	
Regional Center Services	Regional Center - 6500								1															2	
	Regional Center - Assessment of Needs	2		5		3	10	1	2	2		2	3	1	4	2	1	2			2	2		44	
	Regional Center - Behavioral Services	1	6	9	1	1	7	8	4	10	2	3	7	13	2	3	10	6	1		5	11		111	
	Regional Center - Case Management		3	17	5	1	3	5	23	4	12	5	8		1	3	12	7	7			6	7	129	
	Regional Center - Coordination with County Mental Health			1													1							3	
	Regional Center - Crisis Services			1	1										1									3	
	Regional Center - Day Program, Training and Activity	2	2	1	2	2	7	2	2	2	11	5	1	1	2	4	4	4	1	2	5			62	
	Regional Center - DDS Policies / Procedures	1		2		1		4	1	2		1	2			3						1	1	19	
	Regional Center - Early Start (Part C / Under Age 3)		1	2		1	5		1	9	3	1	5	1	1	1	4	1	5			1	8	50	
	Regional Center - Eligibility for Regional Center services	16	22	9	15	12	10	40	11	15	21	22	13	27	6	15	23	12	17	15	9	18		348	
	Regional Center - Fair Hearing Procedures (Information only; n	1	2	13		8	6	4	2	13	15	7		15	1	1	9	2	32	7				142	
	Regional Center - Independent Living Services	1	3	5		3			1	4	1	1	1	3	2		2				2	1		5	
	Regional Center - IPP (Development / Meeting / Compliance)	4	5	4	8	1	14	11	5	9	14	7	10	3	8	2	4	5	13	6	1	2		136	
	Regional Center - Other Regional Center Services	8	8	14		5	5	3	17	9	10	9	14	23	2	6	3	13	5	7	10	8		179	
	Regional Center - Prevention Services			1			2							1										4	
	Regional Center - Respite	4	2	16	1		8	5	2	8	7	3	5	4	1	1	2	23	1	3	5	3		104	
	Regional Center - Supported Employment		1		1		1	2	1	1			1			1						1	1	11	
	Regional Center - Supported Living	3	4		5	8	1	1	9	2	4	1	6	9	2	5		9	1	5	3	5		83	
	Regional Center - Transportation	1	2	1	5	4	4	2	1	5	5		1	2	2		2	2		1				40	
	Regional Center - Waiver			1					1	4	2				2									12	
Regional Center Services Total		44	61	102	44	50	81	90	84	99	107	67	76	107	34	43	81	88	86	53	55	65		1517	
Grand Total		152	206	314	190	225	180	208	241	220	296	218	247	216	145	166	200	193	189	180	254	320		4560	

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Semi-Annual Report - July 1, 2011 through December 31, 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	22	16	109	21	88	109	48	30	35	43	25	64	38	42	52	119	16	43	18	88	128	1154
2 - Rights Information/Consultation (RC/Generic)	95	46	130	18	20	17	141	66	84	172	128	69	116	67	19	69	92	142	103	71	131	1796
3 - Rights Information/Consultation (Other)	5	140	33	102	15	23	1	106	96	17	34	60	18	9	44	2	62		46	65	3	881
4 - Abuse/Neglect Investigation	1			2		1		2		1	1	2		1	4		1		1		1	18
5 - Special Education Compliance Complaint	2							1				1					1			4		9
6 - IEP		1	3	5	4	2		8		3	7	3	3	2	18	3	1			18	2	83
7 - IPP/IDT	1					7	1	3		4	3		2	1	3		3	1	1			30
8 - W&I 4731						1		2	1		3						1			2		10
9 - Technical Assistance	10		17	6	14	7	1	10	1	8	1		24	8			2	2	3	3	3	120
10 - Evaluation and Assessment	14	3	9	28	58	10	7	7	1	41	8	30	14	8	6	6	7		6	3	7	273
11 - Informal Regional Center / Provider Problem Resolution	1		4	3	13		6	4		3	7			2	9		3				6	61
12 - Informal Generic Service Agency Problem Resolution			5	2	9	2	1	1	1	3	4	10		3	11		1		1		27	81
13 - Case Settlement Prior to Informal Meeting, Mediation or Hearing			3				1	1						1							1	7
14 - Direct Representation in RC "Voluntary Informal Meeting"	1			1																		2
15 - Direct Representation in Mediation / RC Fair Hearing					1	1					1		1			1	1	1			2	9
16 - Direct Representation in an Appeal for Generic Services			1	2	3		1	1		1	3	1		1			2		1		9	26
Grand Total	152	206	314	190	225	180	208	241	220	296	218	247	216	145	166	200	193	189	180	254	320	4560

ADVOCACY REPORT

OFFICE OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS ADVOCACY

Fall 2011

BENEFITS

In-Home Support Services (IHSS)

IHSS Protective Supervision Hours Reinstated.

E.C. has numerous disabilities, which include severe cerebral palsy, moderate intellectual disability, anxiety disorder, obsessive compulsive disorder, significant scoliosis, chronic muscle spasms, severe right knee contracture and severe premenstrual syndrome. After an annual reassessment of E.C. by her county worker, E.C. was found no longer eligible for IHSS protective supervision and her IHSS hours were reduced from 269 to 74 hours per month.

OCRA helped E.C. file an appeal to request a hearing challenging the county's reduction of her IHSS hours. At the hearing, the county worker testified that E.C. knew her phone number and address and appeared to understand danger.

OCRA provided an Assessment of Need form from her doctor that stated E.C. has severe short-term memory loss and cannot remember what happened earlier in the day, that her judgment is severely impaired and that she will open the door to strangers, has misused a microwave and does not understand interpersonal boundaries.

The administrative law judge (ALJ) concluded that the evidence supported E.C.'s need for protective supervision and not only reinstated her protective supervision hours, but also increased her personal care hours for a total to 277 hours per month. Lorie Atamian, Assistant CRA, Far Northern Regional Center.

G.M. Gets Protective Supervision and \$20,000 Retroactively.

G.M. is an adult who was approved for 90 hours a month of IHSS. G.M.'s father had requested protective supervision because G.M.'s doctor felt, upon G.M.'s release from a psychiatric hospital, that G.M. needed to be supervised at all times. OCRA assisted G.M.'s father with the appeal. After talking to the appeals specialist, G.M.'s father signed a conditional withdrawal so that the county could reassess G.M. for protective supervision within one month. For the next three months, the county stated it was still reviewing the case. The county never performed a reassessment, so G.M.'s father requested the hearing be reinstated.

OCRA advised G.M.'s father to clarify at hearing that protective supervision is needed not because of G.M.'s Prader Willi syndrome, which causes G.M. to overeat and is a medical condition, but because of G.M.'s intellectual disability and impairments in memory, orientation, and judgment. OCRA also advised G.M.'s father as to what documents to include in his hearing packet, reviewed his paperwork, helped him organize his hearing packet, and made copies for the hearing. After the hearing, G.M.'s father called us to tell us he thought he had lost the case based on his reading of the decision. OCRA reviewed the decision and explained to the father that he won the case, and G.M. was made eligible for protective supervision retroactively. G.M. will receive approximately \$20,000 in retroactive payments. Katie Meyer, CRA, Luisa Delgadillo, Assistant CRA, Westside Regional Center.

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

Parents of 9-year-old V.R., who has severe intellectual and physical disabilities requiring constant care, received a notice that V.R.'s IHSS hours had been reduced from 239 to 91. The county alleged that the non-provider spouse in a two-parent household was an alternative resource. OCRA helped the father to develop a work schedule chart and had him obtain letters from his employer substantiating his 60-hour work week. A hearing was held at which OCRA successfully requested a continuance, the ALJ agreed to continue aid paid pending, and both parties agreed that the issue was not how much

father was working but whether the regulation upon which the county was relying was valid.

OCRA attended the IHSS reassessment. OCRA reviewed the county file which showed assessments of actual need which did not appear in the county's notice, as well as old notices showing that the county had awarded increasing hours during the past 5 years, consistent with the 239 hours that the county now sought to reduce.

OCRA represented V.R. at a second hearing. On the morning of the hearing, the county representative called to say that the county agreed to reinstate the hours. OCRA then met with the parents and the county at the hearing and agreed to an increase of hours from 239 to 266. Margaret Oppel, Interim CRA, Gina Gheno, Assistant CRA, Tri-Counties Regional Center.

County Agrees That Z.W. Meets Criteria for Protective Supervision.

Z.W.'s mother is monolingual Mandarin Chinese speaking. She informed OCRA that IHSS refused to consider evidence that supported that her son needed more hours of IHSS.

OCRA requested a copy of Z.W.'s regional center records and gathered documentary evidence in support of Z.W.'s need for more hours of IHSS, including protective supervision. Z.W. is completely unaware of danger. Once Z.W. had turned the stove on and caused a small kitchen fire. OCRA advised F.L. to obtain another form from Z.W.'s doctor to provide to IHSS. Then, OCRA contacted the county hearing specialist to discuss Z.W.'s needs. The hearings specialist agreed to conduct a reassessment, as there were several medical forms that were not considered. OCRA maintained that if an increase of hours was granted, it would be retroactive to the date of application. The county agreed to this.

Following the reassessment, F.L. contacted OCRA with the news that Z.W. had been approved for 195 hours of IHSS, including protective supervision. Jackie Chiang Dai, CRA, Lucy Garcia, Assistant CRA, Maria Santoyo-Borjas, Temporary Assistant CRA, Eastern Los Angeles Regional Center.

M.C. Obtains 283 Hours Per Month of IHSS.

M.C. is an 8-year-old child who was denied IHSS protective supervision hours because the county social worker did not observe dangerous behavior during her home visit to assess M.C. M.C.'s doctor certified that M.C. has severe impairments in memory, orientation, and judgment, and the social worker knew that M.C. had run out of the house into the street on more than one occasion. M.C.'s regional center service coordinator verified that M.C. needs constant supervision due to her limited safety skills and that she runs away when not supervised. OCRA provided technical assistance to M.C.'s mother, a monolingual Spanish speaker, who represented M.C. at hearing. Although four county representatives attended the hearing, making M.C.'s mother's feel that the hearing had gone badly, the judge awarded 283 hours, the maximum number of IHSS hours allowed by law, including protective supervision. Alba Gomez, Assistant CRA, San Diego Regional Center.

Medi-Cal

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

A.B.'s father contacted OCRA for advocacy assistance in getting his son's zero-share of cost Medi-Cal reinstated. A.B. received Supplemental Security Income (SSI) linked Medi-Cal with a zero-share of cost. A.B.'s SSI benefits were then switched to another program called Disabled Adult Child (DAC) benefits. At that point, the county then re-determined A.B.'s Medi-Cal eligibility and changed his coverage to include a \$785 per month share of cost.

