

OCRA SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT
(July 1, 2009 - December 31, 2009)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES.....	1
A. Services are provided in a manner that maximizes staff and operational resources.....	2
1) Advocacy Reports.....	2
2) Analysis of Consumers Served	4
3) Outreach/Trainings.....	6
B. Issues and complaints are resolved expeditiously and at the lowest level of appropriate intervention.....	7
C. Collaborative and harmonious working relationships are fostered.....	7
1) Memorandums of Understanding	8
2) Meeting with Association of Regional Center Agencies (ARCA).....	8
D. Consumer Satisfaction	8
1) Consumer Satisfaction Survey	8
2) Letters of Appreciation.....	9
3) Cases will be handled in a timely manner.....	11
E. Coordination of services with the DDS contract manager, stakeholder organizations, and multi-cultural community.	12
F. Self-Advocacy Training.....	13
III. TITLE XVII SECTION 50540 COMPLAINTS.....	13
IV. DENIAL OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS	14
V. CONSUMER GRIEVANCES.....	14
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 2009, Advocacy Report Winter 2009)	2
EXHIBIT D (Outreach and Training Semi-Annual Report)	7
EXHIBIT E (Report by Service Level)	7
EXHIBIT F (Memorandums of Understanding).....	8
EXHIBIT G (Consumer Satisfaction Surveys)	9
EXHIBIT H (Board OCRA Advisory Committee and Minutes) .	12
EXHIBIT I (Semi-Annual Self-Advocacy Trainings)	13
EXHIBIT J (Semi-Annual Title 17 Complaints)	13
EXHIBIT K (Semi-Annual Denial of Rights Report)	14
EXHIBIT L (Semi-Annual 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, HD069010, with the Department of Developmental Services (DDS), through its Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy (OCRA). The current contract is effective through June 30, 2011.

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 5,202 issues for consumers which represent a 12 per cent increase in the number of consumers served this past six months over the same time period last year. Additionally, OCRA participated in approximately 293 trainings presented to approximately 16,278 people. Though the number of trainings is less than this time period last year, the number of persons who attended the trainings increased by approximately 5,391 or approximately 30 per cent.

OCRA currently operates 23 offices throughout the state of California, most of which are staffed by one CRA and one Assistant CRA. A list of the current staff and office locations is attached as Exhibit A.

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

II. PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES

Disability Rights California's contract with DDS requires performance outcomes, as established in Exhibit E, Paragraph 3, of the above-referenced contract. Each of the specific required outcomes is discussed in the following Sections A through F. The contract does not set specific

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

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

OCRA continues its tradition of serving a large number of people with developmental disabilities. OCRA handled 5,202 issues for regional center consumers during the first 6 months of the fiscal year. This represents a 12 per cent increase in intakes from this same period last fiscal year.

The breath of issues in these cases is staggering. With the numerous changes in regional center and public benefits law this year, OCRA staff was successful in staying knowledgeable about the current law in an effort to help consumers and parents understand the changes. 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 Summer, 2009, and Winter, 2009, 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:

Consumer Receives Fully Favorable Decision in SSI Case.

A.O. is a regional center consumer with some significant deficits and was denied Supplemental Social Security (SSI). A.O. filed an appeal and OCRA provided direct representation at the hearing. The issue in the case was whether or not A.O. was unable to engage in any substantial gainful activity by reason of any impairment or combination of impairments.

Evidence was admitted and testimony was taken during the hearing. After review of the record, the ALJ determined that A.O. was disabled as of August 31, 2007, the date the application for SSI was filed and that A.O.'s

disability continued through the date of the decision. The ALJ issued a fully favorable decision.

Twins Found Eligible for IHSS.

A.S. and A.S are 5-year-old twin girls diagnosed with autism. After applying for IHSS, they were denied eligibility because they did not meet the SSI disability criteria. OCRA filed for an IHSS hearing on behalf of the twins. Because the twins were not SSI recipients, IHSS needed to determine if the twins qualified for IHSS based on their disability. The twins had to be evaluated by the state disability determination process. The IHSS hearings were conditionally withdrawn reserving the initial application date of September 11, 2008, pending the outcome of the state disability determination. OCRA helped the mother fill out the lengthy disability determination paperwork. After a few months, one of the twins was found eligible by the disability determination unit. Because the other twin's paperwork was sent to a different disability determination office, she still remained ineligible. However, OCRA resolved the SSI eligibility for both of the twins and then contacted IHSS. The county IHSS office reflected the changes in its system and found the second twin eligible for IHSS. Together, the twins received 86.5 hours of IHSS and retroactive payments going back to September 11, 2008.

P.M. Regains His Mobility.

In 2007, P.M. had undergone a long pre-authorization process to get the expensive specialized electric wheelchair he needed funded by Medicare. As time went on, the chair was in the shop for repairs nearly as much as it was being used by P.M. The local distributor could no longer make sufficient repairs to the chair. The distributor arranged to have the chair sent back to the manufacturer in Ohio for complex repairs. The local distributor then misplaced some of the records, moved locations, and ultimately stopped even trying to get P.M. a working wheelchair.

The regional center asked OCRA to intervene. OCRA contacted the manufacturer who claimed that P.M. was a "high-end user" and therefore a new chair would not be covered. OCRA then advised the manufacturer about the "lemon laws" regarding durable medical equipment and assistive technology. The manufacturer then agreed to fit P.M. for a new chair.

Housing Authority Agrees to Move J.M. to Downstairs Apartment.

J.M. was denied his request for a reasonable accommodation to move from his upstairs apartment into an accessible downstairs apartment. J.M.'s upstairs apartment was unsafe for J.M. because a lip on the threshold made it difficult for him to enter unassisted; the hallway is treated with a resin that makes it difficult for J.M. to walk; and the elevator is periodically inoperative. For over a year, the Area Housing Authority failed to respond to J.M.'s requests and physician's letters stating that J.M. needed a downstairs apartment. OCRA was contacted by J.M.'s service coordinator. OCRA agreed to represent J.M. by making a written request for a downstairs apartment as a reasonable accommodation. The housing authority agreed to place J.M. on the waiting list for an accessible downstairs apartment.

Student Maintains Appropriate Placement.

K.U. has always been integrated into general education classes. At the start of her junior year of high school, the district wanted to place her in a special day class (SDC) at a different school. K.U. wanted to remain in her current placement. The district filed for due process to require K.U. to change schools.

OCRA provided direct representation at a 4-day due process hearing and prevailed on all issues.

2) Analysis of Consumers Served.

OCRA handled a total of 5,202 cases from July 1 through December 31, 2009. This represents a significant provision of advocacy service and an increase of 12 per cent from this period last year. 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, 1,616 during this time period, has consistently been the 4-to-17 years-old age group. The next largest is the 23-40 age group with 749 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 64 percent of the consumers served being male and 36 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 3,933 consumers in the family home or 76 percent of the cases handled. The next largest group served is those living independently, with OCRA serving 543 people or 10 percent with this living arrangement. The statistics on the percentages has changed from this time period last year when the percentages were 70 and 13 percent, respectively.

OCRA's statistics on the ethnicity of consumers served from July 1, 2008, through December 31, 2008, show OCRA's continuing commitment to serve underserved communities.

The percentage of consumers from various ethnicities served by OCRA is:

Ethnicity	% OCRA Clients 7/1/08 - 12/31/08	% OCRA Clients 7/1/09 - 12/31/09	% RC Clients Dec. 2007
African-American	10	9	10.35
Latino	33	35	31.92
American-Indian or Alaskan Indian	1	1	.41
Asian	4	4	5.90
Pacific Islander	2	1	2.46
White	45	45	41.74
Multicultural (Self-Identify)	4	4	Not listed

Refused to State/Other	3	4	7.21
------------------------	---	---	------

OCRA's statistics show that OCRA's service to various ethnic groups is close to parity or above the number of consumers of each ethnicity served by the regional center.

The types of problems which the offices handle changed during the period of this report, which would be expected given the significant changes in regional center law that occurred during the time period. OCRA handled, during the six-month period, 2,216 regional center matters, which is 46 per cent of the cases handled for this time period versus the same time period last year, which was 1,327 regional center matters or 29 per cent of the issues handled. Generally, these matters were handled as short-term advice to consumers and families about the changes and consumers' rights. This year, the offices handled 877 education matters versus last year for the six-month period, 1,054 special education cases. OCRA also handled this year approximately 797 cases dealing with income maintenance, which includes Social Security and In-Home Support Services versus 635 last year this time period, and over 100 cases each in conservatorship, health, housing, and personal autonomy. For the first time, OCRA handled fewer than 100 cases in the areas of abuse, family law, and consumer finance. Taken together, the problem codes show a pattern of change in response to changes in law, but also 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 presented at 293 trainings with a total attendance of approximately 16,278 people at the various trainings. This is an outstanding performance by OCRA staff and represents a decrease in

the total number of trainings but an increase in the number of people attending by 30 per cent.

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 a statewide outreach coordinator, Anastasia Bacigalupo. The coordinator advises staff in implementation of their target outreach plans. Based upon an evaluation of the original outreach plans' results, and using new census data and updated figures from DDS regarding the ethnicity of consumers served by each regional center, the OCRA offices update their target outreach plans on an annual or bi-annual basis. A detailed report on target outreach and training is included as Exhibit D.

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

From July 1, 2009, through December 31, 2009, OCRA resolved 5,202 issues for consumers. Of those served, all but 108 were resolved informally. This means that 98 percent of all the matters that OCRA handled were resolved informally. Only 75 cases involved direct representation at hearing. Data showing this is attached as Exhibit E.

C. Collaborative and harmonious working relationships are fostered.

If at all possible, OCRA staff attempts to foster collaborative and harmonious working relationships with the consumers and parents who OCRA serve, regional center staff, stakeholders, and members of the general community. This philosophy is not only incorporated into Disability Rights California's contract with DDS, but 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 addresses that center's individual needs, concerns, and method of operation. MOUs are updated as needed. As part of the implementation of the current contract, the director of OCRA met with each of the regional center directors or designees to revise the existing MOUs. Copies of all MOUs have been forwarded to DDS. The status of each revised MOU is discussed in Exhibit F. All of the MOUs have been completed except one, which has been drafted and needs to be signed by the regional center executive director.

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

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

Catherine Blakemore, Executive Director, Disability Rights California, Jeanne Molineaux, Director, OCRA, and Bob Baldo, Executive Director of the Association of Regional Center Directors, met on December 15, 2009. At that time, several outstanding issues were resolved and further meetings will be planned as needed.

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 twenty-one surveys were mailed out. Eighty-three people returned the survey. Of those responding to the questions, 93 percent of the responders felt they were treated well by the staff, 93 percent understood the information they were provided, 94 percent believed their CRA listened to them, 87 percent believed they were helped by the CRA, and 89 percent would ask for help from OCRA again. 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 receives many letters of appreciation from consumers and others. Below are quotes from a few of the letters¹:

“Respectuosamente doy mis saludos a la a la agencia OCRA y Principal mente a las abogados Margaret Opiel y Kendra McWright y gracias portodos sus servicios.” (“I would like to respectfully greet the OCRA agency and especially the advocates Margaret Opiel and Kendra McWright and thank you for all your services.”)

“Thank you very much for the wonderful job you did in helping ... get out of her credit card problem. After over 2 months of no calls or letters from B & A, we can finally put this incident behind us. You're very good at what you do, And we appreciate your professionalism.”

“Thank you so much for all of your assistance. With your help...we were able to successfully advocate for our son with the Regional Center and ultimately attain the services that he needs as a person with autism. We are extremely grateful for your support, understanding, and expertise. We absolutely would not have been able to make progress in ... case without this assistance. We're extremely fortunate to have had your input.”

“Thank you from the bottom of my heart. Without your help, I don't know what we would do without your help we would be in jam with Social Security. Thank you for helping us with the court case. Thank you.”

“Thank you so much for the continued support and guidance and for keeping in touch...”

¹ Quotations are repeated as stated in the letters, except for the deletion of names.

“Our family cannot thank you enough for the dedication, commitment and support that your office has offered our family. I feel very blessed that we were able to connect and throughout our process for assisting our daughters ... and ..., your office cared from the bottom of your hearts. It's rare to find people today that genuinely care and provide undivided and unconditional attention in doing the right thing. Our family is eternally grateful for the undying support and believing in us. Thank you immensely.”

“I think you did an amazing job yesterday.”

“Thank you for assisting in making the August 27th Community event a successful. Having a Spanish translator available added to the sharing of the important Early Start mediation and due process. Your collaboration is greatly appreciated.”

“...I wanted to sincerely, thank you on behalf of our family for your support and guidance. You are an inspiration and a pleasure to have involved in our lives. I'm confident that some ___ will be able to thank you for all that you do for us, but more importantly for him. ___'s future will be in a much better place due to your involvement in navigating us through what can be very overwhelming hurdles in our lives.”

“Thank you for making a difference for our children with special needs!”

“I want to Thank You for presenting your information...on September 21.... The responses I received from the parents that attended were very positive. They all want to know when you will return. Hopefully we can set another date at the 1st of the year. I look forward to continuing our collaboration as we try to navigate these trying economic times.”

“On behalf of the staff and Training Department....THANK YOU (again) for sharing your times and expertise on IHSS. Staff feedback was “outstanding” and “timely”!!!”

“I wanted to thank you for sharing yesterday at As always you were insightful and on point. Your passion really comes through!

“I cannot express all of my appreciation for all that you have helped us out with, the time you have put into ... case, and for being so available. Thank you so much.”

“Thank you for your support and participation in the development of ___’s Early Start Transition Video. Your contribution to the development of this video will help families make the transition out of the California Early Start program into school-based and community services. We truly appreciate your time and commitment in this special project.”

“Thank you for your help and the speed with which you jumped into this fray. You had the least of all the stakes in this issue and yet you and your organization get the credit for making things happen.”

“Always remembering your efforts contributed to a successful outcome. My child obtained an NPS placement and recovering. Thank you and God Bless You.”

“Thank you for the extraordinary and thoughtful work you do year after year for the special needs families.”

“I wanted to just say how much everyone enjoyed your wonderful presentation on the 13th. I always look forward to outside trainings and information to help keep our employees up-to-date and aware of services which exist for those we support. Your presentation was very informative and contained valuable and useful information. I am certain I speak for everyone in attendance in saying it was clear and well presented. Your agency provides a valuable and necessary service to individuals. You are welcomed back anytime. Thank you again for taking the time out of your busy schedule to come to ___ and share your services with us.”

“We can’t tell you how much it means to us that you have expended the effort you did for ___ who, until just a few short weeks ago was a total stranger to you. It becomes apparent that what you have chosen to do with your life at this moment is the best choice you could make.”

3) Cases will be handled in a timely manner.

It is important that advocacy services be provided in a timely manner. Consumers and families are frequently in emergency situations, in danger of losing their placement in the least restrictive environment, losing their source of income, unable to get their medical needs met and a myriad of other dangerous or difficult situations. For this reason, OCRA has, since its establishment, had a policy that all calls will be returned as soon as possible, but not later than closing of the next business day. OCRA

measures its performance in this area by use of its consumer satisfaction survey, see Exhibit G, discussed more fully above. OCRA statistics show that 89 percent of all callers to OCRA received a call back within two days during the first half of this fiscal year, which is particularly impressive given the 12 per cent increase in office volume. This level of performance provides verification that cases are resolved in a timely manner. OCRA will continue to train on this requirement to ensure that it provides exceptional services for all callers.

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

OCRA works through the OCRA Advisory Committee to ensure that this performance outcome is achieved. 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, 2009.

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

The Board OCRA Advisory Committee is a knowledgeable, constructive, and helpful group of volunteers who continue to provide valuable guidance to the OCRA staff. The meetings are lively and informative and provide a forum for exchange of ideas and information. Minutes for the meeting held on September 11, 2009, are attached as Exhibit H.

DDS staff is invited and encouraged to participate in any of the meetings set for 2010. They are:

March 5, 2010	Sacramento
September 24, 2010	Bay Area

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

Welfare and Institutions Code, Section 4433 (d)(5), requires that the contractor providing advocacy services for consumers of regional center services provide at least two self-advocacy trainings for consumers and family members. Disability Rights California's contract with DDS mirrors this language. OCRA has been proactive in this matter and requires each of its offices to provide at least one self-advocacy training for consumers a year. Many offices provide more than one training.

To date, OCRA has developed 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. Additionally, the grievance procedure is included in all letters to consumers or others who contact OCRA, when an office declines to provide the requested service to that person.

Six grievances were filed by consumers or their families against OCRA during the last two quarters. Findings by Disability Rights California and DDS upheld the actions of OCRA. 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 over 5,202 cases the last six months, a 12 percent increase in cases from this period last year. Additionally, OCRA provided 347 trainings to over 10,887 people, an increase of 30 percent in the number of people who attended OCRA trainings. OCRA continued 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 office – as of December 28, 2009 - Change is *italicized*.

ALTA CALIFORNIA REGIONAL CENTER

Jackie Coleman - CRA

Jacqueline Gallegos - Assistant CRA

Elizabeth Kennedy – Temp PT Assistant CRA

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy

100 Howe Avenue, Ste. 240N

Sacramento, CA 95825

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

Email: Jackie.Coleman@disabilityrightsca.org

Jacqueline.Gallegos@disabilityrightsca.org

Elizabeth.Kennedy@disabilityrightsca.org.

Supervised by Jeanne Molineaux

CENTRAL VALLEY REGIONAL CENTER

Arthur Lipscomb - CRA

Kay Spencer- Assistant CRA (part-time)

Nate Navarro – Temp PT Assistant CRA

567 W. Shaw Avenue

Fresno, CA 93704

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

E-mail: Arthur.Lipscomb@disabilityrightsca.org

Kay.Spencer@disabilityrightsca.org

Nate.Navarro@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Tom Di Verde/Temporary Supervisor Gail Gresham

EASTERN LOS ANGELES REGIONAL CENTER

Matthew Pope - CRA

Lucy Garcia - Assistant CRA

Lily Susanto – Volunteer

James Takhar – Volunteer

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

Alhambra, CA 91802

NOTE: When shipping items through UPS/FED EX please add ELARC

Reception info: Bldg. A2 Room #3128. We ask that all items that are not mail be directed to the ELARC reception area and not our offices."

Phone: (626) 576-4437/(626) 576-4407/Fax: (626) 576-4276E-mail:
Matthew.Pope@disabilityrightsca.org,
Lucy.Garcia@disabilityrightsca.org, Lily.Susanto@disabilityrightsca.org,
James.Takhar@disabilityrightsca.org
Supervised by Katherine Mottarella

FAR NORTHERN REGIONAL CENTER

Andy Holcombe - CRA

Lorie Atamian – Assistant CRA (part-time)

Joshua Garringer - Volunteer

1280 East 9th Street, Unit E

Chico, CA 95928

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

E-mail: Andy.Holcombe@disabilityrightsca.org

Lorie.Atamian@disabilityrightsca.org

Joshua.Garringer@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Jackie Coleman

GOLDEN GATE REGIONAL CENTER

Katy Lusson - CRA

Amanda St. James - 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

amanda.stjames@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Gail Gresham

HARBOR REGIONAL CENTER

Katie Casada-Hornberger - CRA

Abigail Perez - Assistant CRA (part-time)

Catherine Qian - Volunteer

Minaal Malik - Volunteer

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy

13017 Artesia Blvd., Suite D124

Cerritos, CA 90703

Phone: (562) 623-9911/Fax: (562) 623-9929
E-mail: Katie.Hornberger@disabilityrightsca.org
Abigail.Perez@disabilityrightsca.org
Minaal.Malik@disabilityrightsca.org
Catherine.Qian@disabilityrightsca.org
Supervised by Jeanne Molineaux

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 Katherine Mottarella

KERN REGIONAL CENTER

Mario Espinoza - CRA

Valerie Geary - Assistant CRA

Ana Pelayo - Administrative Assistant (part-time)

3200 North Sillect Ave.

Bakersfield, CA 93308

Phone: (661)327-8531, Extension 313

Fax: (661)322-6417

E-mail: Mario.Espinoza@disabilityrightsca.org

Valerie.Geary@disabilityrightsca.org

Ana.Pelayo@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Irma Wagster

FRANK D. LANTERMAN REGIONAL CENTER

Jackie Chiang - CRA

Guadalupe Marquez - Assistant CRA (part-time)

Mary Quach - Volunteer

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy

3580 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 925

Los Angeles, CA 90010

Phone: (213)427-8761, Extensión 3673

Fax: (213)427-8772

E-mail: Guadalupe.Marquez@disabilityrightsca.org
Jackie.Chiang@disabilityrightsca.org, Mary.Quach@disabilityrightsca.org
Supervised by Katherine Mottarella

NORTH BAY REGIONAL CENTER

Yulahlia Hernandez - CRA
Trina Saldana - Assistant CRA
Christina Cutaia - Volunteer

Mailing Address is: Physical Address is:
P.O. Box 3360 25 Executive Court
Napa, CA 94558 Napa, CA 94558
Phone: (707)224-2798
Fax: (707)255-1567
E-mail: Yulahlia.Hernandez@disabilityrightsca.org

Trina.Saldana@disabilityrightsca.org

Christina.Cutaia@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Gail Gresham

NORTH LOS ANGELES COUNTY REGIONAL CENTER

Ibrahim Saab - CRA
Ada Hamer - Assistant CRA
Juan Lamadrid – Personal Care Attendant

15400 Sherman Way, Ste. 300
Van Nuys, CA 91406
Phone: (818) 756-6290
Fax: (818) 756-6175
E-mail: Bebo.Saab@disabilityrightsca.org

Ada.Hamer@disabilityrightsca.org,

Juan.Lamadrid@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Irma Wagster

REDWOOD COAST REGIONAL CENTER

Jim Stoepler - CRA

525 Second Street, Suite 300
Eureka, CA 95501
Phone: (707) 445-0893, Ext. 361
Fax: (707) 444-2563
Reg workweek: Thurs/Fri

1116 Airport Park Blvd.
Ukiah, CA 95482
Phone:(707)462-3832, Ext. 235
Fax: (707) 462-3314
Reg workweek: Mon/Tues/Wed

E-mail: Jim.Stoepler@disabilityrightsca.org
Supervised by Katie Hornberger

REDWOOD COAST REGIONAL CENTER

Doug Harris - CRA

14624 Lakeshore Drive, Space B
Clearlake, CA 95422

Phone: (707) 995-5066

Fax: (707) 995-7050

E-mail: Doug.Harris@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Jim Stoepler

REGIONAL CENTER OF THE EAST BAY

Anna Leach-Proffer - CRA

Celeste Palmer - Associate CRA

1330 Broadway, Suite 500

Oakland, CA 94612

Phone: (510) 267-1280

Fax: (510) 267-1281

E-mail: Anna.Leach-Proffer@disabilityrightsca.org

Celeste.Palmer@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Jeanne Molineaux

REGIONAL CENTER OF ORANGE COUNTY

Jacqueline Miller - CRA

Cynthia Salomon - Assistant CRA

Matthew O'Neill – Volunteer Law Clerk

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,

Matthew.ONeil@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Irma Wagster

SAN ANDREAS REGIONAL CENTER

Rita Defilippis - CRA

Eleanor-Rosa LoBue - Assistant CRA – (On leave)

Jessica Cardenas – Agency Temp

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

Eleanor-Rosa.Lobue@disabilityrightsca.org

Jessica.Cardenas@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Gail Gresham

SAN DIEGO REGIONAL CENTER

Wendy Dumlao - CRA

Alba Gomez - Assistant CRA

Meaghan Connolly – Volunteer (Mon/Fri 9:00a.m. – 1:00p.m.)

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy

1111 Sixth Avenue, Suite 200

San Diego, CA 92101

Phone: (619) 239-7877

Fax: (619) 239-7838

E-mail: Wendy.Dumlao@disabilityrightsca.org

Alba.Gomez@disabilityrightsca.org,

Meaghan.Connolly@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Katherine Mottarella

SAN GABRIEL/POMONA REGIONAL CENTER

Aimee Delgado - CRA

Marisol Cruz - Assistant CRA

3333 Brea Canyon Road, Suite #118

Diamond Bar, CA 91765-3783

Phone: (909)595-4755

Fax: (909)595-4855

E-mail: Aimee.Delgado@disabilityrightsca.org

Marisol.Cruz@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Irma Wagster

SOUTH CENTRAL LA REGIONAL CENTER

Anastasia Bacigalupo - CRA

Christine Armand - Associate CRA

4401 S. Crenshaw Boulevard, Suite 316

Los Angeles, CA 90043-1200.

Phone: (323) 292-9907

Fax: (323) 293-4259

E-mail: Anastasia.Bacigalupo@disabilityrightsca.org

Christine.Armand@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Irma Wagster

TRI-COUNTIES REGIONAL CENTER

Katherine Mottarella – Temporary Supervising CRA

Kendra McWright – Temp CRA

Gina Gheno - Assistant CRA

Margie Oppel – Volunteer

520 East Montecito Street

Santa Barbara, CA 93103

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

Fax: 805-884-7219

E-mail: Katherine.Mottarella@disabilityrightsca.org

Gina.Gheno@disabilityrightsca.org, Kendra.McWright@disabilityrightsca.org,

Margie.Oppel@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Katherine Mottarella

***VALLEY MOUNTAIN REGIONAL CENTER**

***Leinani Walter* – CRA**

Filomena Alomar - Assistant CRA

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy

Valley Mountain Regional Center

702 N. Aurora Street

Stockton, CA 95202

Phone: (209) 955-3329/Leinani's dir line (209)955-3314

Fax: (209) 462-7020

E-mail: Leinani.Walter@disabilityrightsca.org

Filomena.Alomar@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Gail Gresham

WESTSIDE REGIONAL CENTER

Katie Meyer - CRA

Luisa Delgadillo - Assistant CRA

Martha Padilla - Volunteer

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 Supervised by Katie Hornberger

Sacramento OCRA

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
100 Howe Avenue, Suite 240N
Sacramento, CA 95825
Telephone: (916) 575-1615
Toll-Free: (800) 390-7032
Fax: (916) 575-1623/TTY: (877) 669-6023
DIRECT DIAL NUMBER: (916) 575-1615

Los Angeles OCRA

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
3580 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 925
Los Angeles, CA 90010
Telephone: (213) 427-8761
Toll-Free: (866) 833-6712
Fax: (213) 427-8772
DIRECT DIAL NUMBER: (213) 427-8757

Director:

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

Supervising Clients' Rights Advocates:

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

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

Katherine Mottarella Santa Barbara
Email: Katherine.Mottarella@disabilityrightsca.org
Tri-Counties Regional Center - (800) 322-6994, Ext. 218

Support Staff Sacramento:

Alice Ximenez, Office Manager II

(916) 575-1615, Extension 8143

Email: Alice.Ximenez@disabilityrightsca.org

Sacramento

Manuella Osborn, Administrative Assistant

(916) 575-1615, Extension 8141

Email: Manuella.Osborn@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. Alomar, Filomena	VMRC
2. Armand, Christine	SCLARC
3. Atamian, Lorie	FNRC
4. Bacigalupo, Anastasia	SCLARC
5. Cardenas, Jessica	SARC (Agency Temp)
6. Cervantes, Veronica	IRC
7. Chiang, Jackie	LRC
8. Coleman, Jackie	ACRC
9. Connolly, Meaghan	SDRC (Volunteer)
10. Cruz, Marisol	SGPRC
11. Cutaia, Christina	NBRC (Volunteer)
12. Delgadillo, Luisa	WRC
13. Delgado, Aimee	SGPRC
14. Difilippis, Rita	SARC
15. Dumlao, Wendy	SDRC
16. Espinoza, Mario	KRC
17. Gallegos, Jacqueline	ACRC
18. Garcia, Lucy	ELARC
19. Garringer, Joshua	FNRC (Volunteer)
20. Geary, Valerie	KRC
21. Gheno, Gina	TCRC
22. Gomez, Alba	SDRC
23. Gresham, Gail	OCRASAC
24. Hamer, Ada	NLACRC
25. Harris, Doug	RCRC
26. Hernandez, Yulahlia	NBRC
27. Holcombe, Andy	FNRC
28. Hornberger, Katie	HRC
29. Kennedy, Elizabeth	ACRC
30. Lamadrid, Juan	NLACRC (PCA)
31. Lipscomb, Arthur	CVRC
32. LoBue, Eleanor-Rosa	SARC (on leave)
33. Lusson, Katy	GGRC
34. Malik, Minaal	HRC (Volunteer)
35. Marquez, Guadelupe	OCRALA

36. McWright, Kendra	TCRC
37. Meyer, Katie	WRC
38. Miller, Jacqueline	RCOC
39. Molineaux, Jeanne	OCRASAC
40. Mottarella, Katherine	TCRC
41. Navarro, Nate	CVRC (Agency Temp)
42. O'Neill, Matthew	RCOC (Volunteer)
43. Oppel, Margie	TCRC (Volunteer)
44. Ortega, Maria	OCRALA
45. Osborn, Manuella	OCRASAC
46. Palmer, Celeste	RCEB
47. Padilla, Martha	WRC (Volunteer)
48. Pelayo, Ana	KRC
49. Perez, Abigail	HRC
50. Pope, Matthew	ELARC
51. Leach-Proffer, Anna	RCEB
52. Qian, Catherine	HRC (Volunteer)
53. Quach, Mary	LRC (Volunteer)
54. Reyes, Beatriz	IRC
55. Saldana, Trina	NBRC
56. Salomón, Cynthia	RCOC
57. Spencer, Kay	CVRC
58. St. James, Amanda	GGRC
59. Stoepler, Jim	RCRC
60. Susanto, Lily	ELARC (Volunteer)
61. Takhar, James	ELARC (Volunteer – in process)
62. Wagster, Irma	OCRALA
63. <i>Walter, Leinani</i>	<i>VMRC (name change)</i>
64. Ximenez, Alice	OCRASAC

Updated as of December 28, 2009.