A.B.'s father appealed the county's decision and contacted OCRA. OCRA contacted the hearing specialist and discussed that under federal law, people who lose SSI because they start receiving DAC benefits must be treated for Medi-Cal purposes as if they were still receiving SSI, which includes zero-share of cost Medi-Cal. OCRA provided the hearing specialist with the federal statute. Upon review of the statute, the county agreed to change A.B.'s share of cost back to zero under DAC Medi-Cal. Veronica Cervantes, CRA, Beatriz Reyes, Assistant CRA, Inland Regional Center.

J.R. Obtains Medi-Cal without a Share of Cost.

J.R. lost his Medi-Cal when his mother forgot to return some forms to the county. Although J.R. has private insurance and Medicare, he relied on his Medi-Cal in order to remain eligible for IHSS. His mother re-applied for Medi-Cal for J.R., but once approved, he had a large share of cost because he receives Social Security Disability benefits. The county failed to place him into a disability-linked Medi-Cal program.

OCRA contacted a supervisor at the county and provided the supervisor with proof of disability, income, and the fact that J.R. incurs three health care premiums: Medicare, private health plan, and dental plan. These health coverage expenses reduce his countable income to below the Aged and Disabled Federal Poverty Level (A & D FPL) ceiling and thus make him eligible for Medi-Cal with zero-share of cost. The county agreed and sent a new notice reflecting his eligibility for zero share of cost. Katie Meyer, CRA, Luisa Delgadillo, Assistant CRA, Westside Regional Center.

Social Security

SSA Waives Overpayment.

K.N. acts as her own payee for Social Security benefits. After she was laid off from work, K.N. reported her unemployment benefits consistently and on a routine and regular basis. Despite her compliance with reporting requirements, the Social Security Administration (SSA) alleged that she had been overpaid.

K.N. never filed a request for reconsideration. OCRA was contacted for assistance. OCRA contacted the SSA and assisted with the filing of a waiver request including the necessary documentation and evidence. SSA waived the overpayment of \$3,630. Leinani Walter, CRA, Valley Mountain Regional Center.

R.B. Gets Benefits Reinstated and \$50,323 Overpayment Cleared.

R.B. works at a courthouse job site through supported employment. He also receives Social Security benefits under the DAC program. R.B.'s mother, who is his representative payee, received a notice that R.B.'s disability had ended and he had incurred an overpayment of \$50,323, because he was allegedly performing substantial work by earning over \$1,000 per month. R.B. and his mother contacted OCRA for help.

OCRA asked R.B.'s supervisor about R.B.'s work and then asked the supervisor to complete the Work Activity Questionnaire, a SSA form that asks about subsidy and working under special conditions. OCRA learned that one of the job requirements is that workers must have a developmental disability. R.B.'s employer certified that he works 40 hours per week and has a job coach for 40 hours per week. R.B. requires extra help and supervision and has fewer and easier duties, and must meet lower production standards than an employee without a disability in a similar job.

OCRA filed an appeal of the disability cessation and ask for expedited reinstatement of R.B.'s benefits. OCRA provided evidence of subsidy and special employment conditions, which meant that R.B. was not performing substantial work, is still eligible for benefits, and the overpayment should be cleared. The SSA agreed, reinstated R.B.'s benefits, and cleared the overpayment. Katie Meyer, CRA, Luisa Delgadillo, Assistant CRA, Westside Regional Center.

SSA Agrees to Reinstate Payments at the Current Benefit Rate.

M.G. and his mother contacted OCRA for assistance in reinstating M.G.'s SSI benefit payments. The SSA had been reducing, and eventually stopped, M.G.'s payments based on child support income that M.G. should have been receiving from his father.

Additionally, the SSA removed M.G.'s mother as his representative payee after the family moved to the Central Valley. The Central Valley SSA also refused to accept any income statements from M.G.'s mother, telling her that because she was not the representative

payee, it could not accept the information she submitted. M.G. was then assessed an overpayment of more than \$7,000 and a substantial amount of money was withheld every month to repay the overpayment. Subsequently, the SSA stopped providing all benefits to M.G.

OCRA assisted M.G. in filing a Request for Reconsideration and represented M.G. at his SSI informal conference where OCRA was able to correct the record. M.G. had not been receiving child support payments for the majority of 2011. M.G.'s SSI payments were reinstated and his current overpayment amount was reduced. M.G. was then awarded retroactive benefits and the current amount withheld from his SSI check was reduced to an amount he could afford. Kendra McWright, CRA, Maricruz Magdaleno, Temporary Assistant CRA, Central Valley Regional Center.

Consumer Found Eligible for SSI Benefits.

R.C. was denied eligibility for SSI benefits. His only income came from his work at a sheltered workshop. This income did not provide him with enough money to buy food or live on his own.

OCRA assisted R.C. in filing a Request for Reconsideration. Throughout this process, OCRA helped R.C. get transportation to his appointments at the SSA, to fill out paperwork to submit to the SSA, and to obtain food stamps.

R.C.'s Request for Reconsideration was granted. He was found eligible for SSI. R.C. is now planning on moving into his own home. Yulahlia Hernandez, CRA, Annie Breuer, Assistant CRA, North Bay Regional Center.

Other Benefits

J.S. to Receive Needed Wheelchair from CCS.

J.S. is an 8-year-old who lives with his family. J.S. receives SSI and Medi-Cal. J.S.'s mother contacted OCRA for help in getting a wheelchair for J.S.

Since September, 2010, J.S.'s mother had submitted multiple prescriptions from a California Children's Services (CCS) panel physician who determined medical necessity and submitted a treatment authorization request (TAR) for J.S.'s wheelchair evaluation. CCS failed to process the TAR and J.S. was never evaluated by CCS staff or its vendor. By April, 2011, J.S.' parent had arranged for an independent evaluation.

OCRA assisted J.S.'s parent in understanding the authorization process for CCS services and medically necessary durable medical equipment. OCRA contacted J.S.'s CCS nurse case manager to discuss J.S.' continuing need for a wheelchair. OCRA provided CCS with a copy of the independent wheelchair evaluation and equipment recommendation. Due to the length of time since the independent evaluation, OCRA arranged an appointment for J.S. with a CCS medical therapy unit physician to review and update the information contained in the independent assessment. J.S.'s CCS nurse case manager agreed to attend the scheduled appointment and also arranged a CCS social worker referral for the parent. J.S. attended the evaluation appointment with the CCS physician. CCS agreed to the equipment recommendation of the independent evaluator and J.S. is due to receive a wheelchair. Christine Armand, Associate CRA, South Central Los Angeles Regional Center.

CRIMINAL LAW

Criminal Charges Dropped and Placement Obtained for Y.Q.

Y.Q., a young adult consumer with a traumatic brain injury, had been charged with felony assault because she had allegedly attacked a teacher at school. OCRA met with Y.Q. and her parents and obtained needed releases to discuss the case with the public defender, the SELPA Director and the regional center. OCRA coordinated the preparation of the evidence needed to educate the court about Y.Q.'s impairment and the progress being made to obtain placement through the IEP process. The court permitted placement of Y.Q. during the pendency of the criminal proceedings. The criminal charges were ultimately dismissed. Margaret Oppel, Interim CRA, Tri-Counties Regional Center.

DISCRIMINATION

OCRA Advocates against NIMBY-ism.

The regional center informed OCRA that several medically fragile consumers were being discriminated against because of their disabilities. The consumers required advocacy assistance. A new vendor had received a grant for \$90,000 to open a 6-bed home to fulfill unmet placement needs in the foothills area. The home owners association was trying to prevent the project from moving forward. Neighbors began to harass the new vendors with calls, emails, and inappropriate calls to law enforcement.

Threats to prevent the care home from opening in the private community alerted regional center staff, and Area Board 6. The regional center had approved the location and viewed the community as aesthetically pleasing. OCRA attended the home owner's association meeting with the Area Board 6 and regional center with resources and information to share. The regional center notified OCRA that despite efforts to stop the purchase of the home and vendorization of the provider, escrow closed. Six consumers will shortly have an appropriate new home in the community. Leinani Walter, CRA, Christine Hager, Assistant CRA.

HOUSING

Consumer and Family Receive Transitional Housing Services.

T.V. and her son receive regional center services. T.V., her husband, and young son were living in subsidized housing that was not habitable. They complained for two years but the conditions were not corrected. They finally moved out and ended up in a homeless shelter in another county which was still in their regional center catchment area.

OCRA met with the family and the regional center. It was determined that the school in the second county offered better services for the son and the family wanted to stay in that county. OCRA assisted the family in applying for SSI benefits and had several conversations with

the agency that ran the shelter. The agency has a transitional housing program. T.V. and her family were granted an apartment and transitional services. They now have a year to find permanent housing. Katy Lusson, CRA, Assistant CRA, Trina Saldana, Golden Gate Regional Center.

Temporary Restraining Order (TRO) Modified in Housing Case.

K.S. is an adult who has lived with his family in the same apartment for many years. He began going upstairs and knocking on his neighbor's door and asking very inappropriate questions. The neighbors called the police several times and spoke with K.S. and his family but the behavior persisted. The neighbors then obtained a temporary restraining order (TRO).

The forensic social worker from the regional center called OCRA for support in modifying the TRO, as the original TRO would have prevented K.S. from staying in his home. The TRO was subsequently modified with a permanent order allowing K.S. to remain in his home. Counseling and additional support services were also put in place for K.S. Katy Lusson, CRA, Trina Saldana, Assistant CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

REGIONAL CENTER

Dental Services Funded by Regional Center.

Dental surgery was performed on M.H. in January, 2011. The regional center agreed to pay for the amount for the procedure that was not covered by insurance, which was the consumer's co-pay.

For medical reasons, M.H. had to wait for the second phase of her dental work, which was scheduled for August, 2011. M.H.'s parent made a timely request for the regional center to fund the uninsured portion or co-pay for the second phase of the surgery.

The regional center denied funding and stated that it was the responsibility of the parent to pay for the second surgery for the adult

consumer. OCRA met with the regional center executive director to explain OCRA's position that the regional center should complete payment for the second and final phase of the dental surgery. After the director met with his team, OCRA was invited to join the group and the team decided that the regional center would pay for the co-pay for the second phase of the dental surgery. Christine Hager, Assistant CRA, Valley Mountain Regional Center.

OCRA Intervenes When Consumers Dissatisfied with SLS Provider.

T.V. and his wife are both individuals with disabilities. They live in an apartment complex with SLS services. The agency that serves them also serves many of the other regional center residents in the complex. There were several meetings with the agency, other residents, and the regional center.