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Semi-Annual Report - July 1, 2009 through December 31, 2009
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	14	13	18	8	9	25	17	7	30	7	14	11	14	4	19	24	9	17	8	12	23	303
4-17	76	99	155	56	43	94	113	88	54	60	71	68	38	34	97	112	56	70	75	52	105	1616
18-22	27	41	33	21	21	27	37	23	16	27	24	16	17	20	28	14	27	29	44	30	30	552
23-40	44	29	41	41	46	36	46	30	13	33	34	51	35	34	18	15	33	32	52	43	43	749
41-50	15	5	9	27	17	7	13	7	4	10	15	15	5	16	7	4	5	11	23	14	16	245
51+	11	7	31	17	26	11	8	7	4	9	12	16	9	7	11	5	3	9	31	23	14	271
Unknown	5	1	1			1		3					3									14
Total	192	195	288	170	162	201	234	165	121	146	170	177	121	115	180	174	133	168	233	174	231	3750

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Semi-Annual Report - July 1, 2009 through December 31, 2009
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							153			1							155
Amador																				6		6
Butte				121																		121
Calaveras																				8		8
Colusa				1																		1
Contra Costa					1					1		108										110
Del Norte														5								5
El Dorado	5																					5
Fresno	4	132																				136
Glenn				4										1								5
Humboldt														36								36
Imperial																	15					15
Kern		1		1		1		224		1				1					3			232
Kings		16						1														17
Lake														55								55
Lassen				4																		4
Los Angeles	5		362	1		296	1	2	237		205		3	1	1	243		247	1		325	1930
Madera		15																2				17
Marin					82																	82
Mariposa		2																				2
Mendocino						1				1				35								37
Merced		11								1												12
Monterey															22							22
Napa	2									33												35
Nevada	2																					2
Not Selected		6	5	3			1	22		8			3	3	3			1	8		1	64
Orange			1				2						216			1		1				221
Placer	13			3																		16
Plumas				3																		3
Riverside							137		1				1									139

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Semi-Annual Report - July 1, 2009 through December 31, 2009
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	195	3								2												200
San Benito															2							2
San Bernardino	3		4			1	149					1						4				162
San Diego							1										160	1				162
San Francisco					54										1							55
San Joaquin																				118		118
San Luis Obispo																			35			35
San Mateo					90																	90
Santa Barbara																			75		1	76
Santa Clara	1	1								2			7		179					1		191
Santa Cruz												1			19							20
Shasta				42			1															43
Siskiyou	3			3																		6
Solano										65		1										66
Sonoma	1									112				1								114
Stanislaus	1											1								70		72
Sutter	2																					2
Tehama				24																		24
Trinity				2																		2
Tulare		53						1														54
Tuolumne																				9		9
Ventura								1										1	191			193
Yolo	4																					4
Yuba	9																					9
Grand Total	250	240	372	212	228	299	292	251	238	226	205	265	230	138	228	244	175	257	313	212	327	5202

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Semi-Annual Report - July 1, 2009 through December 31, 2009
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	14	21	6	23	24		6	12	3	23	7	10	15	1	9	2	2		18	4	14	214
Autism	35	44	160	34	32	80	91	47	47	24	52	52	45	25	63	85	44	51	56	22	98	1187
Cerebral Palsy	16	14	14	17	27	24	35	8	14	16	10	38	12	10	17	12	17	31	29	17	27	405
Dual Diagnosis - 5th Category	1	1			1			1		8		2		1			1		2		1	19
Dual Diagnosis - Autism	1	1			1	1	2		1	11	2	1	1	1	3	2			2	4	4	38
Dual Diagnosis - Cerebral Palsy		1					1			1	2		3		2	1			4			15
Dual Diagnosis - Epilepsy				1		1	2	1		1	1	2	1	2	2				3	4		21
Dual Diagnosis - Mental Retardation	2	5		5	5	7	9	1	3	14	14	9	10	10	7	2		1	11	7	4	126
Early Start	1	5	1	4	1	20	15	1	20	5	8	10	4		13	11	2	10	8	6	16	161
Epilepsy	3	16	9	19	9	4	28	1	5	5	10	3	6	3	8	3	6	11	19	7	15	190
Mental Retardation	108	92	104	90	85	73	108	98	33	68	67	56	33	73	56	41	86	74	115	120	81	1661
Unknown	33	17	11	5	5	13	6	7	10		11	5	17	5	19	26	3	20	12	32	9	266
Grand Total	214	217	305	198	190	223	303	177	136	176	184	188	147	131	199	185	161	198	279	223	269	4303

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Semi-Annual Report - July 1, 2009 through December 31, 2009
Report by Ethnicity

Ethnicity	ARC	CVRC	ELARC	FNRC	GGRC	HRC	IRC	KRC	LRC	NBRC	NLARC	RCEB	RCOC	RCRC	SARC	SCLARC	SDRC	SGPRC	TCRC	VMRC	WRC	Grand Total
American Indian	3	1		10	1	1		3	1			1	1	4					3	1		30
Asian	6	4	37	2	6	17	3	2	7	1	1	16	6		19	1	1	4		7	7	147
Black or African American	31	18	3	2	17	18	20	11	10	25	16	35	2	3	5	42	3	11	6	15	38	331
Hispanic / Latino	37	85	186	31	20	53	101	59	51	36	52	45	28	15	57	118	49	93	85	39	80	1320
Multiracial	3	12	19	5	14	12	17	2	16	3	6		1	1	6	5	5	9	6	5	4	151
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	3		2	1	7	4	4	5	3	1		5	2		7		7	3	3	3		60
Unknown	5	5	10	3		3	12	2	1	1	6		12	2	2		3	1	18	1	8	95
White	104	70	31	116	97	93	77	81	32	79	89	75	69	90	84	8	65	47	112	103	94	1616
Grand Total	192	195	288	170	162	201	234	165	121	146	170	177	121	115	180	174	133	168	233	174	231	3750

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Semi-Annual Report - July 1, 2009 through December 31, 2009
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	68	76	90	73	70	56	85	62	42	52	54	71	35	44	62	41	50	58	91	72	90	1342
Male	124	119	195	97	92	144	149	103	79	93	116	106	86	70	117	132	81	110	142	101	141	2397
Unknown			3			1				1				1	1	1	2			1		11
Grand Total	192	195	288	170	162	201	234	165	121	146	170	177	121	115	180	174	133	168	233	174	231	3750

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Semi-Annual Report - July 1, 2009 through December 31, 2009
Report by Living Arrangement

	ARC	CVRC	ELARC	FNRC	GGRC	HRC	IRC	KRC	LRC	NBRC	NLARC	RCEB	RCOC	RCRC	SARC	SCLARC	SDRC	SGPRC	TCRC	VMRC	WRC	Total
Adult Residential Facility	15	6	1	8			9	7		5		18	2	2		1	15	1	9	15	3	117
Board and Care	9				2	2	7		1	2	4	3			2				6		3	41
Childrens Group Home			2	3								1		1		2		1	5	3		18
Community Residential Home	2	4			2					2	1				1	2			1	8	1	24
Detention Center							6										1					7
Developmental Center	3					1		1		3			1		1		1		1			12
Federal Facility										2									1			3
Foster Care		2		1	1	2	1	2							1	3	2	1	1		1	18
Foster Family Home		9	1				2	3		3	1	1	1	1	1	3				2		28
Halfway House							1		1													2
Homeless		4		2	2		1	1						2				2				14
ICF DD					2		1								2					1		6
ICF DD-H					2					1	3								2	1		9
ICF DD-N										1	1								1	2		5
ICF/MR/Nursing Home																			4			4
Independent Housing	35	15	8	67	30	2	15	50	16	27	15	27	17	36	14	24	15	18	42	31	39	543
Intermediate Care Facility/Nursing Home			1					1		3							1			3	2	11
Jail	1				1	1				4	2				1	2			3	1		16
Large Group Home (more than 3 beds)	8	2	2		18	15		12		5	5	13	8	5	7	3		3	9			115
Legal Detention										2									1			3
Municipal Detention Facility/Jail	2																1			1		4
Nursing Home					1			1					1		1				1		3	8
Other	2	1	1	1		17			1	1	2		2		1					2	1	32
Other Federal Facility					1										2							3
Parental or Other Family Home	149	188	346	115	140	256	247	167	218	154	161	176	190	79	192	198	138	228	195	140	256	3933
Prison	1			3														1			2	7
Private General Hospital Emergency Rooms											1											1
Private Institutional Hospital/Treatment Facility								1			2	5							1			9
Private Institutional Living Arrangement			1		1																	2
Private Institutional School										1						1					1	3
Psychiatric Wards of Private General Hospitals										1												1
Psychiatric Wards of Public General Hospitals						1			1	2						1						5
Public Institutional Hospital/Treatment Facility	2							1			1		3		1							8
Public Institutional Living Arrangement	1				1									1								3
Public Residential School																				2		2
Semi-independent Home or Apartment	4	2			15		1					13	1			2	1	1	10		10	60
Small Group Home (3 beds or less)				3	3			3		5	2	2	1	4		1			7			31
Specialized Nursing Facility/Nursing Home				1				1				1	1					1		1		6
Supervised Apartment	3	2	2	6	6	1				3	3	5		5					12		4	52
Unknown	13	5	7	2		1	1						2	2	1	1						35
VA Hospital																						1
Grand Total	250	240	372	212	228	299	292	251	238	226	205	265	230	138	228	244	175	257	313	212	327	5202

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Semi-Annual Report - July 1, 2009 through December 31, 2009
Report by Problem Codes

		ARC	CVRC	ELARC	FNRC	GGRC	HRC	IRC	KRC	LRC	NBRC	NLARC	RCRB	RCOC	RCRC	SARC	SCLARC	SDRC	SGPRC	TCRC	VMRC	WRC	Total
4731 Complaint	4731 - Developmental Center 4731 - Regional Center 4731 - Service Provider Title 17										1												1
		2						2	2	1	7	1	3			3	2		3	1	3	1	31
		2										1	1							2	1		10
		1							3				1								2	2	4
4731 Complaint Total		5					2	5	1	8	2	4			3	2	1	3	3	6	1	46	
Abuse	Emotional / Psychological Abuse Exploitation / Coercion Financial Abuse Inappropriate Medical Treatment Other Abuse Physical Assault Physical Neglect Physical Restraint / Seclusion Sexual Assault Verbal Abuse	1																					1
			1	1		2			2				3	1	3	1	1	2		4	3		5
			1					1	1													1	3
								1	1														5
		1			1	8			4			1	1	1	1	3						1	21
						2							1	1	1	1				1			6
									1														1
					5						1					1					2		9
					1										1								2
Abuse Total		2	2	1	1	18		2	8		1	1	4	3	10	8	2	2		5	6	1	77
Assistive Technology	Assistive Technology - Regional Center Assistive Technology - Vocational Rehabilitation												2										3
																							1
Assistive Technology Total													2										4
Consent	Capacity / Incapacity of Client Informed Consent Other Consent Withhold Consent					1		1	1			2											7
											3				1						1	1	6
							1					1									2	1	5
				1																			1
Consent Total				1		1	1	1	1		3	3			1					3	2	2	19
Conservatorship	Alternatives to Conservatorship Change Conservatorship Conservatee's Rights Conservator's Duties LPS Conservatorship Opposition to Petition Petition Termination of Conservatorship	1	4	1				3	13	1	4	1	2	3		6	3	7	9	18	6	4	86
		1	1	1			1				1	1		1		1				2	1		11
		2	1		1		1				3	9	3		1			2		2	5		30
												2		1					1				4
			1											1		1							3
			4					1			1		1	1	1	1		1			3		13
				2	2		2	2				3				1				2	4		18
		1		2	1	1			1				1	1	2			1	1		1	1	12
Conservatorship Total		4	5	9	5	2	3	7	14	1	9	16	8	5	3	12	3	11	11	24	20	5	177
Criminal Justice / Forensic Mental	Competency Criminal Justice Issues - Rights Criminal Matter Representation – Not IOLTA eligible - OCRA Diversion Jail Juvenile (Detention and Probation) Other Criminal Justice	1		2	1	2	1					1	1		1								2
												1	1		1								10
																							1
																		1					4
		2				1			1						1		1						5
																							1
			1	2	2	1	1		1			1	1	1	1	1					3	1	17
Criminal Justice / Forensic Mental Health Issues Total		3	1	4	3	4	2	3	3	1	2	2	2	1	3			1		3	4	1	40
Discrimination (Other than Employment)	Architectural barriers Civil Rights (Race, Religion, Sexual Orientation) Higher Education (Public and Private) Other Discrimination Public Accommodations (Hotels, Restaurants, Etc.) Transportation (Public and Private)																						1
											1												3
				1			1			1													2
					1																		2
			1	1	1	3		1						2		1				2			14
		1		1	1	1						1			1		1	3			1	1	11
		1	1					1					1					1			1	4	10
Discrimination (Other than Employment) Total		3	3	3	4	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	4		4	1	6	41
Education	Education - Adult Education Programs Education - After School Programs Education - Assessment Education - Assistive Technology Education - Behavioral Intervention, Services and Supports Education - Compliance Complaint Education - Discipline (Suspension / Expulsion / Other) Education - Discrimination Education - Due Process Appeals Education - Early Intervention (Part B / Over Age 3) Education - Eligibility Education - Full Inclusion (Except Pre-School) Education - Higher Education Education - Home / Hospital Instruction Education - IEP Development Education - Least Restrictive Environment Education - Non-Public School Placement	4																					8
																							1
		1	2	4	1		4	2	2	3	2		1	2		1	2		2				31
				1			1						1	1									4
		3	7	10		2	2	3	3	2	1	1	3		9	8		3	3	2	2	1	58
		4	2			1	4	3	3	2	4		4	1	3	1	1	3	3	2	2		40
			7	1	1		1		3					1		1			3	5	4	1	28
		1				2			1					1	1	2					1	3	12
					1		2			4	1				1			1		1		2	14
				1													1	1			1	2	6
				3			1						1						5		1		11
			1			2			1				2			2				1			7
		1	1		1			1									2						6
		15	23	15	21	7	7	9	5	15	8	5	7	12	5	36	12	5	13	5	3	6	234
		1	3	4					1	1	1					7		1	2	1			22
		1		6			3	1	2	1	2		2	3		1				2	1	1	26

Legal Referral	Civil (General)	3	1	1	3				2	1	2	4		1	5	1	2	26					
	Criminal (General) - Rights	1		1		1		2	1	1				1		1	1	10					
	Personal Injury	1		3	1	2	2	1	1	2	1			1	3	3	2	24					
	Public Defender			2			2									2		6					
	Small Claims	1		2												2	1	7					
	Worker's Compensation									1	1							2					
Legal Referral Total		3	3	6	4	4	3	4	3	3	1	3	5	5	1	2	8	9	3	5	75		
Mental Health Issues	Mental Health - Complaint													1				1			1		
	Mental Health - Eligibility													1				1	1		3		
	Mental Health - Involuntary Commitment	1			1								1	1		1		1	1		7		
	Mental Health - Service, Supports and Treatment				1								1	1	1	2	1	2			8		
Mental Health Issues Total		1		2									2	1	3	1	2	2	4	1	19		
Placement	Discharge Planning													1				1			2		
	Facility Conditions	1		1	1	1			2												6		
	Facility Evictions	1		1	1	1		1												1	5		
	Health Facilities			1															2		3		
	Move from Institution to Community	1						2	4				1								8		
	Support Services Needed for Placement			5	2		2		1			1		1				1	5	1	19		
	Transitional Housing		1			1			1	1				1							6		
	Unit / Facility / Institution Transfer	1				2							1			1		3			8		
Placement Total		3	1	1	1	8	4	1	7	8	1		4	1	1	1		5	8	2	57		
Privacy/Personal Autonomy / Choices	Community Activities			3										1	1					1	6		
	Least Restrictive Environment	1	1	1					2		1					1			1		8		
	Mail				1														1		2		
	Other Privacy / Personal Autonomy / Choices	9	4	1	1	7	2	9	3		1	1	3		1	4	2	5		5	13	4	
	Personal Property	2							1	1							2		1	1	8		
	Privacy			1						1				1					1	1	6		
	Religion										1								1	1	1		
	Sexuality			1					2												3		
	Telephone				1	2	1	2		1									1		9		
Privacy/Personal Autonomy / Choices Total		11	5	5	4	9	4	10	5	1	8	1	5	2	5	3	8	1	9	16	6	118	
Records	Breach of Confidentiality												1	1							2		
	Denial of Access	1				1							2	3			1				8		
	Erroneous Information	1		1									1								3		
Records Total		1	1	1	1								3	5			1				13		
Regional Center Services	Community Living Arrangements									1	1						1				1		
	Lanterman Act - Regional Center																				2		
	Licensed Residential Services				1																1		
	Regional Center - 6500																			1	2		
	Regional Center - Assessment of Needs	3	1	3	1	18	43	1	6		2	4	2	2	3	6				7	2	104	
	Regional Center - Behavioral Services	9	11	4		1	17	9	1	10		9	13	9	1	9	3	3	6	2	4	121	
	Regional Center - Case Management		4	2	6	3	4	15	10	10	6	20	14	4	2	6	2	3	16		7	136	
	Regional Center - Coordination with County Mental Health																				1		
	Regional Center - Crisis Services		1	1				1	1				1	1					1	3		10	
	Regional Center - Day Program, Training and Activity		1	3	2	3	14	4	8	2	11	4	5	3	6		18	10	4	1	1	2	102
	Regional Center - DDS Policies / Procedures	2		1	1	1	3		1		2	2	1			2	1				1	19	
	Regional Center - Early Start (Part C / Under Age 3)	1	1	2		5	19	17	1	5	2	3	5	4		2	9	1	3	4	6	103	
	Regional Center - Eligibility for Regional Center services	6	32	17	13	18	23	44	15	13	21	14	14	19	4	24	30	8	15	11	18	16	375
	Regional Center - Fair Hearing Procedures (Information only; no repres		8	80	17	8	9	5	8	26	14	1	24	1	3	23	1	67	5	6	7	339	
	Regional Center - Independent Living Services	2	5	4	1	2	1		4			3		3	1	5	2				2	35	
	Regional Center - IPP (Development / Meeting / Compliance)	1	4	3	12	2	6	3	4	6	3	7	6	1	2	3	6	6	6		5	86	
	Regional Center - Microenterprises							2														2	
	Regional Center - Other Regional Center Services	39	4	27	2	11	38	12	25	5	7	9	18	22	7	1	1	4	13	12	8	35	300
	Regional Center - Prevention Services			2	3				1								8					14	
	Regional Center - Respite	8	9	2	5	31	15	33	8	16	32	28	22	9	13	11	5	19	2	8	7	19	302
	Regional Center - Supported Employment			1	1			1					1		1							6	
	Regional Center - Supported Living	8	1	3		2	2	4	5	2	5		2	4	1	4	6	3		4	2	4	62
	Regional Center - Transportation	4	3		7	5	2	1	13	8	2		6	1	1	11	1	1	1	4	2	1	74
	Regional Center - Waiver			1		1				2	7				2		3	1				19	
Regional Center Services Total		83	85	155	72	89	168	198	101	116	125	109	118	112	39	55	134	71	124	83	60	119	2216
Grand Total		250	240	372	212	228	299	292	251	238	226	205	265	230	138	228	244	175	257	313	212	327	5202

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Semi-Annual Report - July 1, 2009 through December 31, 2009
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
Pending										5			1									6
Information/Referral	27	59	53	30	103	96	35	44	30	31	19	53	24	28	67	28	17	57	49	129	103	1082
Evaluation and Assessment	6	24	46	25	15	6	7	7	6	18	4	15	6	1	17	6	8	3	3	9	13	245
Informal Regional Center / Provider Problem Resolution	3	13		2	12	2	14	3			10	36			4	7	1			1	7	115
Informal Generic Service Agency Problem Resolution	1	8		2	23	2	1		1	1	2	18			17	3	2				14	95
Case Settlement Prior to Informal Meeting, Mediation or Hearing				1					1												1	3
Direct Representation in RC "Voluntary Informal Meeting"	1	1	2	1		1	1	1			1		1									10
Direct Representation in Mediation / RC Fair Hearing	1	1				1	1		2		1	1	1	1	4		7				1	22
Direct Representation in an Appeal for Generic Services	3	2	7		2	5	3	1	3		3	5			1	1	3		3		10	53
Court Litigation	1	2	1												1							5
Rights Information/Consultation (RC/Generic)	102	81	93	51	37	155	215	41	102	140	124	66	109	78	15	186	61	181	107	35	151	2130
Rights Information/Consultation (Other)	76	17	85	69	22	2	3	59	87	3	37	52	56	26	52	7	56	1	143	36	8	897
Abuse/Neglect Investigation	3	3		1	2		6	3							1	2						21
Special Education Compliance Complaint		2	1	1				2		1		3	2		3		2				1	18
IEP		22	2	15	2	1	1	2	5	2	2		4		25	2	1	2		1	3	92
IPP/IDT		1		2		2	1	1		6			1		7		7	2	2			32
W&I 4731	2						1	1		1										1		6
Technical Assistance	24	4	82	12	10	26	3	86	1	18	2	16	25	2	13	4	10	11	5	1	15	370
Grand Total	250	240	372	212	228	299	292	251	238	226	205	265	230	138	228	244	175	257	313	212	327	5202

ADVOCACY REPORT

OFFICE OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS ADVOCACY

Fall 2009

BENEFITS

F.C. Receives \$4,000 Retroactive IHSS Payment.

F.C. moved from a board and care setting to an apartment with a roommate on June 1, 2009. F.C. was assisted by her supported living services (SLS) agency to apply for In-Home Support Services (IHSS) on June 3, 2009. An in-home needs assessment was conducted by a County IHSS worker on July 27, 2009. F.C. received a verbal denial from the County on August 5, 2009, stating she was ineligible for IHSS because its computer records showed F.C. was living in a nonmedical out-of-home arrangement. F.C. contacted OCRA for help.

OCRA staff contacted the County and confirmed the accuracy of the information provided to F.C. OCRA discussed with the County that F.C. receives Supplemental Security Income (SSI) and that the regional center was F.C.'s representative payee. The County agreed to withhold the written Notice of Action (NOA) denying IHSS to allow OCRA staff time to have the necessary corrections made by the regional center to the Social Security Administration (SSA) regarding F.C.'s living arrangement.

OCRA contacted the regional center fiscal department representative to make the necessary correction to F.C.'s living arrangement and submit the change to the SSA. F.C. received a NOA approving 122 hours per month of IHSS and a retroactive payment (approximately \$4,896) back to the date of her application. Christine Armand, Associate CRA, South Central Los Angeles Regional Center.

County Agrees to Reinstate L. M.'s Zero Share of Cost Medi-Cal.

OCRA was contacted by L.M.'s mother who reported that her daughter recently received a notice of action (NOA) from Medi-Cal stating that effective March 1, 2009, L.M. would be assessed a \$803 monthly share of cost due to alleged excess income. Upon further investigation, OCRA determined that the Medi-Cal determination was incorrect because L.M. was eligible for zero share of cost Medi-Cal as a Disabled Adult Child (DAC) beneficiary.

After unsuccessfully trying to resolve the issue by agreeing to a conditional withdrawal, OCRA agreed to represent L.M. at hearing. OCRA offered evidence establishing that L.M. was receiving SSI until December 20, 2003, at which time L.M.'s SSI was terminated because she became entitled to DAC benefits under her father's Social Security account. OCRA argued that because L.M. lost SSI because of her DAC benefits, she was eligible for Medi-Cal without a share of cost under the DAC program. Prior to hearing, the County stipulated that L.M. was eligible for zero share of cost Medi-Cal. In order to ensure that the county complied with its stipulation, OCRA proceeded to hearing and secured a stipulated judgment that L.M. was entitled to Medi-Cal without a share of cost. Ibrahim Saab, CRA, Ada Hamer, Assistant CRA, North Los Angeles County Regional Center.

Related and Personal IHSS Hours Authorized for Minor.

J.S.' IHSS failed to provide enough hours to meet his needs. J.S. was totally dependent on others to provide many services. J.S.' mother had repeatedly been told by the IHSS social worker that J.S. would not be authorized for related or personal services because J.S. was a minor. OCRA agreed to assist J.S.' mother to appeal. J.S.' mother used the Disability Rights California Self-assessment Packet and the IHSS Nuts and Bolts publications to assist in preparing for hearing. The County agreed to re-assess J.S. and authorized 60 additional hours per month of related and personal services that J.S. required to remain at home. In addition, the County increased J.S.' paramedical services based upon J.S.' new medical documentation.

Jacqueline Miller, CRA, Cynthia Salomon, Assistant CRA, Regional Center of Orange County.

Persistence Pays Off.

S.M.'s mother had concerns that S.M. was not receiving the appropriate monthly SSI amount. S.M.'s mother on numerous occasions had provided the SSA with information to support an increase of S.M.'s monthly benefits but was not successful. S.M.'s mother contacted OCRA requesting assistance. OCRA reviewed S.M.'s parental income and determined that S.M.'s monthly SSI benefit amount was too low. S.M.'s mother used the information provided by OCRA and again returned to the SSA office. As a result, S.M.'s SSI benefits were increased from \$534 a month to \$739 a month. Aimee Delgado, CRA, Marisol Cruz, Assistant CRA, San Gabriel/Pomona Regional Center.

Twins Found Eligible for SSI.

A.S. and E.S are 5-year-old twin girls diagnosed with autism. After applying for SSI, the girls were denied due to being over the family resource limit. The family owned three vehicles, one of which was in very poor condition. The Assistant CRA agreed to evaluate the case and upon review concluded that the vehicle in poor condition was overvalued by the SSA. The Assistant CRA filed a Request for Reconsideration, which included estimates on the current market value of the vehicle in its present condition. The reconsideration was denied. The Assistant CRA filed for hearing and included more supporting evidence on the true value of the vehicle by using the SSA's vehicle estimates website. Because the Assistant CRA had requested an informal meeting on the Request for Reconsideration, and SSA never afforded the opportunity, the Assistant CRA contacted the local SSA office supervisor. The Assistant CRA advocated on the right to an informal meeting, and the supervisor agreed to re-open the Request for Reconsideration. Upon SSA's review of the additional information, it agreed to rescind its original determination and find the twins eligible for SSI benefits. Together, the twins received approximately \$19,000 in retroactive payments. Veronica Cervantes, CRA, Beatriz A. Reyes, Assistant CRA, Inland Regional Center.

OCRA Assists with Waiver Request.

M.M. received an overpayment from the SSA for a period of time that he was not employed. The overpayment incorrectly calculated his benefits on the basis of his previous earnings. M.M.'s mother and representative payee had submitted all necessary documents and changes in circumstances to the SSA.

OCRA assisted in writing a waiver request and a Request for Reconsideration. OCRA received notification that the overpayment has been waived. Katy Lusson, CRA, Amanda St. James, Assistant CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

Medi-Cal Is Ordered to Fund A.Z.'s Orthodontia.

A.Z., a 17-year-old with Down's syndrome, applied for orthodontia braces through the Medi-Cal EPSDT program. Individuals with Down's syndrome often have teeth space issues in their mouths and need braces to correct the problem. These problems can lead to speech impairments and tooth damage. A.Z. had crowding of her top teeth which caused damage to her cusp teeth, but Medi-Cal refused to fund her braces. A.Z.'s mother filed for hearing.

At the first hearing, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) found that A.Z. met the Medi-Cal criteria for braces and proposed an order that Medi-Cal fund A.Z.'s braces. The Director of Medi-Cal overturned this decision. A.Z.'s mother called OCRA, which agreed to represent at the re-hearing stage.

For the re-hearing, OCRA secured a declaration from A.Z.'s orthodontist regarding the medical necessity of braces under the Medi-Cal criteria and under the supplemental services criteria. The ALJ found in favor of A.Z. again, and this time the Director approved the decision. Wendy Dumlao, CRA, Alba Gomez, Assistant CRA, San Diego Regional Center.

Protective Supervision Awarded Following Negotiations.

J.H. is on oxygen and requires constant supervision. J.H. was denied protective supervision despite the existence of significantly impaired memory, judgment, and orientation. J.H. was frequently found trying to pull out the oxygen tubing and crawl out of his bed with the tubing attached.

OCRA contacted the County and negotiated on behalf of J.H. with the County hearing specialist. Following informal negotiations, the County agreed to provide J.H. with 281 hours of protective supervision. Arthur Lipscomb, CRA, Kay Spencer, Assistant CRA, Nate Navarro, Temporary Assistant CRA, Central Valley Regional Center.

Benefits Reinstated and Overpayment Waived with OCRA Assistance!

R.S. is a young woman who has lived in supported living for many years. Her SLS worker changed and there was a period when R.S.'s bank account was not properly monitored. SSI sent a Notice of Overpayment and terminated benefits.

OCRA worked with R.S. and the SLS agency. OCRA obtained a letter from the agency stating that it was its fault that the overpayment occurred. OCRA got copies of R.S.'s bank statements and assisted her in writing a waiver request.

OCRA went to a meeting with R.S. at SSA and presented the information. The waiver was granted and the benefits reinstated at the meeting. Katy Lusson, CRA, Amanda St. James, Assistant CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

Direct Representation in SSI Hearing Makes a Difference.

N.A. received notice that her SSI benefits would be discontinued. She was initially found eligible for SSI using the childhood criteria for disability. Upon turning 18, a review was required to determine if N.A. met adult criteria. An appeal was filed from the initial

determination that N.A. did not meet the standards used to evaluate disability in adult claims.

OCRA provided additional evidence and direct representation at N.A.'s SSI hearing. Less than a week after the hearing, OCRA was notified of a fully favorable decision. Based on all the evidence, it was determined that N.A. met listing requirements. Arthur Lipscomb, CRA, Kay Spencer, Assistant CRA, Nate Navarro, Temporary Assistant CRA, Central Valley Regional Center.

County Ordered to Pay Increased Rate and Retroactive Payments in Dual-Agency Case.

G.C. was denied the foster care rate by the County. G.C. was entitled to the dual agency rate since she was both a regional center client and in foster care. OCRA provided direct representation at a due process hearing. OCRA prevailed and the County was ordered to pay the foster care rate of \$2006 a month, retroactive to July 1, 2007. Katie Hornberger, CRA, Harbor Regional Center, Arthur Lipscomb, CRA, Kay Spencer, Assistant CRA, Nate Navarro, Temporary Assistant CRA, Central Valley Regional Center.

Consumer Receives Fully Favorable Decision in SSI Case.

A.O. was denied SSI. A.O. filed an appeal and OCRA provided direct representation at the hearing. The issue in the case was whether or not A.O. was able to engage in any substantial gainful activity by reason of any impairment or combination of impairments.

Evidence was admitted and testimony was taken during the hearing. After careful review of the record, the ALJ determined that A.O. was disabled as of August 31, 2007, the date the application for SSI was filed and that A.O.'s disability continued through the date of the decision. The ALJ issued a fully favorable decision. Arthur Lipscomb, CRA, Kay Spencer, Assistant CRA, Nate Navarro, Temporary Assistant CRA, Central Valley Regional Center.

Foster Children Receive Supplemental AFDC-FC Benefits.

J.M. and M.M. are twins who are living with their foster parents. Because J.M. and M.M. are both mentally retarded and require a high level of care, they are entitled to supplemental Aid to Families with Dependent Children-Foster Care (AFDC-FC) benefits of up to \$1,000 per month in addition to the regular AFDC-FC of \$2,006. Their foster parents felt as if they should be receiving the additional money, but did not know what to do.

OCRA presented a training to Spanish speaking families. At the training, the foster parents asked OCRA for help in getting additional AFDC-FC. OCRA assisted the family in requesting the supplement from the County and in completing the Supplement to the Rate Questionnaire (SOC 837). J.M. and M.M. were found to need extraordinary care and supervision that cannot be met by the \$2,006 rate. The family was awarded an additional \$750 per month for each child. The family was also found entitled to benefits retroactive to 2007. Jackie Coleman, CRA, Elizabeth Kennedy, temporary Assistant CRA, Alta Regional Center.

G.C. Gets SSI and Medi-Cal Reinstated and Overpayment Cleared.

G.C. is a 27-year-old man who receives SSI. His mother is his representative payee, and his father helps him, also. His parents are both monolingual Spanish-speaking. G.C. was arrested one day last year and released. He missed one court date, but with his family's assistance, he attended every court date since the one he missed. After 8 months, the SSA sent him a letter cutting off his SSI and charging him with a large overpayment. The SSA said he had an outstanding warrant and was not entitled to any benefits for the period of the outstanding warrant. G.C. had cleared up his warrant the month after it was issued by attending his court dates.