T.V. and his wife were not satisfied with the services. They called OCRA because they felt that the agency was not being responsive to their needs. OCRA called the supervisor at the regional center and arranged for a meeting with the residents and the apartment complex. As a result of that meeting, T.V. and several other residents terminated services with the SLS agency and began receiving services from another vendor they had requested. Katy Lusson, CRA, Trina Saldana, Assistant CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

Regional Center Eligibility for A.R.

A.R.'s grandmother had custody of A.R. and previously submitted an eligibility application to the regional center on A.R.'s behalf. OCRA agreed to assist A.R. with the preparation and submission of a new application and obtained an evaluation. The regional center had a new evaluation of its own performed. In the initial application, A.R. had sought eligibility for regional center services on the basis of autism. However, both evaluations completed for the second application focused on 5th category eligibility, finding that A.R. needed services or treatment similar to people with intellectual disabilities, although autism was also considered. Nonetheless, the regional center denied eligibility again, and OCRA submitted a hearing request for A.R.

At the informal conference, which is part of the regional center due process, OCRA assisted the grandparents in providing a lengthy explanation of A.R.'s limitations. Following lengthy discussions at the informal conference, and subsequent fact-checking of the anecdotal information provided, the regional center granted eligibility on the basis of autism. Andy Holcombe, CRA, Lorie Atamian, Assistant CRA, Far Northern Regional Center.

D.L. Gets 40 Hours of Home Nursing.

Before aging out of the EPSDT Medi-Cal program when he turned 21, D.L. was receiving 80 hours per week of LVN-level home nursing services. These services stopped on his 21st birthday and D.L. was transferred to the Nursing Facility/Acute Hospital Medi-Cal Waiver program. Under that program, D.L. was only eligible to receive 35 hours of LVN nursing per month with 266 hours per month of IHSS. D.L. asked the regional center for 70 hours a week of LVN home nursing services to fill the gap created when he aged out of the EPSDT program. The regional center denied his request stating that IHSS was a generic resource that D.L. could use to fill the gap, because he could convert the IHSS to LVN nursing hours instead. This conversion would only account for 70 hours of LVN and not allow for a number of IHSS services to be performed, including laundry, meal preparation, accompaniment to medical appointments and other IHSS services. OCRA argued that D.L. needed both the IHSS service hours and the LVN nursing services because each served a different purpose and both were needed to meet D.L.'s individual needs. OCRA filed for hearing and represented D.L. in negotiations. OCRA maintained that IHSS was not a generic resource that D.L. had to utilize to pay for home nursing services. The regional center considered D.L.'s argument and agreed to provide 40 hours of LVN nursing services in the home without requiring that D.L. give up his IHSS. Eva Casas-Sarmiento, CRA, Abbey Perez, Assistant CRA, Harbor Regional Center.

OCRA Provides Direct Representation at Hearing for ABA/ DTT Services.

For almost two years, I.G., the mother of 6-year-old R.S., had requested applied behavioral analysis and discrete trial training (ABA/DTT) services for R.S. I.G. had obtained an independent assessment which confirmed R.S. needed ABA/DTT. The regional center denied providing ABA/DTT and instead offered parent training. OCRA agreed to represent R.S.

On the second day of the hearing, after OCRA began presenting evidence, the regional center asked for negotiations to take place. As a result, a settlement agreement was reached. R.S. is currently receiving 60 hours a month of ABA/DTT services. Mary Melendrez, CRA, South Central Los Angeles Regional Center, Jackie Dai, CRA, Eastern Los Angeles Regional Center.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Student Receives Accommodation in School Honors Program.

R.V. is a student with a seizure disorder that has been unresponsive to medication. She has many seizures throughout the day that leave her tired and unable to complete the amount of homework necessary in her junior high school honors program. R.V. has always excelled in her schoolwork and she wanted to stay in the honors class. In order to do so, she required an accommodation.

OCRA strategized with R.V.'s mother about how to best present the information, documentation, and the request. R.V.'s mother called OCRA after an independent education plan (IEP) meeting to let OCRA know that all of the necessary accommodations were going to be put into place immediately. Katy Lussion, CRA, Trina Saldana, Assistant CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

OCRA Secures Appropriate Program for Student.

A.M. has very little speech but is bright and wants to learn. He was placed in a county class with students more cognitively involved than

he was. A.M. was leaving the classroom and wandering in the hall. There was not a bathroom near the classroom and he was soiled for much of the day. A.M. had no academic goals in his IEP. His mother felt that it was not healthy or safe for A.M. to continue in his current class and requested an emergency IEP.

OCRA met with A.M.'s mother before the scheduled IEP and reviewed A.M.'s assessments, IEPs, and documentation regarding the unsafe environment. OCRA advised A.M.'s mother about the need for additional documentation from doctors and therapists. Relevant federal and state laws were discussed.

A.M.'s mother called after the meeting. A.M. was being transferred immediately to a different site. A 1:1 aide was assigned and the IEP team developed goals and objectives consistent with his needs. Katy Lusson, CRA, Trina Saldana, Assistant CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

B.T. Returns to School with Behavior Services.

B.T. is a high school student with autism who was suspended for assaulting school staff. The district informed B.T.'s parents that B.T. was being placed into an alternative educational setting as the district felt B.T. presented a danger to staff and students. OCRA represented B.T. at the manifestation determination meeting. B.T.'s behavior was found to be related to his disability and the district had failed to implement B.T.'s IEP and behavior plan. The district agreed to return B.T. to his school placement and to conduct a Functional Analysis Assessment so that an appropriate behavior intervention plan could be developed. Rita Defilippis, CRA, San Andreas Regional Center.

OCRA Secures Less Restrictive Placement for Student.

J.P. is a first grade student with autism whose parents had repeatedly tried to get their son into a less restrictive setting without success. Despite their disagreement, the parents signed J.P.'s IEP at end of the school year knowing they would home school J.P. and not utilize the IEP. In the fall, the parents disenrolled J.P. from school and educated him at home. In December, the parents tried to re-enroll J.P., but again were offered only the inappropriate, restrictive placement. The parents

contacted OCRA for help. OCRA represented J.P. at two IEP meetings and negotiated a mutually agreed upon, less restrictive, temporary placement while new assessments were completed which could determine J.P.'s placement needs. Following assessment, it was determined that J.P. was doing well and was appropriately placed in the temporary placement. The IEP team agreed to adopt it as J.P.'s placement. Rita Defilippis, CRA, San Andreas Regional Center.

Student Gets Desired Transition Programming in Spite of School District Having Issued a Diploma.

At J.J.'s June, 2011, IEP meeting, J.J. found that because the district had placed him on a "diploma track," J.J. would not be allowed to participate in the transition program he wanted to attend. J.J. told the other members of the IEP team that he wanted and needed to be in the transition program, and that he did not know that receiving a diploma would make him ineligible. J.J. asked the district not to give him a diploma, but the district denied his request. J.J.'s regional center case manager contacted OCRA on his behalf.

OCRA reviewed J.J.'s school records and found that J.J. had always attended a special day class for his core curriculum subjects, and that he had not met the required standards for completion of the general education high school curriculum. OCRA presented this information to the school district, and requested that J.J.'s status be changed to reflect his eligibility for transition programming. OCRA received no response. When the new school year's transition program was about to begin, OCRA advised the district that an OAH complaint was about to be filed regarding the issue. The district then met with J.J. and OCRA and J.J. was immediately admitted to the transition program of his choice. Celeste Palmer, Associate CRA, Regional Center of the East Bay.

District Ordered to Provide Compensatory Special Education Services and Complete Independent Education Evaluations.

E.B.'s parent called OCRA for legal assistance when the school district failed to provide education services during the extended-school year. Although E.B.'s IEP stated services would be provided during the extended-school year, the school district did not provide a

health care aide as stated in the IEP. OCRA agreed to contact the school district and also review recent assessments. After not receiving a reply from the school district, OCRA filed a compliance complaint with the Department of Education alleging that the school district failed to provide services during the extended-school year or reply to OCRA's requests for Independent Education Evaluations. The Department of Education found that the school district was out of compliance and ordered the school district to complete the Independent Education Evaluations and provide compensatory services in tutoring, speech and occupational therapy. Timothy Poe, CRA, Frank D. Lanterman Regional Center.

OCRA Persuades School District to Comply With Previous Settlement Agreement Regarding Services.

M.R.'s mother had previously retained an attorney to file a due process hearing against the school district regarding the amount of time M.R. should be pulled out of general education to attend the learning center to work on math and reading skills. M.R.'s mother felt the school district's recommendation to pull M.R. out of general education a total of 450 minutes per week was excessive and not the least restrictive environment. M.R. had previously made the honor roll with minimal pull-out services in his general education curriculum.

The matter was resolved through a written settlement agreement between the mother, her attorney and the school district. The agreement stated that pull-out services would be limited to 225 minutes per week. However, after new assessments were done the school district recommended increasing the pull-out service to 480 minutes per week. When the mother's attorney was not able to continue representing on this matter, M.R.'s mother asked OCRA for assistance. OCRA agreed to attend an IEP meeting. The IEP team agreed to comply with the previous settlement agreement. Mario Espinoza, CRA, Kern Regional Center.

R.W. Retains Educational Placement.

Five years ago, R.W.'s IEP team determined that R.W.'s home school could not meet her educational needs, and placed R.W. at another school within the district. Subsequent IEP teams determined that

R.W.'s placement remained appropriate, including the team at R.W.'s last IEP in June. On the second Thursday of this school year, the school principal notified R.W.'s parent that Friday would be R.W.'s last day, and on Monday, R.W. would be attending a new school. The school principal and the Director of Special Education denied R.W.'s parent an IEP to discuss this issue. On Friday, while R.W. was still in class, the school principal had all of R.W.'s belongings packed and sent to the new school. The CRA wrote a due process complaint and request for "stay put" that R.W.'s parent filed, so that R.W. could remain in her current placement. Jacqueline Miller, CRA, Cynthia Salomon, Assistant CRA, Regional Center of Orange County.

OUTREACH/TRAINING

OCRA and Regional Center Co-Present at Training.

Jim Stoepler, the CRA for consumers at Redwood Coast Regional Center (RCRC), Ukiah, and Claudia Gomez, the eligibility specialist at RCRC, worked together to prepare a training on regional center eligibility. Yulahlia Hernandez, the CRA for consumers at North Bay Regional Center, assisted with the preparation and was available at the training to translate. RCRC welcomed and assisted the people who attended the training event.

Participants at the training had very thoughtful questions and comments. One participant noted, "The panel did an excellent job of presenting complex information clearly." Another participant stated, "It is good to see the attention that the eligibility process gets." Participants and presenters all enjoyed the opportunity to spend time together discussing this important topic. Jim Stoepler, CRA, RCOC, Yulahlia Hernandez, CRA, North Bay Regional Center, Gail Gresham, Supervising CRA.