G.C. also lost his Medi-Cal because the County improperly determined him to be medically needy and not disabled after he lost his SSI-linked Medi-Cal. OCRA intervened on both issues. OCRA filed for a Medi-Cal hearing and negotiated with the local office. The County placed him in a disability-linked bridge program pending a

redetermination of the outcome of the SSI problem. As for his SSI, the SSA told his father that it could not reinstate him until G.C. finished his court-ordered Alcoholics Anonymous meetings and counseling. This was incorrect since his warrant had been cleared and he was not fleeing to avoid prosecution.

OCRA spoke to an SSA representative who promised he would look into G.C.'s case. OCRA advised the father to get a printout of the minute order from the court. It showed that the warrant had been recalled and G.C. had appeared in court every month. G.C. and parents brought this proof to SSA and the representative immediately reinstated G.C.'s SSI. G.C. will also receive a back payment of \$7,958. G.C. was able to withdraw the Medi-Cal hearing, as he was reinstated into SSI-linked Medi-Cal. Katie Meyer, CRA, Luisa Delgadillo, Assistant CRA, Westside Regional Center.

Toddler Gets Her Nursing Hours Reinstated.

S.B. is two and has been in the hospital more of her life than she has been at home. However, S.B.'s health has been improving. Unfortunately, S.B.'s nursing hours were unexpectedly terminated. S.B.'s tracheostomy tube had fallen out in transport to the hospital and her doctor decided to not replace it. The doctor left the opening in case the tube has to be replaced. Medi-Cal In-Home Operations (IHO) responded by terminating funding for all nursing services with no notice. The nursing agency abruptly stopped coming under direction from IHO, as IHO indicated the agency would not be paid for any additional services.

S.B. went from 20 hours per day to zero hours of nursing. The family finally obtained a NOA and immediately appealed, thinking it would get aid paid pending. But IHO refused to provide the aid paid pending asserting that because S.B.'s medical needs had changed, she was no longer entitled to nursing services.

OCRA filed an expedited motion for the aid paid pending and participated in a telephone hearing on the two due process issues (lack of NOA and aid paid pending). The ALJ reinstated the services pending the hearing. S.B. began receiving 20 hours per day of IHO nursing again.

OCRA further resolved the case by working with the local IHO office and the nursing services department for the regional center. S.B. is now receiving the appropriate level of service and has withdrawn the hearing request. Katie Meyer, CRA, Westside Regional Center, Marilyn Holle, Senior Attorney, Los Angeles Regional Office.

SSI Benefits Reinstated.

J.G.'s mother received a Notice of Overpayment from the SSA terminating J.G.'s benefits and requesting reimbursement for an alleged overpayment of benefits. J.G.'s mother was told by a SSA worker that because the mother had a bank account in her name that had more than \$2,000 in it, J.G. was not eligible for SSI.

The mother requested assistance from OCRA in getting SSI reinstated. OCRA assisted the mother in filing a Request for Reconsideration and a Request for Waiver of Overpayment with Social Security. The mother co-owned the bank account with two other people. OCRA assisted in obtaining declarations from the two co-owners stating that the money that was in the bank account was actually owned by them. The co-owners also produced records showing that they had deposited and withdrawn the money in the account. Based on this information, SSI was reinstated and it was determined that there was no overpayment. Jackie Coleman, CRA, Elizabeth Kennedy, Temporary Assistant CRA, Alta Regional Center.

County to Submit a Treatment Authorization Request for Room and Board.

R.G. is a teenager with mild mental retardation and bi-polar disorder. For the past few years, R.G. has had numerous hospitalizations for psychiatric treatment. Upon release from her most recent psychiatric hospitalization, the psychiatrist recommended temporary placement at a psychiatric residential treatment facility (PRTF). R.G.'s parents receive Aide to Adoptions Program (AAP) funding and continuously asked how the PRTF placement would be funded. All agencies involved, including Children's Welfare Services (CWS), County Mental Health (CMH), regional center and Fred Finch Youth Center (FFYC) informed the parents that they must use their AAP to fund the

residential portion of the placement. The parents were reluctant to place R.G. because they could not afford the cost. Although the parents continued to ask about other funding, they were told, “the money follows the child.”

In October, 2008, R.G.’s parents were told by CWS that if R.G. was not placed at FFYC, CWS would go to court and take custody away from the parents. The parents placed R.G. at FFYC and then called OCRA for help. OCRA represented at hearing and the ALJ limited the issue as to whether the County failed to perform its duty when it failed to submit a Medi-Cal treatment authorization request (TAR) on behalf of R.G. for the residential portion of FFYC.

The ALJ agreed that a TAR should have been submitted. He also agreed that FFYC meets the definition of a PRTF, thus making Medi-Cal responsible to fund the residential portion of FFYC. But, as the ALJ had limited the hearing to one issue, he only ordered that the County and FFYC work together to submit a TAR on R.G.’s behalf. Wendy Dumlao, CRA, Alba Gomez, Assistant CRA, San Diego Regional Center.

J.H. Is Awarded 283 IHSS Hours Retroactive to the Date of Reassessment.

J.H. is a regional center consumer who has been diagnosed with autism and several other related disabilities. J.H. is non-verbal and communicates using printed cards, ASL, communication boards, vocalizations and two augmentative communication devices. Despite his mother’s request for additional IHSS hours for J.H., IHSS continued to deny her request and awarded only 56.5 hours with no protective supervision. J.H. needed protective supervision because he lets strangers into his home at night, he cannot dial 911, he leaves his home without informing any family members, he cannot ask a community member for assistance, and he cannot self-monitor the amount of medication he takes.

J.H.’s mother came to OCRA requesting assistance with appealing the IHSS denial of protective supervision and award of only 56.5 hours. OCRA assisted J.H.’s mother with preparing for the hearing.

J.H.'s mother was initially denied copies of J.H.'s records so OCRA provided the mother with the Manual of Policies and Procedures citations detailing the claimant's right to his own records. J.H.'s mother finally obtained a copy of the records. OCRA reviewed the records, prepared the hearing position statement and helped J.H.'s mother prepare for the IHSS hearing. J.H. was awarded 283 hours of IHSS including protective supervision retroactive to the date of the reassessment on February 11, 2009. Jackie S. Chiang, CRA, Guadalupe Marquez, Assistant CRA, Lanterman Regional Center.

County Agrees to Provide 195 IHSS Hours Including Protective Supervision.

At age 17, J.C. was denied IHSS. After turning 18, J.C. resubmitted her IHSS application and was awarded minimal hours with no protective supervision. J.C. was told that she should apply for the SSI out-of-home care rate rather than receive IHSS. J.C.'s mother filed for hearing although no NOA was sent. J.C.'s mother contacted OCRA, which agreed to represent J.C. A conditional withdrawal was filed with the agreement that the County would reassess. The County did not reassess but sent a new NOA with the same number of hours. As a result of the County's failure to reassess, J.C.'s mother again filed for hearing. OCRA obtained reports and medical documentation to support the need for protective supervision. At the hearing, the ALJ ordered the parties to meet and confer. After OCRA again provided J.C.'s reports and medical documentation, the County agreed to settle and found J.C. eligible for 195 hours of protective supervision. The County also agreed to reassess to determine J.C.'s eligibility for 283 hours as a person with a severe disability. Margaret Oppel, Volunteer CRA, Kendra McWright, Temporary CRA, Katherine Mottarella, CRA, Gina Gheno, Assistant CRA, Tri-Counties Regional Center.

R.W. Gets His Social Security Benefits Reinstated.

OCRA was initially contacted by R.W.'s service coordinator who reported that in 2006, R.W. lost his Social Security benefits because he allegedly engaged in substantial gainful activity (SGA). Upon investigation, OCRA discovered that R.W. was working in a sheltered workshop. According to SSA regulations, earnings do not indicate

SGA when the subsidy provided by the employer and/or by the supported employment program is deducted from an individual's earnings. Accordingly, OCRA worked with R.W.'s employer to provide information about his earnings dating back to 2005, and the amount of subsidy provided by the employer. After reviewing all the information provided, the SSA determined that R.W. was entitled to monthly disability benefits beginning in March, 1998. The SSA determined that beginning in September, 2009, R.W. will begin to receive \$941 each month. Ibrahim Saab, CRA, Ada Hamer, Assistant CRA, North Los Angeles County Regional Center.

CRIMINAL LAW

Judge Dismisses Young Man's Vehicle Code Violation.

F.E. is an adult with mental retardation who was cited for causing a hazard to cars by crossing outside of a crosswalk. He faced a fine of \$706.00 because of the original citation, a failure to appear fine, and court fees. He asked for OCRA's assistance to represent him in court since his monthly income is only SSI. OCRA obtained signed declarations from F.E.'s service coordinator and Independent Living Skills instructor that F.E. did not always understand rules in the community but that the regional center will continue to fund and work with F.E. on mobility and street crossing.

OCRA represented F.E. in court. The judge stated she did not want to hear arguments or stories from anyone. The CRA asked to approach the bench for privacy and the judge allowed her to ask for the case to be dismissed. The CRA offered copies of a psychological evaluation and the declarations. The judge accepted the argument and dismissed the case, "in the interest of justice." Katie Meyer, CRA, Westside Regional Center.

HOUSING

Housing Authority Agrees to Move J.M. to Downstairs Apartment.

J.M. was denied his request for a reasonable accommodation to move from his upstairs apartment into an accessible downstairs apartment. J.M.'s upstairs apartment was a safety hazard for the following reasons: (1) due to a lip on the threshold he was unable to enter unassisted; (2) the hallway that runs in front of his apartment is treated with a resin-like substance that makes it difficult for J.M. to walk when he uses his crutch; and (3) the elevator is periodically inoperative due to malfunction or maintenance. For over a year, the Area Housing Authority failed to respond to J.M.'s requests and physician's letters stating that J.M. needed a downstairs apartment. OCRA was contacted by J.M.'s service coordinator. OCRA agreed to represent J.M. by making a written request for a downstairs apartment as a reasonable accommodation. The housing authority agreed to place J.M. on the waiting list for an accessible downstairs apartment. Kendra McWright, Temporary CRA, Katherine Mottarella, CRA, Gina Gheno, Assistant CRA, Tri-Counties Regional Center.

Credit Bureau Releases \$200,000 Recorded Lien.

V.S. owns her own mobile home, and the property upon which it is situated. She has lived there for approximately twenty years. In the late 1980's, V.S. got married. Due to domestic violence issues, the marriage only lasted a few years. However, during the marriage, V.S. put her husband on the title to the property. The husband did not tell V.S. that he had a recorded judgment previously entered against him and his prior wife. Through the divorce action, the husband was taken off the deed and title, but the lien recorded against him attached to V.S.'s property while he and V.S. were married, and the lien remained attached.

By the time V.S. came to OCRA, due to accrued interest and costs, the lien amount was in excess of \$238,000. The property and mobile home were appraised at \$65,000 to \$70,000. V.S. was extremely concerned about losing her home, and that she would not be able to leave it to her son.

OCRA intervened with the credit bureau and its attorney, and negotiated a settlement on hardship and equitable grounds that in exchange for \$2,000 payment to cover out-of-pocket costs incurred, the credit bureau would release the lien. Payment was made on V.S.'s behalf by her mother, and the credit bureau provided full release of lien as to V.S. and her property. Andy Holcombe, CRA, Lorie Atamian, Assistant CRA, Far Northern Regional Center.

Eviction Averted with OCRA Intervention.

J.D.-H. and G.W. were roommates receiving SLS. They both had problems with using the bathroom and their landlord was threatening them with an eviction. OCRA spoke with the SLS vendor, the regional center, and the attorney for the management corporation.

The regional center increased the level of support the consumers were receiving. The SLS vendor came up with a plan to keep the apartment clean and odor free. OCRA negotiated with the attorney and drafted a document regarding the agreement between the parties. The management company agreed to allow the consumers to remain in their apartment. Katy Lusson, CRA, Amanda St. James, Assistant CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

Settlement Reached with Housing Authority.

D.S. is a 40-year-old consumer with a severe and uncontrolled seizure disorder. He lives in public housing. The Housing Authority (HA) claimed that D.S. unhooked the fire detector and that they had to pay to have it reinstalled. They sent D.S. a bill for the labor involved.

D.S. uses a wheelchair and claimed that he could not have reached the fire detector and that it was not properly hooked up in the first place. He claimed that it went off several times and that he had to call 911. The fire department came and unhooked the fire detector because it was not properly installed.

OCRA went to an informal hearing with D.S. and his mother. OCRA pointed out that there were inconsistencies in the work orders, dates,

times, and reports. Despite this and the fact that the Housing Authority had no actual evidence to support its claim, the representative from the HA reached a decision that D.S. was still liable for the full amount of the labor.

Without paying the demanded amount, the matter settled prior to formal hearing. Katy Lusson, CRA, Amanda St. James, Assistant CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

Representative Payee Pays Back Rent in Housing Case.

D.P. is a young woman who lives in public housing. When D.P. began a relationship with a man, she asked the regional center to stop being her representative payee. She wanted a relative of the man to be her payee. At some point the relationship ended and the new representative payee stopped paying D.S.'s rent and bills. The regional center again took over the responsibility as representative payee. The regional center was attempting to have the late rent payments paid by the relative-payee. The relative kept telling D.P. and the regional center that she did not owe the money and that she had worked everything out with the HA.

OCRA contacted the relative-payee and the HA. We explained to the relative-payee that we were going to assist D.P. in filing a police report and a case in Small Claims Court. Before OCRA had a chance to proceed, D.P. was informed that the back rent had been paid by the relative-payee to the HA. Katy Lusson, CRA, Amanda St. James, Assistant CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

PERSONAL AUTONOMY

OCRA and Regional Center Collaborate to Support Consumer's Choices.

V.P. is a 36-year-old consumer living at an adult residential facility (ARF). V.P. lived with her mother most of her life until her mother was hospitalized for a stroke. V.P. was placed at an ARF for safety reasons. V.P. made friends at the ARF and decided that she wanted to continue

to live at the ARF even after her mother was released from the hospital. The regional center supported V.P.'s decision but her mother did not.

V.P.'s mother called OCRA for help, but was informed that V.P. was our client and that we would support her choices. Subsequently, an IPP meeting was held. OCRA worked as a mediator between the regional center and V.P.'s mother while advocating on V.P.'s behalf. V.P. told her mother at the IPP meeting that she wanted to continue to live at the ARF. The mother agreed to V.P.'s choices. Although the mother's agreement was not necessary, it was beneficial for a resolution to this matter. V.P. will stay where she lives and will visit her mother every other weekend. Wendy Dumlao, CRA, Alba Gomez, Assistant CRA, San Diego Regional Center.

Consumer Opposes Conservatorship.

K.B. is an unconserved adult who has lived on her own for ten years with the assistance of a supported living agency. Her mother and family friend, a former SLS worker, filed a petition to conserve K.B. who called OCRA to report that she did not want to be conserved.

OCRA contacted the regional center. The regional center had no knowledge of the proposed conservatorship and opposed it. OCRA attended K.B.'s initial hearing to provide technical assistance and request court-appointed counsel for K.B. The public defender (PD) was assigned to represent K.B. The outcome of the challenged conservatorship is pending. Rita Defilippis, CRA, Eleanor LoBue, Assistant CRA, San Andreas Regional Center.

OCRA Advocates for Independent Evaluation and Access to Court System.

I.Z. is on a limited conservatorship. She does not want to be conserved. She believes that the conservator is exceeding the scope of her authority. I.Z. contacted OCRA for assistance in terminating the conservatorship.

OCRA spoke to the deputy PD assigned to I.Z.'s conservatorship case and offered technical assistance. OCRA assisted the PD in getting an affordable independent psychological evaluation to

challenge the need for the conservatorship. The PD's office funded an evaluation to determine if I.Z. needed to be conserved.

Following the completion of the evaluation, which supported termination of the conservatorship, I.Z. requested a hearing. The deputy PD did not respond to I.Z.'s request for a hearing. OCRA assisted I.Z. in writing a letter to formally request a hearing. I.Z. now has a hearing date to determine if the conservatorship should be terminated. Rita Defilippis, CRA, Eleanor LoBue, Assistant CRA, San Andreas Regional Center.

Adoption of Consumers' Baby Declared Unlawful.

OCRA was contacted after a consumer and his girlfriend had their child put up for adoption by the girlfriend's parents. OCRA met with the consumers and provided technical assistance. The consumer went to court to fight for his right to retain custody of his child. The Presiding Judge determined that the adoption was illegal and ordered the return of the baby to the consumers. Arthur Lipscomb, CRA, Kay Spencer, Assistant CRA, Nate Navarro, Temporary Assistant CRA, Central Valley Regional Center.

REGIONAL CENTER

F.C. Gets to Keep Her SLS Provider of Choice.

F.C. was sent a NOA by the regional center indicating its intent to discontinue funding F.C.'s current SLS and switch her to a new provider that could also provide SLS and Personal Attendant care services (PA). F.C. did not want to change her SLS provider because she was satisfied with the level of care and it had only been working with her one month. F.C. was advised that her current SLS provider was approved by other regional centers to provide PA services. F.C. filed for fair hearing and contacted OCRA. OCRA represented F.C. at two informal meetings with the regional center.

OCRA on behalf of F.C. reached an informal agreement with the regional center in which it agreed to: 1) maintain SLS services with her current provider; 2) begin the PA vendor process for her current

SLS provider; 3) during the PA vendor process, increase SLS hours by 160; and 4) fund an assessment with F.C.'s current SLS provider for both SLS and PA hours. Christine Armand, Associate CRA, South Central Los Angeles Regional Center.

Client Kept Out of Porterville Developmental Center.

It was decided by the regional center that A.P. should return to Porterville Developmental Center due to his behaviors and severe medical conditions. A.P.'s group home no longer felt that it could take appropriate care of A.P. A.P. very much enjoys his life and did not want to return to the development center.

OCRA became involved and persuaded the regional center to provide A.P. with a 1:1 aide and give him another chance. A.P. is working hard to remain in the community. Mario Espinoza, CRA, Valerie Geary, Assistant CRA, Kern Regional Center.

J.G. Attends the Day Program of His Choice.

J.G. graduated from the Cypress College Independent Living Skills program and was ready to move to a day program. His current teachers recommended a program for him. J.G. and his parents went to visit the program and really liked it. However, the regional center decided not to fund it as it was out of their catchment area. J.G. and his family then went to visit all of the programs offered by the regional center. None of the offered programs met his needs.

The family filed for hearing. OCRA prepared the family for the informal meeting and upcoming hearing by developing the evidence packets, witness list, opening statement, questions for witnesses, parent's testimony, and an opening brief

Following the informal meeting, the regional center offered the program that J.G. wanted. Katie Hornberger, CRA, Harbor Regional Center.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

CDE Orders School to Change Its Translation Process for IEP's.

M.M. is a high school student in a severely handicapped special day class. M.M. is non-verbal and has limited communication skills. M.M.'s mother called OCRA last year to help advocate for sign language goals. OCRA successfully secured two sign language goals in M.M.'s IEP. The team agreed to provide the mother with a copy of the IEP and the sign language words M.M. would be using in Spanish, so she could work on them at home.

M.M.'s mother called OCRA because she never received the sign language words in Spanish or a copy of the IEP. OCRA filed a compliance complaint with the California Department of Education (CDE) on M.M.'s behalf for: (1) the lack of translation of the IEP when requested; and, (2) the lack of implementation of the sign language goals. CDE found in favor of M.M. on the first issue but not the second. The school was ordered to circulate a memo regarding the laws on translation of IEP's and was required to change its translation process.

OCRA filed a reconsideration on the second issue. The CDE approved the reconsideration and the case has been assigned to a new investigator for review. Wendy Dumlao, CRA, Alba Gomez, Assistant CRA, San Diego Regional Center.

Compliance Complaint Gets Results.

J. H. is a 7-year-old student who is fully-included. J.H. was having vision and fine motor skills difficulties at school. The school district conducted occupational therapy and vision assessments to determine his educational needs. J.H.'s parents disagreed with both assessments. J.H.'s parents requested Independent Education Evaluations (IEE's) but the district failed to respond by either agreeing to the IEE's or filing a request for hearing to defend its assessments.

J.H.'s parents asked OCRA for assistance. OCRA drafted a CDE Compliance Complaint. The district then agreed to fund independent

vision therapy and occupational therapy assessments to be administered by providers of the parents' choice. OCRA attended a follow up IEP meeting. Matthew M. Pope, CRA, Lucy Garcia, Assistant CRA, Lily Susanto, Intern, Eastern Los Angeles Regional Center.

T.H. Gets School of Choice and Compensatory Speech Services.

T.H. had been attending pre-school at his home elementary school. His parents were excited for the transition to a general education kindergarten as T.H. was doing very well academically and getting bored in his preschool class. Although T.H. has Down's syndrome, he has strong academic skills and can read. However, T.H. has great difficulty with speech and, at times, is difficult to understand. At the annual IEP, the school district recommended a special day class at his home school. His parents refused and requested a general education classroom with typical peers. They also requested to visit a variety of classroom types and the logs of their son's speech services provider.

After multiple meetings with the school principal, T.H.'s parent requested an alternate school for kindergarten. The IEP team refused this request although it did offer a general education classroom with supports and related services. The family filed for hearing and contacted OCRA.

OCRA represented the family at the Informal Dispute Resolution (IDR) session with the school district. At that meeting, it was agreed that the school would try to find another kindergarten class with an opening and would review the speech logs to determine if T.H. was entitled to any compensatory services. Before the case could be resolved informally, the mediation date was held. OCRA represented the family at the mediation and obtained the school of choice, 10 hours of compensatory speech, and postponed the triennial evaluation. T.H. would start on the first day of school in a new classroom just like his non-disabled peers. Katie Hornberger, CRA, Harbor Regional Center.

Mediation Is Effective.

L.W. was scheduled to begin a resource specialist program (RSP) in a second grade classroom in September, 2009. In December of the previous school year, L.W. was placed in a first grade RSP program where he began to make friends. L.W.'s mother was concerned that L.W. did not benefit from a full year of RSP and requested that the district retain L.W. in first grade. L.W.'s mother also requested lunchtime support for social purposes, an inclusion specialist assessment, an increase in personal aide time beyond the three hours listed in the IEP, a behavioral assessment, and a Lindamood Bell assessment. At the IEP meeting, the district denied these requests. The regional center education specialist referred L.W.'s mother to OCRA for assistance.

OCRA agreed to represent at mediation. The district scheduled an informal dispute resolution meeting. Since this meeting typically excludes attorneys, OCRA helped to prepare the regional center education specialist and parent for the meeting. During the informal meeting, the district agreed to increase the aide from three to five hours per day, provide resources for a behavioral assessment, change the aide to one supervised by a behavioral-services non - public agency, incorporate strategies from the Lindamood Bell program, and conduct occupational therapy and adapted physical education assessments. L.W.'s mother signed the agreement. Matthew M. Pope, CRA, Eastern Los Angeles Regional Center.

Student Receives Appropriate Placement.

R.S. has autism. Based on his needs related to the developmental disability, he was not successful in his placement. Because his behavioral needs were not adequately addressed, R.S. was not able to access or benefit from his educational placement in an autism class. Essentially, R.S. had no educational program as required by federal and state law.

OCRA requested an independent educational evaluation to determine appropriate eligibility, placement, and related services. Pending evaluation results, J.S. has been placed in a grade appropriate non-categorical special day class with a 1:1 aide and a flexible schedule.

Rita Defilippis, CRA, Eleanor LoBue, Assistant CRA, San Andreas Regional Center.

OCRA Secures Diabetes Monitoring at School.

Over the summer, K.L. was diagnosed with diabetes. She needed additional monitoring at school. K.L.'s mother was spending the day at school to provide the monitoring for K.L.'s diabetes.

K.L.'s mother requested an IEP and was told that the school would not be able to schedule an IEP for six weeks. K.L.'s mother called OCRA. OCRA requested an emergency IEP and obtained additional documentation from the doctor.

OCRA represented K.L. at the IEP. The school district reviewed the additional documentation and agreed to implement all of the monitoring requirements at school as a related service. Yulahlia Hernandez, CRA, Trina Saldana, Assistant CRA, North Bay Regional Center.

OCRA Advocates for IEE and Related Services.

C.B.'s parent contacted OCRA seeking assistance. C.B. needed assistance obtaining a proper assessment and disability related services. OCRA agreed to provide advocacy services.

OCRA provided direct representation at two IEP's. At the first IEP, the district agreed to fund an IEE to review C.B.'s need for a 1:1 aide who could sign. At the second IEP, the district agreed to place C.B. in a classroom where the staff will communicate to C.B. using sign throughout the day's instructional program. And, an ongoing sign training will be provided to staff and C.B.'s parent on a monthly basis of not less than 1 hour per month. Arthur Lipscomb, CRA, Kay Spencer, Assistant CRA, Nate Navarro, Temporary Assistant CRA, Central Valley Regional Center.

Parent Improperly Required to Provide Assistance in Classroom.

K.A. is now two and receiving Early Start services. K.A.'s mother contacted OCRA seeking assistance in regard to her son's

educational services. The district was requiring the mother to be present in the classroom in order for K.A. to receive services.

OCRA contacted the school district explaining that it is not lawful to require the mother to work in the classroom. Additionally, the mother was using her regional center respite hours for her other two children in order to work in the classroom. The school district agreed that the mother would not be mandated to be present in the classroom. Rita Defilippis, CRA, Eleanor LoBue, Assistant CRA, San Andreas Regional Center.

OUTREACH/TRAINING

OCRA Pays Respects at Remembrance Ceremony in Stockton.

The California Memorial Project (CMP) held its annual Remembrance Ceremony at Stockton Rural Cemetery on Monday, September 21, 2009. Daniel Meadows, Disability Rights California, gave a warm welcome to everyone attending and offered some powerful words-- sharing the value and importance of the California Memorial Project.

Whether participants were former residents of a developmental center, consumers, family members, friends, support persons, or advocates, everyone enjoyed the meaningful words spoken by Krisi Franzone. She is the wife of the late Donald Roberts who was a strong advocate of this project. Mr. Roberts was also a former resident of a developmental center.

Person Centered Services (PCS) choir provided participants with the melody of *Amazing Grace* accompanied by guitar. With meaningful songs and good spirits to guide us, we all remembered that all people, regardless of disability or living situation, should be afforded dignity, respect, and love as they are laid to rest. Leinani Neves, CRA, Filomena Alomar, Assistant CRA, Valley Mountain Regional Center.

OCRA Continues Work with Early Start Program.

During September, 2009, OCRA returned to the Walton School Early Start Program to meet with parents and staff. Recent changes in the law had been enacted and all participants were concerned about the effect on the program and on individual children and families. Administrative staff were concerned because they had not yet received information about the new Prevention Program authorized by statute for children at risk for developmental disability.

OCRA staff provided training on the changes in the law, distributed resource information, and contact information for follow-up. Parents and staff had very good questions and are aware of the issues with which they are now challenged. Translation was provided to Spanish-speaking parents.

OCRA also provided a training on “Feeling Safe—Being Safe” to parents. The material for this training was developed by the Department of Developmental Services for implementation and distribution as a Self-Advocacy training by OCRA. Parents also played a Safety Bingo game developed by OCRA. It was a wonderful and productive training—enjoyed by everyone. Filomena Alomar, Assistant CRA, Valley Mountain Regional Center, Manuella Osborn, OCRA, Sacramento, Gail Gresham, Supervising CRA, Sacramento.

ADVOCACY REPORT

OFFICE OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS ADVOCACY

Winter 2009

BENEFITS

ALJ Rules That Recovery of Overpayment Would Defeat Purpose of Social Security Act.

D.P. has Down's syndrome. Her wages were not reported to the Social Security Administration (SSA) due to an oversight on the part of her Independent Living Skills (ILS) agency. D.P.'s parents and ILS worker had tried for several years to work with SSA on this issue but had been unsuccessful. OCRA assisted D.P. in filing a waiver request and a request for reconsideration. Both were denied on the basis that D.P. was "at fault" in regard to the overpayment.

OCRA represented D.P. at her administrative hearing. The Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) found that D.P. was not at fault and that recovery of the overpayment would defeat the purpose of the Social Security Act. Katy Lusson, CRA, Amanda St. James, Assistant CRC, Golden Gate Regional Center.

Working Man becomes Eligible for Zero-Share-of-Cost Medi-Cal.

K.J. is an adult who works and who was receiving Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefits. The SSA found that J.K. was eligible for Social Security Disability Insurance (SSDI) at a higher monthly benefit amount than his SSI. He began receiving SSDI and no longer received SSI. Under the *Craig v. Bonta* procedures, the county Medi-Cal office should have changed K.J. into the most favorable Medi-Cal program for which he was eligible. Instead, the county found him "medically needy" with a high share of cost. This meant his Medicare Part B premiums would no longer be paid by the state, since his Medi-Cal share of cost (SOC) was more than \$500.

OCRA determined that K.J. had been eligible for the 250% Working Disabled program from the time he lost his SSI-linked Medi-Cal.

OCRA called the Medi-Cal worker and sent a letter, and when that did not change K.J.'s status, OCRA filed for hearing.

OCRA negotiated with the county appeals specialist and entered into a conditional withdrawal. The county agreed to assess K.J.'s eligibility for the 250% Working Disabled program retroactive to the month he lost his zero-share-of cost Medi-Cal.

K.J. was made eligible for the 250% working disabled program retroactive to the first month he had a share of cost. K.J. now has no share of cost and the state will pay his Medicare Part B premium. The state also sent K.J. a check for the reimbursement of the Medicare Part B premiums that he had already paid. Katie Meyer, CRA, Westside Regional Center.

Two Brothers Receive Needed Protective Supervision.

I.E. and O.E. are brothers who are ages 13 and 8, and who each have autism and mental retardation. Both boys have 1:1 aides at school for safety reasons and have very limited ability to understand the harm that could come to them.

In 2008, I.E. and O.E.'s mother learned about protective supervision through the In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) program. She applied for protective supervision for both boys but it was denied, and each boy was only granted 16 hours per month in personal care services. The mother filed an appeal, and OCRA represented the boys at a home reassessment. OCRA prepared a packet of medical, psychological, and educational evidence about the need for protective supervision, along with an opinion letter. The county still found the boys had no need for protective supervision. OCRA requested reinstatement of the hearing.

At the hearing, the county argued that the boys were "self-directing," and simply had behavior problems. Protective supervision is not available for behavior problems. The evidence that OCRA presented explained that the boys were non-self-directing and had no ability to keep themselves safe without supervision. After the hearing, I.E. and O.E. received favorable hearing decisions and each was awarded

195 hours per month of protective supervision. Katie Meyer, CRA, Luisa Delgadillo, Assistant CRA, Westside Regional Center.

Award of Protective Supervision to Minor.

C.G. has multiple disabilities, and has significant delays due to those disabilities. Upon turning 3, C.G. transitioned from Early Start to Regional Center eligibility on the basis of autism. C.G.'s mother applied for IHSS, including protective supervision, on C.G.'s behalf at that time because of C.G.'s increase in risk to his health and safety as he became more mobile. Although there were multiple professional opinions that C.G. was significantly at risk due to his disabilities, eligibility for protective supervision was denied based upon a social worker's home visit and observations that C.G. seemed fine and engaged only in normal behavior for his age.