ADVOCACY REPORT

OFFICE OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS ADVOCACY

Winter 2012

BENEFITS

IN HOME SUPPORT SERVICES

R.J. Gets the Protective Supervision She Needs.

R.J. had been receiving In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) in the areas of personal care, domestic, and related services, but was not granted any protective supervision. R.J. meets the criteria for protective supervision as she has significant impairments in memory, orientation, and judgment. She uses few words and is not able to act in an emergency. She has always been supervised 24 hours per day.

OCRA agreed to represent R.J. at hearing. The County did not send the file to the appeals specialist and did not show up for the hearing. Therefore, the appeals specialist could not tell whether or not the County had ever assessed for protective supervision. OCRA presented evidence and testimony proving R.J.'s need for protective supervision. The administrative law judge (ALJ) ordered an assessment. OCRA attended the home assessment, after which R.J. was given protective supervision. Her provider will receive a retroactive award of over \$13,000. Katie Meyer, CRA, Luisa Delgadillo, Assistant CRA, Katie Hornberger, Supervising CRA, Westside Regional Center.

IHSS Awarded after Being Denied.

T.D. has autism, a seizure disorder, and other health issues. His mother applied for IHSS for him. The mother was told by the County that her child, who was three, was too young to receive IHSS. The written notice stated that there was no assessed need.

The mother requested assistance from OCRA in obtaining IHSS. At the hearing, the County indicated that the determination was based on the

child's age, age appropriate guidelines, observations at the home visits, and a review of other documents.

OCRA assisted the mother in preparing for the hearing and providing evidence that because of his disabilities, T.D. needed additional services that a 3-year old without disabilities does not need.

The ALJ ruled that because of the evidence submitted of additional needs related to his impairments, T.D. was entitled to time for laundry, bowel and bladder care, dressing, rubbing skin and repositioning and medical accompaniment. T.D. was awarded 68 hours a month of IHSS. Jackie Coleman, CRA, Ramona Landeros, Assistant CRA, Tim Poe, Supervising CRA, Alta California Regional Center.

K.M. Obtains Retroactive Payment for Protective Supervision.

K.M. was found eligible to receive protective supervision through a settlement with the County. K.M.'s parent was informed by the IHSS social worker that the County would not pay retroactive protective supervision services that the County had wrongfully denied. OCRA assisted the parent in preparing for hearing and the parent was successful in obtaining a hearing decision awarding her 13 months of retroactive service hours. Jacqueline Miller, CRA, Cynthia Salomon, Assistant CRA, Irma Wagster, Supervising CRA, Regional Center of Orange County.

S.T. Recovers His IHSS Benefits.

As a minor, S.T. received Supplemental Security Income (SSI), SSI-linked Medi-Cal, and IHSS. Due to a parental deeming error, S.T.'s SSI benefits were erroneously terminated in January, 2010, but subsequently reinstated with retroactive payments. The erroneous termination caused S.T. to lose his SSI-linked Medi-Cal and because the County did not comply with required procedures, S.T. lost his IHSS benefits on July 15, 2010. S.T.'s mother was deterred from appealing the termination as the County told her nothing could be done when Medi-Cal is lost.

When S.T.'s mother notified the County that S.T.'s SSI-linked Medi-Cal was reinstated, the County refused to reinstate his IHSS benefits. Instead, the County re-assessed S.T. and reduced his IHSS hours with no retroactive payments. S.T.'s mother requested a hearing and prevailed on regaining

S.T.'s 283 hours of IHSS, but did not prevail on the retroactive payments. S.T.'s mother did not agree with the decision and contacted OCRA for assistance. The Assistant CRA agreed to request a re-hearing, which was granted, and the CRA agreed to represent at the re-hearing. As a result, the judge deemed the County erred by failing to follow procedure when S.T. lost his SSI-linked Medi-Cal and ordered the County to pay retroactive payments back to July 15, 2010, at 283 hours per month. Veronica Cervantes, CRA, Beatriz Reyes, Assistant CRA, Katie Hornberger, Supervising CRA, Inland Regional Center.

Protective Supervision Hours Reinstated.

H.S. has a history of traumatic brain injury. He resides in his own home with his sister-in-law, who serves as his full time IHSS provider. After an IHSS annual assessment, the County worker disagreed with H.S.'s need for protective supervision and reduced his IHSS hours from 270 to only 65.8 per month. Without protective supervision, H.S. was at risk for out-of-home placement.

OCRA provided technical assistance to H.S.'s mother, who filed the appeal. OCRA assisted in the review of all available records, advised on witness preparation and hearing procedures, and prepared the position statement. OCRA also provided resource information to the parent regarding protective supervision requirements.

One week prior to hearing, H.S.'s parent met with the IHSS worker to discuss information provided by OCRA. IHSS determined that H.S. was eligible for protective supervision and agreed to reinstate all of the protective supervision hours. Leinani Walter, CRA, Christine Hager, Assistant CRA, Gail Gresham, Supervising CRA, Valley Mountain Regional Center.

SOCIAL SECURITY

SSI Waives an Overpayment and Stops Monthly Deductions for In-Kind-Support.

L.L. received notice of a \$5824 SSI overpayment which the Social Security Administration (SSA) claimed had occurred over a 15-month period during which it reportedly had not known that L.L. had also been receiving a Social

Security Survivor's benefit in the amount of \$384 per month.

OCRA's review of L.L.'s SSI notices revealed that it had been aware of the monthly Social Security Survivor's benefits, and had miscalculated the SSI payment amount. In addition, during this same time period, SSI had been mistakenly deducting \$225 per month from L.L.'s SSI checks for in-kind-support, in spite of the fact that L.L. had been paying her fair share of all monthly living expenses.

OCRA accompanied L.L. to an informal meeting with an SSA worker, and presented proof of SSI's miscalculations, together with a budget showing that any repayment amount would be a significant burden for L.L. As a result, L.L. was granted a waiver of the overpayment, and SSI stopped the deduction of in-kind-support from L.L.'s future SSI checks. Arthur Lipscomb, CRA, Celeste Palmer, Associate CRA, Andy Holcombe, Supervising CRA, Regional Center of the East Bay.

OCRA Assists in SSI Overpayment Case.

S.C. is a minor who lives with his family. S.C.'s mother is also a regional center consumer. S.C.'s case worker contacted OCRA after the family received a letter from the SSA stating that S.C. had been overpaid nearly \$6,000 in SSI benefits. OCRA assisted S.C. in filing a Request for Waiver of Overpayment.

Within months, the SSA informed OCRA that the entire overpayment had been waived. However, a few weeks later, S.C. received another notice stating that he still owed close to \$1,000 to the SSA. OCRA communicated with the SSA on S.C.'s behalf and the remaining overpayment was waived. S.C. continues to remain eligible for SSI benefits. Yulahlia Hernandez, CRA, Annie Breuer, Assistant CRA, Gail Gresham, Supervising CRA, North Bay Regional Center.

OCRA Helps J.M. Receive Correct Amount of SSI.

J.M. has been legally blind since birth but when his mother reapplied for SSI for J.M., as required when he turned eighteen, SSI refused to change J.M.'s status to legally blind. As a consequence, J.M. was receiving less SSI income. For almost a year, J.M.'s mother attempted to obtain the change for J.M. Frustrated with the process, J.M.'s mother called OCRA.

OCRA advised J.M.'s mother to write a letter to the SSA and provide documentation in support of J.M.'s legally blind status. OCRA advised J.M.'s mother to deliver the letter in person and ask to speak with a supervisor. OCRA assisted J.M.'s mother with writing the letter to the SSA office and determining what documentation to take to SSI.

J.M.'s mother went to the SSA prepared with her letter and documentation. Once there, J.M.'s mother was able to speak with a supervisor who approved J.M.'s request. In addition, J.M. will be receiving the additional grant amount retroactively for a year of SSI payments. Mary Melendrez, CRA, Christine Armand, Associate CRA, Irma Wagster, Supervising CRA, South Central Los Angeles Regional Center.

Consumer Remains Eligible for SSI.

C.W. is a minor who lives at home with her mother. C.W. has a history of medical and behavioral issues which made it difficult for C.W.'s mother to work outside the home. C.W.'s mother recently left her employment in order to become C.W.'s IHSS provider. OCRA was contacted after C.W. received a letter from the SSA stating that she was no longer eligible for SSI due to her mother's income.

OCRA filed an appeal with the SSA explaining that the mother's income from IHSS is not used in determining C.W.'s SSI eligibility. The SSA found that C.W. continues to be eligible for SSI. Yulahlia Hernandez, CRA, Annie Breuer, Assistant CRA, Gail Gresham, Supervising CRA, North Bay Regional Center.

SSA Agrees to Waive \$16,000 Overpayment.

Years after completing her work at the school district, E.G. received notification that she had to repay the SSA \$16,355 due to her work history from 2007 through 2009. During this time period, E.G. was employed by the school district as a classroom aide and later, as a housekeeper.

E.G.'s representative payee failed to properly appeal the notification and eventually E.G. contacted OCRA for assistance. After talking with E.G. about her work history, it became clear that the work E.G. performed did not rise to the level of substantial gainful activity (SGA) because she received special conditions and support from other school staff to perform

her job. After agreeing to assist E.G., OCRA gathered declarations and other evidence to substantiate E.G.'s claim that she did not engage in SGA. OCRA set up an informal meeting with the SSA to assert that E.G. should not have to repay the money. After the meeting, the SSA agreed to waive the entire overpayment. The SSA found that E.G. and her children were also eligible for additional monthly SSA benefits. The issue of her continuing disability from 2007-2009 has been forwarded on to the SSA appeals office. Margaret Oppel, Interim CRA, Kendra McWright, CRA, Gina Gheno, Assistant CRA, Katherine Mottarella, Supervising CRA, Tri-Counties Regional Center.

Termination of SSI Reversed.

C.L. is a minor who lives in a group home and spends his weekends with his family. His SSI money goes toward paying for his placement. C.L.'s mother opened a Payable On Death (POD) account and named C.L. as a beneficiary. Although C.L. has no access to that money, SSA sent a letter notifying the family that C.L.'s SSI benefits were going to be terminated due to the excessive amount of assets, noting that C.L. was a beneficiary on his mother's POD account. The SSA also demanded repayment of \$21,000 for benefits previously paid to C.L.

OCRA assisted with filing an appeal and submitted documents which establish that C.L. does not have access to the money so the money should not be considered an asset. The SSA terminated benefits even though the appeal was submitted in a timely manner.