OCRA assisted with filing a hearing request, and represented C.G. at the hearing. The ALJ ruled in C.G.'s favor. Andy Holcombe, CRA, Lorie Atamiam, Assistant CRA, Far Northern Regional Center.

K.S. Appeals Improper IHSS Share of Cost.

K.S. receives Social Security benefits on her deceased father's earnings account as a disabled adult child and is no longer eligible for SSI. OCRA was contacted by K.S.'s supported living provider because of concerns about K.S.'s notice of an increase in her IHSS SOC. K.S. needs her entire benefit amount to continue living in her own apartment with supported living services.

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

In this case, OCRA appealed the NOA assigning a SOC and was able to get the county to correctly assign a zero SOC without going to hearing. As a result of OCRA's advocacy, K.S. is able to continue living independently. Anna Leach-Proffer, CRA, Celeste Palmer, Associate CRA, Regional Center of the East Bay

Twins Found Eligible for IHSS.

A.S. and A.S are 5-year-old twin girls diagnosed with autism. After applying for IHSS, they were denied eligibility because they did not meet the SSI disability criteria. OCRA filed for an IHSS hearing on behalf of the twins. Because the twins were not SSI recipients, IHSS needed to determine if the twins qualified for IHSS based on their disability. The twins had to be evaluated by the state disability determination process. The IHSS hearings were conditionally withdrawn reserving the initial application date of September 11, 2008, pending the outcome of the state disability determination. OCRA helped the mother fill out the lengthy disability determination paperwork. After a few months, one of the twins was found eligible by the disability determination unit. Because the other twin's paperwork was sent to a different disability determination office, she still remained ineligible. However, OCRA resolved the SSI eligibility for both of the twins and then contacted IHSS. The county IHSS office reflected the changes in its system and found the second twin eligible for IHSS. Together, the twins received 86.5 hours of IHSS and retroactive payments going back to September 11, 2008. Veronica Cervantes, CRA, Beatriz A. Reyes, Assistant CRA, Inland Regional Center.

OCRA's Technical Assistance Results in Protective Supervision for M.F.

M.F.'s parent contacted OCRA because M.F. qualified for only 22.2 IHSS hours and M.F.'s father thought that was not M.F.'s actual need. OCRA provided M.F.'s parent with self-assessment and related forms to analyze M.F.'s need for services. M.F.'s father completed all documentation and concluded that M.F.'s behaviors could qualify him for protective supervision. OCRA requested that the parents get a copy of M.F.'s records from the school district and regional center to assist in the initial assessment with IHSS.

M.F.'s father and OCRA went through all the documentation and organized a packet for M.F.'s father to give to the IHSS worker. Within 30 days of the initial assessment, M.F.'s father received the

NOA awarding M.F. 195 hours of protective supervision. Anastasia Bacigalupo, CRA, South Central Los Angeles Regional Center.

Fully Favorable Decision in SSI Case.

J.R. currently attends community college after earning a diploma at his local high school. When J.R. turned 18, the SSA notified him that he was no longer disabled and that his SSI would be discontinued. J.R. immediately requested a reconsideration. At his December, 2008, reconsideration, the hearing officer upheld the cessation determination so J.R. requested a fair hearing with continued benefits.

J.R. asked OCRA to represent him at hearing. OCRA developed a brief discussing errors the reconsideration hearing officer had made. The ALJ agreed and found J.R. eligible for SSI. Matthew M. Pope, CRA, Eastern Los Angeles Regional Center.

D.R. Receives Protective Supervision after OCRA Intervention.

D.R.'s mother, who is a monolingual-Spanish speaker, initially contacted OCRA in October, 2009, requesting assistance with obtaining protective supervision for her 18-year-old daughter who has cerebral palsy. D.R.'s mother reported that during the annual reassessment for IHSS, the county social worker requested that the parent have D.R.'s primary care physician complete the mandatory forms to document the need for protective supervision.

D.R.'s mother returned the completed form to the county. Soon after submitting the required paperwork, the parent received a NOA dated December 1, 2009, awarding D.R. a total of 52.1 hours per month which was the same amount previously awarded. The notice of action had a comment which read "pending protective supervision hours determination."

Upon receiving this NOA, OCRA advised D.R.'s mother to immediately file for hearing on the basis that her daughter was eligible to receive protective supervision hours from IHSS. OCRA explained to the parent that the December 1, 2009, NOA constituted

a constructive denial of protective supervision and that the parent had to file for a hearing to preserve the original eligibility date.

OCRA agreed to represent D.R. at the upcoming hearing. In an effort to resolve this matter informally, OCRA contacted the county appeals specialist and argued that D.R. was eligible for protective supervision. The county agreed to a conditional withdrawal in light of the additional information provided by OCRA. Subsequently, D.R.'s mother received an amended NOA dated December 31, 2009, indicating that D.R. was entitled to receive a total of 195 hours for protective supervision, bringing her total monthly hours to 247.1. Ibrahim Saab, CRA, Ada Hamer, Assistant CRA, North Los Angeles County Regional Center.

P.M. Regains His Mobility.

In 2007, P.M. had undergone a long pre-authorization process to get the expensive specialized electric wheelchair he needed funded by Medicare. As time went on, the chair was in the shop for repairs nearly as much as it was being used by P.M. The local distributor could no longer make sufficient repairs to the chair. The distributor arranged to have the chair sent back to the manufacturer in Ohio for complex repairs. The local distributor then misplaced some of the records, moved locations, and ultimately stopped even trying to get P.M. a working wheelchair.

The regional center asked OCRA to intervene. OCRA contacted the manufacturer who claimed that P.M. was a "high-end user" and therefore a new chair would not be covered. OCRA then advised the manufacturer about the "lemon laws" regarding durable medical equipment and assistive technology. The manufacturer then agreed to fit P.M. for a new chair. Jim Stoepler, CRA, Redwood Coast Regional Center.

Retro SSI.

S.M.'s mother had concerns that S.M. was not receiving the appropriate monthly SSI amount. S.M.'s mother, with help from OCRA, was successful in obtaining an increase in S.M.'s monthly SSI amount. S.M.'s mother, who is monolingual-Spanish speaking,

contacted OCRA for assistance in understanding a new letter she had received from the SSA. After reviewing the letter, it was good news that S.M. was going to receive a retro amount of \$5,384.00. Aimee Delgado, CRA, Marisol Cruz, Assistant CRA, San Gabriel/Pomona Regional Center.

County Agrees to Rescind K.M.'s Medi-Cal Termination.

K.M. appealed a Medi-Cal termination of services caused when K.M. failed to fill out and return a packet that Medi-Cal had sent K.M. The packet was very thick and included six separate application forms including applications for IHSS, voting, and immigration. K.M.'s social worker threatened to stop aid-aid-pending unless K.M. submitted a completed packet. One week later, K.M. was denied Medi-Cal coverage for K.M.'s usual monthly order of necessary medical supplies. OCRA worked with the appeals representative to reinstate K.M.'s aid-paid-pending, so that K. M. could obtain medication and supplies.

One week before the Medi-Cal hearing, K.M. received a call from K.M.'s IHSS social worker and was informed that if K.M. did not fill out a packet, K.M.'s IHSS would immediately be terminated. OCRA and K.M. contacted the social worker who agreed to provide a NOA. OCRA assisted K.M with preparing a hearing packet for the Medi-Cal hearing. Prior to the hearing, K.M.'s termination was rescinded by the appeals representative. Jacqueline Miller, CRA, Cynthia Salomon, Assistant CRA, Regional Center of Orange County.

CONSUMER FINANCE

Consumer Struggles with Credit Card Debt.

OCRA was called by M.T.'s father because he had spent many months attempting to resolve a credit card issue for his daughter. M.T. had a credit card and had considerable debt resulting from its use. Her father paid the debt and was assured by the company that the account would be closed. Unfortunately, that did not happen and M.T. was issued a new credit card.

OCRA spent many months contacting the credit agency. Several

times it seemed the issues had been favorably resolved and then M.T. would receive another phone call or bill. OCRA continued to advocate for M.T. It has now been three months since M.T. has received any further phone calls or bills from the credit agency. Katy Lusson, CRA, Amanda St. James, Assistant CRC, Golden Gate Regional Center.

Credit Account Access Re-established.

J.F. contacted OCRA because she received a notice from WalMart's credit card company stating her access to credit was terminated because of a history of bad check payments on the account. J.F. denied any history of sending bad checks. OCRA investigated records of the account and J.F.'s bank account and found no evidence of returned checks.

OCRA wrote the credit company explaining that J.F. disputed the claim of bad checks, and requested either an itemization of specific payment problems or reinstatement of the line of credit. WalMart notified J.F. a short time later that her access to her credit line was re-established. Doug Harris, CRA, Redwood Coast Regional Center.

PERSONAL AUTONOMY

Consumer Challenges Conservatorship.

I.Z. wanted to terminate her conservatorship. She felt that the conservator, who was her sister, was exceeding the scope of her authority.

I.Z. had been living in a residential care facility for years. She wanted to live more independently. On the day of hearing scheduled to contest the conservatorship, the public defender and OCRA met with the family and family's attorney. I.Z. eloquently advocated for herself. She explained why she was ready to live without a conservatorship.

I.Z. and her public defender negotiated an agreement with the conservator whereby I.Z. will be placed in her own apartment with regional center support services. The regional center will monitor

I.Z.'s progress toward independent living. The conservatorship will remain in place until it is determined that I.Z. has demonstrated the ability to live independently with regional center services. A three month review was scheduled to verify new placement and progress. Rita Defilippis, CRA, Eleanor LoBue, Assistant CRA, San Andreas Regional Center.

Requirement of Conservatorship for Continued CCS Services Avoided.

N.W. receives California Children's Services (CCS) and had recently turned 18. The local CCS office informed N.W.'s mother that a conservatorship would be needed for someone to provide consent for future services. Her mother contacted OCRA. Through consultation and research it was determined that legal precedent for consent by the closest relative was permissible. OCRA wrote a letter explaining the legal basis for consent by the mother and the inappropriateness of a conservatorship in this situation. CCS reversed its position and services continued without need of a conservatorship. Doug Harris, CRA, Redwood Coast Regional Center.

Consumers Exercise Choice.

J.K. and R.K. are brothers and are diagnosed with developmental delays and speech impairment. The brothers reside next door to their mother who lives in a senior retirement home. They love living in a small family home with people who have known them for years. The residential service provider and the brothers' sister have a difficult relationship and the sister had complained to licensing and wanted her brothers to move.

The brothers refused to move and expressed their desire to remain in their home instead of doing as their sister wanted. OCRA advocated for the clients to choose their preferred living option and remain in the community near their mother. No further changes in placement have occurred since OCRA sent a letter advocating for the rights of the brothers. Leinani Walter, CRA, Valley Mountain Regional Center.

REGIONAL CENTER

Regional Center Collaborates with School District.

S.M. and S.C. are both 7-years old and have Down's syndrome. Their parents were told that the children could not attend an after-school program. S.M. had already attended last year, with an aide paid for by regional center, and had no problems.

The new administrator of the after-school program claimed that attendance at the after-school program represented a potential "liability." County Counsel got involved and said the "liability" issue had to do with the fact that the aide worked for both the regional center and the school district. The school district wanted assurances that it would be indemnified if problems arose with the aid's work in the after-school program.

OCRA facilitated discussion between parents, regional center, the school district, and counsel for the regional center. An agreement was ultimately developed and signed by all the parties. The two children and their aide are now attending the after-school program. Katy Lusson, CRA, Amanda St. James, Assistant CRC, Golden Gate Regional Center.

Regional Center Eligibility.

A.C. was an early start client and prior to turning 3, he received more than 3 services from the regional center. During the social assessment to determine on-going regional center eligibility at age 3, A.C.'s mother reported that A.C. was talking about how much he liked Spiderman. The regional center assessor noted this in the assessment and added that A.C. sees spiders in his room. The psychologist read the social assessment and decided that A.C. has hallucinations and therefore diagnosed A.C. with psychotic disorder, though the testing indicated a diagnosis of autism.

His mother contacted OCRA. OCRA agreed to provide assistance. Based on a review of all documentation related to A.C., OCRA recommended a psychological assessment with a private psychologist for a determination of eligibility. The psychologist assessed and diagnosed A.C. with autism. OCRA submitted A.C.'s records to the regional center for a new eligibility determination. A.C.

was made eligible for regional center services. Anastasia Bacigalupo, CRA, South Central Los Angeles Regional Center.

Early Start Eligibility Redetermined.

A.D. is one-year old and receiving Early Start services. A.D.'s mother contacted OCRA after the regional center sent a NOA terminating Early Start services. The regional center alleged that A.D. no longer met the definition for an infant or toddler with a disability as a result of changes in the eligibility criteria. A new developmental assessment concluded that A.D. did not meet the requirements for significant delay of 33% in two or more areas or 50% delay in one developmental area.

OCRA provided technical assistance. At the mediation, both parties agreed to delay going to hearing in favor of a second developmental assessment. As a result of the second developmental assessment, the regional center decided to continue eligibility for A.D. under the Early Start program. Filomena Alomar, Assistant CRA, Valley Mountain Regional Center.

Regional Center Finds C.K. Eligible for Services.

C.K. was verbally denied regional center eligibility twice before contacting OCRA for assistance. Each verbal denial was given immediately upon her call to the regional center intake worker. With C.K. stating that her IQ was 90, the regional center consistently told C.K. that her IQ was too high to qualify for services. The regional center never conducted any psychological assessments to determine C.K.'s true IQ scores.

C.K. contacted OCRA for assistance with the regional center intake coordinator. OCRA provided C.K. with advice about self-advocacy, including how to work with the intake coordinator. OCRA sent C.K. a letter explaining the regional center eligibility criteria. C.K. again contacted the regional center intake coordinator, advised him that she had been in touch with OCRA and he agreed to set up an appointment for assessments. After initial and follow-up appointments, C.K. was found eligible for regional center services under the qualifying diagnosis of mental retardation. Kendra

McWright, Temporary CRA, Gina Gheno, Assistant CRA, Tri-Counties Regional Center.

R.R.'s Receives Supported Living Services.

R.R. is a 59-year-old woman with CP, who started living independently at the age of 16. As her medical care needs increased, R.R. requested supported living services (SLS). After a favorable SLS assessment, the regional center denied her request due to safety concerns because R.R. smokes.

R.R. appealed and OCRA agreed to provide legal representation at hearing. OCRA argued that providing SLS to R.R. was consistent with the Lanterman Act provisions to enable people with developmental disabilities to be integrated in the community and to obtain services and support to enable them to maintain their independence. As a result, the ALJ ordered the regional center to provide 290 hours of SLS for R.R. Wendy Dumlao, CRA, Alba Gomez, Assistant CRA, San Diego Regional Center.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Student Maintains Appropriate Placement.

K.U. has always been integrated into general education classes. At the start of her junior year of high school, the district wanted to place her in a special day class (SDC) at a different school. K.U. wanted to remain in her current placement. The district filed for due process to require K.U. to change schools.

OCRA provided direct representation at a 4-day due process hearing and prevailed on all issues. Arthur Lipscomb, CRA, Kay Spencer, Assistant CRA, Nate Navarro, Assistant CRA, Central Valley Regional Center.

Twins Obtain Appropriate Educational Program and Trained Teacher.

M.K. and I.K. are 15-year-old twins with autism. They attend a SDC for students with a combination of significant disabilities. This is the only program available to them in their remote community. M.K. and I.K.'s mother called OCRA requesting advocacy assistance because she believed her sons were not making academic progress in this school setting. She was seeking an organized, quiet classroom, with a structured schedule, led by a teacher with training or experience in autism.