In addition to advocating for the proper characterization of the asset, OCRA assisted with advocating for the proper processing of the appeal. After numerous communications between the SSA and OCRA, C.L.'s appeal was processed properly. The decision on the appeal was fully favorable. Katy Lusson, CRA, Trina Saldana, Assistant CRA, Gail Gresham, Supervising CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

Decision Is Reversed and B.R.'s Benefits Reinstated.

B.R. has been working at a grocery store for many years. He formerly received SSI but because he had worked for many years, he began to receive Social Security Disability Insurance (SSDI) on his own earnings record.

B.R.'s representative payee received a notice that B.R.'s disability had ended and that B.R. had incurred an overpayment of \$109,000 because B.R. was allegedly performing SGA work. The payee filed an appeal and then called OCRA. OCRA gave the payee the Work Activity Questionnaire (subsidy form) for B.R.'s employer to complete. According to B.R.'s supervisor, B.R. is not able to perform all of the duties on the job description for his position because of B.R.'s intellectual disability. B.R. only performs about 50 to 70 percent of the work of an employee without a disability in the same position.

B.R.'s payee provided this evidence of subsidy to supplement the appeal evidence. OCRA provided advice to the payee through the appeals process. The payee worked with the local SSA office to prove B.R. was not performing SGA work, was still eligible for benefits, and the overpayment should be cleared. SSA agreed and reinstated B.R.'s monthly benefit of \$995 as of the date the benefit was erroneously terminated, the Trial Work Period was recalculated, and the overpayment was cleared. Katie Meyer, CRA, Luisa Delgadillo, Assistant CRA, Katie Hornberger, Supervising CRA, Westside Regional Center.

DISCRIMINATION

A.T.'s Termination from After-School Care Is Rescinded.

A.T. was attending an after-school program at his elementary school. The program was federally-funded, so A.T. did not have to pay for the program. A.T. was terminated from the program for behaviors related to his autism. No accommodations were made by the program. However, the program did offer A.T. a spot in the program for younger children, which was not federally-funded, and for which his mother would need to pay. A.T. had been terminated because of his disability, and then was told he could come back if he paid, while his same age, non-disabled peers received a program for free.

OCRA reviewed federal law on child care programs and the Americans with Disabilities Act as it pertains to this type of program. OCRA sent a notification of disability and reasonable accommodation letter to the program. The executive director called A.T.'s mother and said A.T. could immediately re-enter the program. Katie Meyer, CRA, Luisa Delgadillo,

Assistant CRA, Katie Hornberger, Supervising CRA, Westside Regional Center.

HOUSING

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

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

OCRA drafted a notification of disability and request for reasonable accommodation letter for the parents. J.E.'s parents signed the letter and sent it directly to the owner of the complex, since the manager had behaved inappropriately to them in the past. The owner contacted the family and apologized. He thanked them for sending the letter and rescinded the 60-day notice. He also made arrangements to put carpet in certain areas of the apartment. J.E. and his family will now be able to stay in their home. Katie Meyer, CRA, Luisa Delgadillo, Assistant CRA, Katie Hornberger, Supervising CRA, Westside Regional Center.

T.K. Released from Locked Adolescent Psychiatric Facility.

T.K. is a 17-year-old man who wanted to leave the locked psychiatric facility he had been living in for more than one year, and be in a less restrictive community setting. T.K. had been moved to the facility in September, 2010, due to aggressive behaviors and elopement at his foster family placement. Within a few months of the move, T.K. had shown marked improvement and was considered ready for discharge to a less restrictive community placement. However, almost an entire year passed and no community placement was secured for him.

T.K.'s dependency court attorney contacted OCRA for assistance in getting the regional center to find a community placement for T.K. The CRA recommended that T.K.'s attorney file a joinder motion to bring all the parties (2 different regional centers, Department of Mental Health, and

Department of Children and Family Services) together in juvenile court to account for their efforts to secure a less restrictive placement for T.K. The CRA helped T.K.'s attorney compile the information needed for the joinder motion and worked with the regional centers to ensure that updated and accurate placement packets were distributed to possible community placements. Although the joinder motion was ultimately not granted, it did trigger a series of interdisciplinary meetings that brought together the various agencies involved. Within a few months, everyone came together and identified a foster care placement for T.K. along with mental health support services and community activities for him. T.K. is now living with a foster family near his biological family and was able to celebrate the holidays with them. Eva Casas-Sarmiento, CRA, Abbey Perez, Assistant CRA, Katie Hornberger, Supervising CRA, Harbor Regional Center.

OCRA Assists D.S. with Habitability Issues.

D.S. lives in low-income housing. The County had recently hired a new management company to manage the complex in which D.S. lives. D.S. and his caregiver had been complaining for several months about a leaky toilet, a faulty heater, and several other issues. They had spoken with both the County and the management company. These issues had not been addressed. OCRA made several phone calls and sent a letter to both parties asking that these issues be addressed immediately. Within two weeks, all of the issues had been addressed satisfactorily. Katy Lusson, CRA, Trina Saldana, Assistant CRA, Gail Gresham, Supervising CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

Security Deposit Returned.

R.K. was living in an apartment with the assistance of Independent Living Services (ILS). He decided to move, and gave a written 30-day notice of his intention to do so. Although R.K.'s rent was paid in full to the end of the month, R.K. ended up moving out early. R.K. made arrangements to have his ILS provider do a post-move clean up before the end of the month, and return the keys to the landlord.

When the ILS provider arrived to do the clean up, the keys did not work. The landlord had already entered, taken possession, and changed the locks. The landlord failed to return R.K.'s security deposit. When asked

about it, the landlord indicated he was keeping it due to clean up needed and alleged damages due to needed repairs.

R. K. and his service coordinator contacted OCRA for assistance. R.K. had moved out of the community, and returning to litigate the dispute would have been quite difficult financially and physically. However, R.K. still wanted to take action. Moreover, many other regional center consumers live in the same apartment building, so the regional center felt a stand needed to be taken.

OCRA wrote a letter requesting the landlord return the deposit, or in the alternative, provide an itemized written accounting. The landlord did neither, but did offer a partial return of R.K.'s deposit of \$100 to resolve matters. R.K. rejected that offer, and a final letter was sent, outlining the various causes of action and potential liability on the part of the landlord. On the final date for a response, a full refund check was received. Andy Holcombe, CRA, Lorie Atamian, Assistant CRA, Jackie Coleman, Supervising CRA, Far Northern Regional Center.

PERSONAL AUTONOMY

Client Returns to His Job.

M.A. was happy at his job and depended on the local paratransit company to drop him off and pick him up at work. M.A. contacted OCRA for help after his job of many years was terminated by his supported employment agency. OCRA agreed to represent M.A. at a meeting with the supported employment agency and the regional center.

After interviewing staff involved with M.A.'s regional center case and reviewing the records, OCRA determined that the local paratransit van was frequently late in picking M.A. up from his job site. The supported employment agency was not willing to pay for his job coach to continue waiting with M.A. after his shift ended everyday without additional funding from the regional center.

At the meeting with the regional center and the supported employment agency, OCRA negotiated to have the regional center provide additional

funds so a staff person could wait with M.A. after work until the paratransit van arrived. M.A. is now back working at his nursing home job. Timothy Poe, CRA, Jazmin Romero, Assistant CRA, Katherine Mottarella, Supervising CRA, Frank D. Lanterman Regional Center.

REGIONAL CENTER

Mediation Worked in J.D.'s Favor.

J.D. is a teenage boy whose respite was terminated without proper notice. J.D.'s mother did not appeal, although she did obtain an extension of respite from the regional center. When the respite extension ended, the mother did not realize she could still appeal. Around the same time, the family was dealing with several life-changing events, including plans to move to another regional center's catchment area and the death of the respite provider's son. J.D.'s mother requested respite again, but the regional center denied the request, claiming J.D. was not eligible for any respite because he had IHSS protective supervision and his mother was his provider.

OCRA agreed to represent J.D. at hearing. At the start of the hearing, the ALJ offered to conduct mediation. Both parties agreed to participate. After mediating for many hours, an agreement was reached. J.D. will receive 15 hours of respite for December, 2011, and 30 hours each quarter starting January, 2012. The regional center also agreed to increase J.D.'s behavioral services from 34 hours to 50 hours per month. Counseling was also extended through March, 2012. Katie Meyer, CRA, Luisa Delgadillo, Assistant CRA, Katie Hornberger, Supervising CRA, Westside Regional Center.

A.L. Keeps Her Supported Living Services Hours.

A.L. is a 22-year-old who receives supported living services (SLS) to help her with mobility training, planning, community integration, learning about her health issues and medications, and budgeting. She is also preparing to move out of her parents' home. The regional center sent a notice reducing A.L.'s SLS from 32 hours per month to 16 hours per month because the 32 hours "were supposed to be temporary." A.L.'s parents helped her to appeal and contacted OCRA.

OCRA reviewed A.L.'s IPP's from the regional center and Individual Service Plans from the SLS agency. It was clear that A.L. had not met her goals in either plan, and had not begun working on goals in two major areas. OCRA prepared the family for hearing, drafted an opening statement, witness questions, a closing statement, and prepared evidence packets for the parents to represent A.L. at hearing.

The family presented the evidence as planned at the hearing. The ALJ found that the regional center did not meet its burden in proving the reduction was warranted and that A.L. still requires the 32 hours per month of SLS. Katie Meyer, CRA, Luisa Delgadillo, Assistant CRA, Katie Hornberger, Supervising CRA, Westside Regional Center.

Extraordinary Event Exemption Applies.

The regional center informed A.A. and her family that it would be reducing A.A.'s respite hours from 8 hours per day to 4 hours per day. Two of A.A.'s older sisters are receiving treatment for cancer. A.A.'s mother has to take each older sister on the bus to the hospital separately since A.A.'s mother does not drive. A.A. is facing a very difficult time with both of her sisters being ill and this has triggered behavioral issues for A.A.

OCRA assisted A.A.'s mother with filing the fair hearing request and immediately requested a copy of A.A.'s records from the regional center. The Assistant CRA attended the informal meeting and advocated for A.A. to keep 8 hours per day, 7 days a week of respite services based on the fact that the family met the extraordinary event exemption. The regional center agreed. These hours would continue while A.A. is on vacation and the hours would be changed to 6 hours per day, 7 days per week when A.A. is in school. Jackie Chiang Dai, CRA, Lucy Garcia, Assistant CRA, Irma Wagster, Supervising CRA, Eastern Los Angeles Regional Center.

Emergency SLS Provided by the Regional Center.

B.M. is a 66-year-old woman who was released from Intensive Rehabilitation after a third stroke this year. B.M. was released without a clear support plan to follow her discharge. B.M.'s niece and a family friend immediately began providing 24-hour care and support so that B.M. could remain living in her home. Although the regional center was aware of B.M.'s need for support services and that IHSS had not yet completed its

assessment, the regional center was not invited to the discharge planning meeting. As a result, the regional center did not have services and supports in place upon the client's release from the hospital.

OCRA advocated for the regional center to provide SLS services until the generic resource of IHSS could be provided. B.M. received all of the necessary hours from SLS so that she could remain in her home with her companion dog. Leinani Walters, CRA, Christine Hager, Assistant CRA, Gail Gresham, Supervising CRA, Valley Mountain Regional Center.

Social Skills Program Ordered to Continue.

S.P. had been receiving services from a social skills training program and was making good progress towards his goals. The goals were extremely important as they were allowing S. P. to live in the community. S.P. was given a notice of proposed action to terminate the program because he had made significant progress and the service was time limited. S.P.'s father appealed the termination and requested technical assistance from OCRA.

The CRA prepared S.P.'s father for the fair hearing by reviewing the evidence packet, discussing the applicable law and helping with the preparation of witnesses.

The hearing was held over three separate dates. The hearing decision was in favor of S.P. and the order was for funding to continue for the social skills training program until S.P.'s goals have been met. Aimee Delgado, CRA, Marisol Cruz, Assistant CRA, Irma Wagster, Supervising CRA, San Gabriel/Pomona Regional Center.

OCRA Provides Technical Assistance to J.A. and Case Settles.

J.A. is a 9-year-old who lives with his mother and sister. J.A.'s mother reported concerns regarding the quality of the vendor services including implementation delays, and limited progress for J.A. with regional center funded in-home behavior services since 2008.

In August, 2011, J.A.'s mother requested an IPP meeting. The regional center agreed to provide 14 hours per month of direct in-home behavior services. However, by December, 2011, the in-home behavior services had not begun. J.A.'s mother filed for fair hearing against the regional

center for the first time. She requested the implementation of the agreed upon 14-hours per month of in-home behavior and that J.A.'s school-funded ABA agency be contracted as provider.

OCRA agreed to assist the mother to prepare a fair hearing packet and helped J.A.'s mother understand her fair hearing rights. Prior to meeting with OCRA, J.A.'s mother received a notice of proposed resolution. The regional center agreed to implement 14 hours per month of in-home behavior supports for J.A. and to contract the service with the ABA provider requested by J.A.'s mother. Mary Melendrez, CRA, Christine Armand, Associate CRA, Irma Wagster, Supervising CRA, South Central Los Angeles Regional Center.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

OCRA Facilitates S.B.'s Return to School.

S.B. and his mother are adult consumers of regional center services. S.B. and his mother withdrew S.B. from his post secondary program because the relationship with the school staff had deteriorated due to attendance issues. OCRA was contacted because of concern that S.B. had been home for a year without any services. OCRA called a meeting with S.B., his mother, his service coordinator, and counselors to develop a plan to serve S.B. OCRA secured 1:1 in-home behavioral services from the regional center to assist S.B. and his mother in establishing morning routines for S.B. while getting on the bus and to school on time. It is believed this will work to ameliorate the attendance issues.

OCRA offered special education advocacy to assist S.B. to get back into a post secondary program. OCRA contacted the local education agency (LEA) and a placement was offered and accepted by S.B. and his mother. The LEA also agreed to provide a 1:1 aide to ride the bus with S.B. Rita Defilippis, CRA, Filomena Alomar, Assistant CRA, Katie Hornberger, Supervising CRA, San Andreas Regional Center.

Individualized Transition Plan Created by OCRA and School District.

A.P. is a 20-year old who completed 4 years of high school and was offered a fifth year which he declined because he wanted to engage in more adult

activities. OCRA accompanied him to an individual Transition Planning (ITP) meeting. The only transition program offered and available in the area was a continuation of high school. At the ITP meeting, the district agreed to create an individual ITP which included work at a lunch deli (funded by the Workability program), membership in a fitness program where A.P. is accompanied by staff three days per week, classroom based academic instruction several hours a week at the local high school, and a Kindle to help with his reading goals. Margaret Oppel, CRA, Kay Spencer, Assistant CRA, Maricruz Magdaleno, Temporary Assistant CRA, Katherine Mottarella, Supervising CRA, Central Valley Regional Center.

S.M. Returns to School Despite “Graduating with a Diploma.”

S.M. is a 19-year-old who was graduated from his non-public school without realizing it. S.M. had been told he would be walking with his class at graduation, but would then enter a transition program until he turned 22. In the fall, S.M. was told he could not attend school because he was given a diploma. The school failed to hold an Individual Education Plan (IEP) meeting in June, 2011, as the current IEP indicated was necessary. The school failed to hold an exit IEP as well. Therefore, the IEP still in effect was not being implemented, as S.M. was not attending any school program.

OCRA drafted a compliance complaint in order to describe the violations, and prior to sending it contacted the district and asked for an IEP meeting. The district agreed to meet. OCRA asked that everyone work to reach agreement to avoid the filing of the compliance complaint. At the meeting, the district agreed to place S.M. in a transition program individually tailored to his needs with counseling and transportation. A referral to Pathways UCLA for the next school year would also be made. The district also agreed to fund a video game design class at an occupational center as compensatory education. OCRA attended a follow-up IEP meeting. Katie Meyer, CRA, Luisa Delgadillo, Assistant CRA, Katie Hornberger, Supervising CRA, Westside Regional Center.

OCRA Helps Secure Appropriate Educational Setting for Student.

D.C.’s mother called OCRA to request educational advocacy on behalf of D.C., her minor child. D.C.’s parent sought to stop the school district’s plan

to transfer D.C. to a different school. OCRA agreed to represent D.C. at the pending mediation and assisted D.C.'s mother in filing for a hearing.

OCRA contacted the school district and provided information that the existing school program was more appropriate than the new school in meeting D.C.'s education needs. As a result of OCRA's intervention, and prior to the mediation, the district agreed to keep D.C.'s existing school program as D.C.'s permanent education placement. Ibrahim Saab, CRA, Ada Hamer, Assistant CRA, Timothy Poe, Supervising CRA, North Los Angeles County Regional Center.

Client's Special Education Eligibility Category Changed to Autism with Enhanced Services.

C.B. is an 8-year old with autism who was listed by the school district as eligible for special education under Speech and Language and ADHD. C.B. was in a special day class but was not receiving services appropriate for a child with autism, and thus had a number of behaviors that were interfering with his education. OCRA reviewed the psycho-educational report and had several phone meetings with the school psychologist and classroom teacher. OCRA represented C.B. at an IEP meeting at which his primary disability was changed to autism. The district agreed to perform occupational therapy, speech and assistive technology assessments. The district also agreed to provide services from an autism specialist and to include social skills training as part of C.B.'s program. Margaret Oppel, CRA, Kay Spencer, Assistant CRA, Maricruz Magdaleno, Temporary Assistant CRA, Katherine Mottarella, Supervising CRA, Central Valley Regional Center.

OCRA Assists in Obtaining Special Education Services.

O.F. is a 10-year old with autism and severe behavior problems. The school district told his mother that it was unable to find a suitable placement for O.F. due to his behaviors and elopement issues. The district told her the only options were either home school or to put O.F. in a residential placement. Not liking either of these options, O.F.'s mother contacted OCRA.

After a review of the records, the Assistant CRA realized that although O.F. had a triennial IEP earlier in the year, no assessments were performed,

despite the fact that O.F. was barely verbal, and his behaviors were impeding his ability to learn. The school was not providing any speech or behavioral services.

The Assistant CRA attended the next IEP only to find that there was no teacher in attendance. The IEP was rescheduled to a time when the entire IEP team could be present. Due to the school district's prior resistive attitude, the Assistant CRA requested an IEP facilitator to help make the IEP meetings go more smoothly and also requested that a representative from the Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) attend. OCRA got the school to do assessments in speech, occupational therapy, assistive technology and a functional analysis assessment.

OCRA attended five IEP meetings on O.F.'s behalf which resulted in a classroom placement specifically set up for O.F. with a teacher, a behavioral aide and a second aide. The assessments resulted in O.F. receiving 30 minutes of speech therapy per week, occupational therapy, numerous assistive technology devices and a positive intervention behavior plan. O.F. is now able to benefit from his education. Andy Holcomb, CRA, Lorie Atamian, Assistant CRA, Jackie Coleman, Supervising CRA, Far Northern Regional Center.

OCRA Secures Placement and Services for Student Following Expulsion.

J.B. is a student with autism and is nonverbal. J.B. was expelled from school for aggressive behavior. However, J.B.'s behavior plan was not being followed and he was excluded from community outings. The LEA informed J.B.'s parent that J.B. had to go to a new school because of his conduct. J.B. was at home for over a month and the district failed to facilitate a new placement. J.B.'s parent contacted OCRA.

The LEA offered a placement, and after visiting the placement, J.B. agreed to go. OCRA represented J.B. at his placement IEP meeting. The LEA agreed to conduct a functional analysis assessment and a speech assessment because J.B.'s behaviors appeared to be related to his inability to communicate. The LEA expedited the assessments and a meeting was held to review results. J.B. had zero behavior incidents with the use of assistive technology for communication. J.B. now receives speech services, participates in all community outings and continues to have no

behavior problems. Rita Defilippis, CRA, Filomena Alomar, Assistant CRA, Katie Hornberger, Supervising CRA, San Andreas Regional Center.

A.A.'s Parents Are Able to Participate at IEP Meeting.

A.A. has maladaptive behaviors and a behavior intervention plan at school to address his behaviors. After A.A. displayed a new behavior not addressed in A.A.'s behavior plan, the principal decided to change A.A.'s placement. The principal contacted A.A.'s parents and informed them that an IEP meeting would be held on a certain date. A.A.'s parents expressed their inability to drive the three hours it would take to attend the IEP on that date due to a health issue with A.A.'s sibling, and requested a new date or to participate by telephone. The principal denied the parents' request, and informed A.A.'s parents that the IEP would be held on the date selected even if the parents could not attend.

The CRA wrote a letter for the parents to submit to the principal requesting participation by phone as required under the California Education Code. After receiving the letter, the principal informed the parents that they would be able to participate in the IEP meeting by telephone. Jacqueline Miller, CRA, Cynthia Salomon, Assistant CRA, Irma Wagster, Supervising CRA, Regional Center of Orange County.

School District Agrees to Transition Program at Community College.

T.P. had completed 4 years of high school. The school district only offered him a 5th year of high school as his transition program. OCRA attended T.P.'s IEP meeting with the school district but was unable to reach an agreement at the meeting. OCRA continued discussions with the school district attorney and negotiated a settlement agreement which included placement at the local community college and 25 hours per week of 1:1 supervision and assistance. Margaret Oppel, CRA, Kay Spencer, Assistant CRA, Maricruz Magdaleno, Temporary Assistant CRA, Katherine Mottarella, Supervising CRA, Central Valley Regional Center.

A.B. Receives Necessary Support to Interact Appropriately at School.

A.B.'s mother contacted OCRA after A.B. was allegedly involved in a sexual assault at his high school and was suspended. A.B.'s IEP team had held an IEP meeting to discuss the incident and treated the incident as a

manifestation of A.B.'s disability. Despite his need for close supervision and for help developing his social and communication skills so that he can interact appropriately with peers, the IEP team only made small adjustments to A.B.'s routine, added a few sessions of counseling services to his IEP, and told his mother that A.B. was already getting everything he needed. Also, A.B.'s mother, who is a monolingual-Spanish speaker, did not know that A.B.'s IEP document, which she had seen only in English, provided for just 30 minutes of speech therapy per year.

OCRA represented A.B. at a new IEP meeting and obtained the school district's agreement to provide supervision throughout A.B.'s day while also allowing him some independence. This included adding supervision during the highest risk part of A.B.'s day, when he is in a P.E. class with a 57:1 student-to-staff ratio and near the location where the incident happened. OCRA ensured that the district corrected A.B.'s IEP to provide 300 minutes per year of speech therapy, added consultation by the speech therapist with the classroom teacher, and added meetings between the speech therapist and A.B.'s mother so that she can reinforce speech skills at home. OCRA requested a new speech assessment to determine whether A.B. needs additional help in learning to initiate appropriate conversations. OCRA ensured that continued counseling services were written into the IEP and asked that A.B.'s counseling sessions be used to address how to interact appropriately with peers with whom he is interested. Megan Chambers, CRA, Alba Gomez, Assistant CRA, Jeanne Molineaux, Director, San Diego Regional Center.

OUTREACH and TRAINING

Consumers Have a Great Time at Self-Advocacy Training.

On December 29, 2011, OCRA provided a clients' rights self-advocacy Bingo training to people at Consumers' Work Center in Ukiah. Several factors produced a noteworthy training event. Two consumers immediately volunteered to assist OCRA with the training. During the game, consumers actively engaged in a meaningful dialogue with trainers and had many interesting questions. OCRA prizes were distributed to acknowledge the consumers' successes. Consumer surveys were completed after the training. The surveys were overwhelmingly positive. One consumer stated, "It was the best bingo game I ever played!" Jim Stoepler, CRA,

Redwood Coast Regional Center, Gail Gresham, Supervising CRA,
Sacramento.



*Serving Consumers of
Inland Regional Center*

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
1585 South D Street, Suite 206
San Bernardino, CA 92408
Tel: (909) 383-1133
TTY: (877) 669-6023
Fax: (909) 383-1113

www.disabilityrightsca.org

MEMORANDUM

TO: Jeanne Molineaux, Director

FROM: Beatriz Reyes, OCRA Outreach Coordinator (South)
Kendra McWright OCRA Outreach Coordinator (North)

RE: Semi-Annual OCRA Outreach Report
July – December 2011

DATE: 2/3/2012

The demand for OCRA to conduct outreach trainings and presentations every year is always extremely high and the past 6 months has been no exception. During this review period, OCRA staff conducted 169 outreach trainings and presentations to 8,088 attendees. Below we have provided a breakdown of the distinct types of outreach staff provide (self-advocacy trainings, general and targeted outreach) statewide. OCRA staff contributed their thoughts as to why the highlighted outreaches were unique and/or impactful.

Self-Advocacy Trainings

Normally, each OCRA office conducts a minimum of one self-advocacy training per contract year. Topics presented during this review period included: Emergency Preparedness/ Being Safe, Feeling Safe, Self-Advocacy/ Client's Rights, Hands Off My Money/Rights to Money Management, Voting Rights, and Community Living Options/ My Own Choice.

Voting Training Provided for Central Valley and Kern Regional Center

Clients: *The Primary Advisory Committee at CVRC hosted a Self-Advocacy Conference on November 10, 2011. Our office and DRC presented a Voter Rights Training during the breakout session. The training lead to a lively discussion about how to vote, who can vote and the value of voting.*

Consumer Rights Bingo Training Provided to Ability First Day

Program: *The OCRA office serving consumers and families of the Frank D. Lanterman Regional Center facilitated a self-advocacy activity with over 25 adult consumers attending the Ability First work program in Pasadena on August 29, 2011. The consumers participated in a bingo game in which they learned about their rights as regional center consumers, as well as specific rights for those participants that lived in group homes and other facilities in the community. All the consumers were very participatory and given the individual opportunity to share their comments after choosing a bingo card that identified a specific right. Everyone had a fun time learning.*

Outreach Trainings and Presentations Statewide (General Outreach):

Given that OCRA is required to conduct a minimum of 160 trainings per contract year, over the past 6 months we have met and surpassed our annual goal with 169 trainings to 8,088 attendees. Staff have worked to create and maintain contacts in their respective communities and have been encouraged to seek out new outreach opportunities to ensure that OCRA is reaching-out to all members of their catchment areas. What follows is a description by staff of new or innovative outreach trainings and presentations they provided over the review period:

Napa County Special Education Transition Fair: *Every year our office has a table at this event. Transition aged special education students, families and professionals attend the fair. The event was created for transition aged people to gather resources and learn about support services for adults. A variety of agencies that provide services for people who have disabilities have tables at the fair. OCRA enjoys participating in this event because it is fun way to help students learn about their rights.*

Take Back the Power on Abuse and Neglect of Older Adults and People with Disabilities: *OCRA, in collaboration with Orange County Behavioral Health, Dayle McIntosh Center, Area Board XI, Orange County*

Adult Protective Supervision, Regional Center of Orange County, and the UCI Center of Excellence on Elder Abuse & Neglect planned and executed the 8th Annual Disability Rights Workshop entitled "Take Back the Power" on abuse and neglect of older adults and people with disabilities. Topics included warning signs and risk factors for physical, emotional and financial abuse, prevention and local resources, bullying, institution/caregiver abuse, and hoarding. The workshop featured Laura Mosqueda, M.D. from the Center of Excellence on Elder Abuse & Neglect at UCI as opening key note speaker, Leslie Morrison, Esq. and Michael Stortz, Esq. from Disability Rights California, a panel from the Anaheim Family Justice Center, and other knowledgeable speakers in individual break out sessions. Attendance was at the maximum capacity of 185 people. The surveys completed by the attendees indicated that all expectations of the workshop had been met, and noted that the information provided at the workshop by highly knowledgeable presenters was greatly appreciated. CRA provided the OCRA brochure at the resource table and spoke to many attendees about what OCRA is and how OCRA can assist consumers of the regional centers.

Targeted Outreach:

Organizationally, OCRA has made a commitment to actively outreach to and serve people with developmental disabilities from traditionally underserved communities. Of the 22 offices statewide, 18 offices have targeted the Latino community through their outreach plans, 1 office has targeted Asians, 2 offices have targeted African Americans, and 1 office has targeted the Native American community. OCRA continues to build lasting relationships of trust with leaders and members in communities typically underserved by social service agencies.

North Los Angeles County Outreach on IHSS: *Our office planned this in conjunction with Jay Nolan Community Services in response to complaints from families and providers regarding recent change to the In-Home Supportive Services Program (IHSS). It was unique because we were working with a local community agency to provide information to the consumers and families as to how to advocate for their rights despite recent changes in the law. The audience included a combination of English and Spanish speaking consumers, families and advocates who primarily reside and serve the San Fernando Valley Area.*

Diploma v. Certificate of Completion: *Celebracion de Familias Excepcionales* asked the Kern OCRA office serving consumers of Kern Regional Center to give a presentation on the difference between receiving a Diploma vs. Certificate of Completion to a group of 20 mono-lingual Spanish speaking parents. In addition, there was an emphasis on the importance of developing an out of high school transition plan early on. Parents were so thirsty for knowledge that they then began asking questions about parental rights with adult children and conservatorships. At that point the training took an exciting turn where we discussed a client's right to autonomy as the core of everything we believe in and do, and educated the parents and others on alternatives to a conservatorship such as powers of attorney or advanced health care directives, which can help parents remain an important part of their children's lives after they turn 18-years-old. Parents were very appreciative and receptive to the information they received and asked to be part of the next presentation OCRA puts together.

We are excited to see what the next 6 months brings as we work to provide outreach to our communities with a focus on serving those communities which have been traditionally underserved.

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

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Semi-Annual Report - July 1, 2011 through December 31, 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	22	16	109	21	88	109	48	30	35	43	25	64	38	42	52	119	16	43	18	88	128	1154
2 - Rights Information/Consultation (RC/Generic)	95	46	130	18	20	17	141	66	84	172	128	69	116	67	19	69	92	142	103	71	131	1796
3 - Rights Information/Consultation (Other)	5	140	33	102	15	23	1	106	96	17	34	60	18	9	44	2	62		46	65	3	881
4 - Abuse/Neglect Investigation	1			2		1		2		1	1	2		1	4		1		1		1	18
5 - Special Education Compliance Complaint	2							1				1					1			4		9
6 - IEP		1	3	5	4	2		8		3	7	3	3	2	18	3	1			18	2	83
7 - IPP/IDT	1					7	1	3		4	3		2	1	3		3	1	1			30
8 - W&I 4731						1		2	1		3						1			2		10
9 - Technical Assistance	10		17	6	14	7	1	10	1	8	1		24	8			2	2	3	3	3	120
10 - Evaluation and Assessment	14	3	9	28	58	10	7	7	1	41	8	30	14	8	6	6	7		6	3	7	273
11 - Informal Regional Center / Provider Problem Resolution	1		4	3	13		6	4		3	7			2	9		3				6	61
12 - Informal Generic Service Agency Problem Resolution			5	2	9	2	1	1	1	3	4	10		3	11		1		1		27	81
13 - Case Settlement Prior to Informal Meeting, Mediation or Hearing			3				1	1						1							1	7
14 - Direct Representation in RC "Voluntary Informal Meeting"	1			1																		2
15 - Direct Representation in Mediation / RC Fair Hearing					1	1					1		1			1	1	1			2	9
16 - Direct Representation in an Appeal for Generic Services			1	2	3		1	1		1	3	1		1			2		1		9	26
Grand Total	152	206	314	190	225	180	208	241	220	296	218	247	216	145	166	200	193	189	180	254	320	4560

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	MOU dated 7/19/07
Inland	MOU dated 4/10/07.
Kern	MOU dated 10/7/11
Lanternman	Previous MOU adopted 8/17/07.
North Bay	MOU dated 5/30/07.
North Los Angeles	MOU dated 9/1/11.
Redwood Coast	MOU dated 8/2010.
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 10/3/11.
San Gabriel/Pomona	MOU dated 7/30/07.
South Central	MOU dated 10/06.
Tri-Counties	MOU dated 2/2011.
Valley Mountain	MOU dated 11/14/06.
Westside	MOU dated 4/07.



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

Memo

To: Disability Rights CA Board of Directors
From: Jeanne Molineaux, Director
Date: January 10, 2012
Re: Semi-Annual Consumer Satisfaction Survey
July 1, 2011, through December 31, 2011

Attached are the results of the current Consumer Satisfaction Survey. The surveys were sent out for the period of July 1, 2011, through December 31, 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.

Seven hundred fifty-seven surveys were mailed out. Ninety-six returned the surveys. This represents a 13 percent return rate. This rate is lower than in the past which is believed might be a result of Disability Rights California moving its headquarters in September, 2011, after being at its former address for decades. Of those responding to the questions, 98 percent of the respondents who answered the questions felt they were treated well by the staff, 97 percent understood the information they were provided, 96 percent believed their CRA listened to them, 98 percent would ask for help from the Clients' Rights Advocate again, 95 percent were helped by the CRA, and 92 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.	93	2	1
2. My call was returned within two (2) days	87	8	1
3. I could understand the information I got.	92	3	1
4. My Clients' Rights Advocate listened to me.	91	4	1
5. I was helped with my question/problem by my Clients' Rights Advocate.	90	5	1
6. I would ask for help from the Clients' Rights Advocate again.	94	2	0

Comments: ¹

- On more than one occasion my CRA assisted my daughter with getting what she's entitled to. Kay Spencer is amazing and we are blessed to have her fighting for our children's rights.
- I was impressed.
- ___ was supposed to be removed from group home because nothing was done to the GH administrator ___ was removed by her conservator the lady who neglected/ refused to help ___ rec'd no consequences where are the rights of the consumer ___ was stranded 11:00pm in unfamiliar area, no buses running business closed she called her GH administrator/ owner refused who refused to pick her

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.

up/ Police Dept was called to help.... Your office did not offer much help when I called.

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

- They were kind and understanding
- Trina and Katy were great and very helpful Thank you for your support for the ___ evaluation.
- The woman who helped me was fabulous
- Apoyo y asistencia y mas apoyo en las audiencias porque solos a veces no entendemos los temas y problemas de los hijos
(Support and assistance and more support in the hearings because alone sometimes we don't understand the topics and problems of our children)
- I want to know if you have special training for advocates
- May I know if your lawyers can defend me in a hearing do you have the best psychologist list?
- Thank you.
- Jazmin helped me.
- I called several of times and I felt the staff (___ was bother because I kept calling her. Honestly I felt uncomfortable.
- Gracias
(Thank you)
- Thank you for the support and advocacy provided.
- Thank you!!
- Estoy contenta con todo.
(I am happy with everything.)

DISABILITY RIGHTS CALIFORNIA
OCRA ADVISORY COMMITTEE

December, 2011

Committee Members:

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

OCRA ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

September 23, 2011

Present: Lakeisha Burke, Billy Hall, Izetta Jackson (Board Member), Amy Kalivas (by phone), Lily Lambert, Leslie Napper (Board Member), and Jean Townsend

Staff: Cara Armstrong, Catherine Blakemore, Maxine Dalaza, Christine Hager, Kendra McWright (by phone), Jeanne Molineaux, Maria Ortega, Milanka Radosavljevic, and Beatriz Reyes (by phone)

Facilitators/Attendants: Zina Guerrero, Jeannie Sholly and Melissa Steffenhagen

Introductions: Jeanne Molineaux introduced the Committee's new Chair, Billy Hall. Mr. Hall called the meeting to order at 11:13 a.m. Committee members introduced themselves.

Valley Mountain Regional Center Update: Christine Hager, Assistant Clients' Rights Advocate for Valley Mountain Regional Center in Stockton, gave the Committee an overview of the work OCRA does for Valley Mountain RC clients. Valley Mountain Regional Center serves five counties.

Ms. Hager also does outreach. Recently she participated in an outreach event in Sonora for Tuolumne County. OCRA and DRC staff did a training for clients and they learned about their rights by playing Clients Rights Bingo. Another outreach featuring Clients Rights Bingo was done at a day program in Sonora. The most recent outreach in the foothills was held at the day program, Community Compass. Over three hundred consumers attended an outreach in August in conjunction with the area board and Valley Mountain Regional Center.

Ms. Hager highlighted some recent cases with successful outcomes for OCRA clients:

- Social Security overpayment - OCRA helped the client fill out her waiver request and spoke with the Social Security office. OCRA was able to assist the client in getting the overpayment waived.
- School suspension for child with disabilities - A ten year old boy with disabilities in the foster care system was suspended from school due

to behavioral issues. The school district threatened to expel him for behaviors on the playground. OCRA looked through school and regional center records and referred him to a psychologist to be assessed. At the IEP meeting they advocated to get the school to understand that the behaviors were related to the client's disabilities and added his mental health diagnosis to his IEP. The client was not expelled; instead, he received additional supports so he could stay in public school.

- Medi-Cal pays for wheelchair for child with disabilities - In this case, a seven year old boy with multiple disabilities was using a stroller to meet his mobility needs, which he'd outgrown. Medi-Cal denied payment for a new wheelchair. OCRA reviewed his paperwork and asked the occupational therapist to clarify some items in their report to help Medi-cal understand that he needed a wheelchair and they funded a new pediatric wheelchair for the client.

Introductions: Jean Townsend joined the meeting. She introduced herself and her assistant, Melissa Steffenhagen. Ms. Townsend expressed that she is excited to be joining the Committee.

The Committee and staff introduced themselves to Ms. Townsend.

OCRA Outreach Coordinator Update: Beatriz Reyes, Outreach Coordinator South, and Kendra McWright, Outreach Coordinator North, gave the Committee an update on OCRA's outreach to the communities they serve.

A memo was handed out to the Committee which reported on OCRA outreach from June 2010 – June 2011. The Committee was also provided with a sample Bingo card used in OCRA's Bingo game that's used in clients' rights group trainings.

This year OCRA presented over 422 outreach presentations which included General Outreach, Targeted Outreach, and Self-Advocacy Outreach. Additionally, this year, many offices were also responsible for presenting the "My Own Choice" presentation as required by the Capitol People First settlement.

Introductions: Izetta Jackson, Leslie Napper, and Maria Ortega joined the meeting and introduced themselves. The committee members and other

attendees introduced themselves to Ms. Jackson, Ms. Napper, and Ms. Ortega and welcomed them to the meeting.

Legislative and Budget Update: Catherine Blakemore gave the Committee updates on last year's state budget that was approved in June:

The Developmental Disabilities budget was reduced, resulting the following:

- A new requirement for private insurance cards to be given to the regional center to pay for some services.
- Electronic billing for vendors to submit their bills.
- Transportation access plan requirements.
- Limitations on regional centers paying for educational services for consumers ages 18-22.
- Requirements for consumers whose supported living services exceed the average cost to receive an independent assessment.
- A new Annual Family Program Fee – It specifies that if the family income is more than 400% of poverty level (about \$75,000 for a family of four) and they are not on the Medicaid waiver, then they have to pay an annual fee to the regional center. It's either \$100-\$200 per year, depending on the income level.
- If the State's revenue in December is not at anticipated level, trigger will go into effect that will result in an additional 100 million dollars in reductions.
- Beginning in 2009, there was a reduction to IHSS of 3.6%. This cut expires in June, 2012. This year there was a proposal for more cuts. The cuts didn't happen. In the trigger language there's a cut to IHSS by 20%. DRC will be putting together materials to let IHSS recipients know how to request the exemption and deciding if it can challenge the cut.
- There are trigger cuts for K-12 education. There's less certainty about whether or not this will happen.

- Adult Day Health Care (ADHC) was also eliminated. DRC sued to stop this cut. The judge postponed the hearing to November unless the case settles.

OCRA Brochure: Jeanne Molineaux showed the Committee the new OCRA brochure and pointed out that new Committee members were also provided with the DRC brochure and the DRC Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) brochure.

Annual Report Update: Jeanne Molineaux gave the Committee highlights from the annual report. Last year OCRA served 9,323 people and conducted 422 trainings, attended by approximately 18,000 people. The number of cases that each office handles varies, based on the number of people the regional center in that area serves.

Ms. Molineaux reported on the results of the most recent OCRA Consumer Satisfaction Survey. OCRA mailed 2,994 surveys and received 502 responses. This represents a 17 percent return rate. Ninety-six percent of responders felt they were treated well by the staff, ninety three percent understood the information they were provided, ninety three percent believed their CRA listened to them and ninety one percent believed they were helped by the CRA. Ninety four percent would ask for help from OCRA again.

Ms. Molineaux encouraged the Committee to read about the good outcomes of the cases reported in the annual report.

Ms. Molineaux reported that OCRA received nine grievances for the year.

Approval of Minutes: It was M/S/C (Jackson/Burke) that the February 25, 2011 OCRA Advisory Committee Minutes be approved as presented.

The meeting adjourned at 1:01 p.m.

ATTEST,

Billy Hall, Chair

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Self-Advocacy Trainings
July 1, 2011 - December 31, 2011

Self-Advocacy Trainings held:

Central Valley RC	July 14, 2011 August 24, 2011
Golden Gate RC	September 21, 2011 October 31, 2011 October 31, 2011
Lanternman RC	August 29, 2011 September 20, 2011 September 29, 2011 October 31, 2011
North Bay RC	December 2, 2011
North LA RC	October 19, 2011 October 19, 2011
Redwood Coast RC	August 19, 2011 August 26, 2011 November 30, 2011 December 28, 2011 December 29, 2011
San Andreas RC	July 26, 2011
San Diego RC	July 25, 2011
South Central LA RC	November 4, 2011

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Self-Advocacy Trainings
Page Two

Valley Mountain RC	August 5, 2011 September 16, 2011 September 19, 2011 November 2, 2011(2) December 12, 2011(2)
Westside RC	July 7, 2011

**OFFICE OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS ADVOCACY
SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT
JULY 1, 2011 – DECEMBER 31, 2011**

TITLE 17 REPORT

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

**OFFICE OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS ADVOCACY
SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT
(July 1, 2011 – December 31, 2011)**

DENIAL OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS

Regional Center	Good Cause	Right(s) Denied	Date Denial Began	Date of Review	Date of Restoration
HRC10-07	I, O	V, T	5/13/11	6/29/11	6/29/11

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
SEMI - ANNUAL REPORT
JULY 1, 2011 – December 31, 2011**

CONSUMER GRIEVANCES WITH CONTRACTOR

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