OCRA represented M.K. and I.K. at an IEP meeting and argued that their current placement was not appropriate for them. The school district agreed to an assessment of the classroom by an autism specialist and to have the teacher trained in the area of autism. Arthur Lipscomb, CRA, Kay Spencer, Assistant CRA, Nate Navarro, Assistant CRA, Central Valley Regional Center.

OCRA Prevents Expulsion.

OCRA was contacted by J.W.'s Regional Center case worker due to a threatened expulsion. After receiving a letter from OCRA, the district agreed to withdraw the expulsion and assess J.W. Before the assessments could be completed, the district again attempted to expel J.W. following a second incident.

OCRA filed for due process and represented at a resolution session. The district agreed to withdraw the expulsion and assess J.W. Arthur Lipscomb, CRA, Kay Spencer, Assistant CRA, Nate Navarro, Assistant CRA, Central Valley Regional Center.

C.C. Receives Appropriate Placement.

C.C.'s family contacted OCRA because it had some concerns regarding his educational program. The family felt C.C.'s teacher was punishing C.C. without cause and the school refused to hold an IEP meeting. C.C.'s family felt his placement was no longer appropriate.

OCRA provided direct representation at an IEP. The district agreed to provide C.C. with individual counseling. They also agreed that C.C. could transition into a resource (RSP) class and offered

transportation. Arthur Lipscomb, CRA, Kay Spencer, Assistant CRA, Nate Navarro, Assistant CRA, Central Valley Regional Center.

OCRA Successfully Advocates at Manifestation Determination.

OCRA was initially contacted because R.R.'s parent wanted R.R. to attend a different school. Subsequently, the district attempted to expel R.R. OCRA provided direct representation at an IEP and manifestation determination meeting.

R.R.'s behavior was determined to be a product of his disability, so he was not expelled. R.R. was offered a program that has behavioral support funded by the school district. Transportation will be funded by the regional center. The regional center also agreed to fund an occupational therapy (OT) assessment. Arthur Lipscomb, CRA, Kay Spencer, Assistant CRA, Nate Navarro, Assistant CRA, Central Valley Regional Center.

Hot Water Restored to Student Restroom.

OCRA received complaints of hot water not being provided in the restroom which served students of a SDC. Some students were being sent home because they could not be properly cleaned without hot water. OCRA sent the school and the superintendent a Williams complaint form which explained all of the reasons why the lack of hot water is a violation of the *Williams* lawsuit.

The *Williams* lawsuit was filed on behalf of public school students to ensure that students will have books, a safe and clean school, and qualified teachers. Upon sending the complaint form, the school immediately called OCRA and stated that the hot water would be fixed the following school day.

Students will now have a restroom in proper working condition at the school. For more information about the *Williams* settlement, please go to <http://www.decentschools.org/> Yulahlia Hernandez, CRA, Trina Saldana, Assistant CRA, North Bay Regional Center.

C.M. Remains in School after Manifestation Determination.

C.M. is 15, attends a regular high school and has autism spectrum disorder. Somehow, the high school did not have information about C.M.'s diagnosis and labeled C.M. as having a speech and language delayed.

C.M. was a member of the track team. His mother usually attended his track meets so that she could supervise him and make sure that he was safe. C.M. attended a track meet without his mother. He lost a race, was very upset, and was inappropriate with other children. His mother was then called to pick up C.M. He was suspended and his parents were told that C.M. would be expelled.

OCRA was asked to help keep C.M. from being expelled. It was clear that C.M. did not understand that his behavior had harmed the other children. OCRA explained the process of the Manifestation Determination Meeting and the importance of showing that C.M.'s behavior was caused by or had a direct and substantial relationship to C.M.'s autism and his lack of understanding of how his behavior affected other people.

OCRA represented C.M. at the Manifestation Meeting and the IEP Team agreed that C.M.'s behavior was caused by his disabilities. C.M. was not expelled. C.M. is now attending a nonpublic school and is receiving appropriate services. Jackie Coleman, CRA, Elizabeth Kennedy, Temporary Assistant CRA, Alta California Regional Center.

School Agrees to Provide Transportation to Student.

B.K. recently started a new school and was told the school does not provide transportation to special education students who live close to the school or who do not have a specific type of disability. OCRA represented B.K. at his IEP and advised that the school district's position was contrary to state and federal law. The school district agreed to provide transportation for B.K. Yulahlia Hernandez, CRA, Trina Saldana, Assistant CRA, North Bay Regional Center.

Student Receives Transportation.

J.B. is a student with autism who lives over 8 miles from school. He was denied transportation services and was informed that the district no longer had funding for transportation. OCRA contacted the district to inform it that transportation is a special education service and case law makes it clear that districts are obligated to provide this service. The district agreed to provide bus transportation for J.B. Rita Defilippis, CRA, Eleanor LoBue, Assistant CRA, San Andreas Regional Center.

Student Out of School for Two Years without Appropriate Services.

V.Z. is a student with autism who has behavior challenges including jumping out of moving vehicles and physical resistance to attempts to get him to school. The school district failed to provide appropriate behavior intervention and placed V.Z. on home instruction for two years. OCRA filed for due process.

V.Z. is now placed full-time in a SDC with positive behavior intervention at home and school. He is also receiving compensatory special education services. OT services and parent training are also being funded by the district in the home.

Independent educational evaluations for speech, OT, and behavior were agreed upon and funded by the school district. Rita Defilippis, CRA, Eleanor LoBue, Assistant CRA, San Andreas Regional Center.

Student Restricted to Teacher's Lounge for One Year before OCRA Intervenes.

R.S. is a student eligible for special education under the category of autism and emotional disturbance. He had behavior problems related to his inappropriate placement in a class for students with emotional disabilities. Although R.S. was a teenager, the district placed R.S. in the only autism program in the district, a preschool. He was instructed by a 1:1 aide in the teacher's lounge for a year before his parents contacted OCRA.

OCRA negotiated an independent educational evaluation to determine an appropriate placement. R.S is now placed on a public

middle school campus in a non-categorical SDC with a 1:1 aide. He receives mental health counseling and social pragmatics small group instruction. His special education and county mental health providers case conference on a monthly basis to assess his progress and assist R.S. with appropriate self regulation skills.

OCRA also advocated for an evaluation for OT as R.S.'s behaviors were related to unmet OT needs. He is currently receiving OT twice a week. Rita Defilippis, CRA, Eleanor LoBue, Assistant CRA, San Andreas Regional Center.

R.A. Will Continue Riding the General Education Bus.

R.A. is a consumer who is integrated in an elementary school program. His father became concerned because a bus driver issued a warning about R.A.'s behavior on the bus including being out of his seat and not complying with requests to sit while in route. R.A.'s father asked the school to provide alternative transportation or reimburse him for driving R.A. to and from school. There was no reply, so he called OCRA.

OCRA advised the father to convene the IEP team to address behavior issues that occur on the bus and look for solutions that do not segregate R.A. from the general school population during transportation. As a result, the father and the IEP team agreed to measures on the regular bus that included assigning a "bus buddy" who rides to and from the same bus stop and seating R.A. in the front seat within easy view of the driver. These measures allowed R.A. to continue to ride in the regular education bus. Doug Harris, CRA, Redwood Coast Regional Center.

M.C. Will Spend More Time in a General Education Classroom.

M.C. is diagnosed with autism and lives at home with his mother. The mother contacted OCRA for assistance in advocating for school placement in the least restrictive environment for her son. The mother believed M.C. would benefit from placement in a general education classroom as opposed to placement in a SDC because he has tested in the average range of intelligence.

OCRA assisted the mother with preparing for the IEP meetings. OCRA also provided A.C. with information on the school district's responsibilities. OCRA attended a team meeting with the mother to advocate for a change from the SDC to the general education class. At this meeting, the school district agreed to begin transitioning M.C. to spend more time in the general education class. Jackie S. Chiang, CRA, Guadalupe Marquez, Assistant CRA, Lanterman Regional Center.

R.M. Will Go Back to a LRE.

R.M. is a 15-year-old with autism. During the school year, R.M. had been suspended about 9 times. Unaware of her child's rights, R.M.'s mother initially agreed to home schooling and signed an IEP authorizing the school district to place R.M. in a very restrictive non-public school placement. R.M.'s mother is a monolingual-Spanish speaker and all of the paperwork she was given, including the IEP, was provided in English. After noticing R.M. was regressing and mimicking aggressive behaviors of other students, R.M.'s mother contacted OCRA. OCRA agreed to review the case and after representing R.M. at two IEP meetings, the school district agreed to return R.M. to his previous public school placement for the upcoming semester. Veronica Cervantes, CRA, Beatriz A. Reyes, Assistant CRA, Inland Regional Center.

M.M. Is Successful in His Reconsideration Request.

Update: A compliance complaint that was filed on behalf of M.M. came back only partially in his favor. M.M.'s mother requested that OCRA appeal the California Department of Education's (CDE) finding that there was no proof that the school district did not implement M.M.'s American Sign Language (ASL) goal.

OCRA filed for reconsideration and provided additional arguments about the implementation of IEP goals. CDE approved the reconsideration request and ultimately found that the school was out of compliance with M.M.'s ASL goal. CDE ordered the district to supply it with additional documentation that the goal was being implemented or that it had been revised. Wendy Dumlao, CRA, Alba Gomez, Assistant CRA, San Diego Regional Center.

Parent Files a Compliance Complaint.

O.C. is a 5-year-old boy with autism. He resides with his parents. O.C.'s mother contacted OCRA for assistance. O.C. had not received educational support services from the school district since beginning school in October, 2008. During the 2008-2009 school year, O.C.'s parent expressed to his teacher and other district staff ongoing concerns regarding O.C.'s initial assessment results including his significant communication deficits, fine motor delays, lack of play skills, self-help and sensory processing needs, maladaptive behaviors, difficulty initiating social interactions and making transitions. OCRA assisted O.C.'s parent in filing a compliance complaint for the district's failure to hold a 30-day placement meeting as required in O.C.'s October 17, 2008, IEP; to convene an IEP meeting within 30 days of the parent's written request; to provide an assessment plan for speech/communication; to provide progress reports over the 2008-2009 school year as required in his October 17, 2008 IEP; and ensure that adequate notice is provided to IEP team members of scheduled IEP meetings. The CDE accepted the complaint for investigation and advised O.C.'s parent of its preliminary findings supporting the allegations of non-compliance. Christine Armand, Associate CRA, South Central Los Angeles Regional Center.

Compliance Complaint Yields NPA Assessments for A.C.

A.C.'s parent had been trying to get assessments and appropriate services from A.C.'s school through the IEP process. After A.C.'s parent had attended numerous IEP meetings, the parent contacted OCRA for assistance.

After a review of A.C.'s cumulative file, OCRA filed a compliance complaint with the CDE. The complaint alleged numerous procedural violations and a proposed resolution including assessment plans for OT and a functional behavioral assessment (FBA), agreement that a non-public agency (NPA) would conduct the OT and FBA assessments, and that the school receive an in-service training as to timelines associated with consent forms, assessments, and requests for IEP meetings.

The CDE investigator district found the district out of compliance and granted all aspects of the proposed resolution. Anastasia Bacigalupo, CRA, South Central Los Angeles Regional Center.

OUTREACH/TRAINING

OCRA Uses Outreach and Training to Assist Families in Preserving Social Skills Training Services.

The budget signed by the Governor on August 28, 2009, suspended a group of regional center services. These services included: camp, non-medical therapies, social recreational services, educational services, and others. The services may continue to be funded under an exception policy. OCRA began providing trainings to the community about the changes to law and the appeal process. OCRA also prepared a hearing booklet that explained the hearing process and included sample documents for families to use at hearing. These were given to many families to educate them about their rights and the appeal process.

One of these clients is W.D. a 17-year-old with autism who had been receiving services through Inclusive Education and Community Partnership (IECP). He worked with IECP to increase his functional communication (as he is non-verbal) and socialization skills. His goals include sustaining group meals, chewing food appropriately, sitting appropriately in the car and wearing a seat belt, increasing his safety awareness, expanding his concept of money and using money for purchases, and participating in non-preferred activities without protest behaviors. W.D.'s mother used the hearing booklet and sample documents to prepare for hearing. The CRA also was available for consultation and documents review. The ALJ found that the regional center had been overbroad in its interpretation of the suspended services law. He ordered the regional center to continue funding IECP. Katie Hornberger, CRA, Harbor Regional Center.



*Serving Consumers of
South Central Los Angeles Regional Center*

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

www.disabilityrightscalifornia.org

MEMORANDUM

TO: Jeanne Molineaux, Director
FROM: Anastasia Bacigalupo, Outreach Coordinator
RE: Semi-Annual OCRA Outreach Report
July – December 2009
DATE: 2/1/2010

Overview of the Past Six Months

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

For August, September and October, OCRA staff finalized their outreach goals and objectives, and began to connect with their contacts within their respective catchment areas. Also, during this period, staff doubled their outreach efforts to reach consumers, their families and circles of supports regarding the Trailer Budget Bill and potential changes to the IHSS program. Staff collaborated with DRC staff throughout the state to provide accessible outreach trainings related to the budget cuts and changes to IHSS.

Over the past six months, staff continued their focus on the development of on-going relationships with traditionally underserved communities of color, providing trainings to communities on a variety of subjects including the following: Special Education Rights, IEP Development, IPP Development, Regional Center Fair Hearing Process, Medi-Cal, Social Security, In Home Supportive Services, and Denial of Rights. Staff also conducted numerous client-centered outreaches, training consumers on financial abuse, voting rights, and clients' rights.

Target Communities

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

Outreach Highlights

Over the past six months, OCRA has provided more than 220 outreach trainings and reached over 8,900 people. Topics of these trainings ranged from "Disability Awareness" given to a local police department to "Your IPP".

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

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Semi-Annual Report - July 1, 2009 through December 31, 2009
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
Pending										5			1									6
Information/Referral	27	59	53	30	103	96	35	44	30	31	19	53	24	28	67	28	17	57	49	129	103	1082
Evaluation and Assessment	6	24	46	25	15	6	7	7	6	18	4	15	6	1	17	6	8	3	3	9	13	245
Informal Regional Center / Provider Problem Resolution	3	13		2	12	2	14	3			10	36			4	7	1			1	7	115
Informal Generic Service Agency Problem Resolution	1	8		2	23	2	1		1	1	2	18			17	3	2				14	95
Case Settlement Prior to Informal Meeting, Mediation or Hearing				1					1												1	3
Direct Representation in RC "Voluntary Informal Meeting"	1	1	2	1		1	1	1			1		1									10
Direct Representation in Mediation / RC Fair Hearing	1	1				1	1		2		1	1	1	1	4		7				1	22
Direct Representation in an Appeal for Generic Services	3	2	7		2	5	3	1	3		3	5			1	1	3		3		10	53
Court Litigation	1	2	1												1							5
Rights Information/Consultation (RC/Generic)	102	81	93	51	37	155	215	41	102	140	124	66	109	78	15	186	61	181	107	35	151	2130
Rights Information/Consultation (Other)	76	17	85	69	22	2	3	59	87	3	37	52	56	26	52	7	56	1	143	36	8	897
Abuse/Neglect Investigation	3	3		1	2		6	3							1	2						21
Special Education Compliance Complaint		2	1	1				2		1		3	2		3		2				1	18
IEP		22	2	15	2	1	1	2	5	2	2		4		25	2	1	2		1	3	92
IPP/IDT		1		2		2	1	1		6			1		7		7	2	2			32
W&I 4731	2						1	1		1										1		6
Technical Assistance	24	4	82	12	10	26	3	86	1	18	2	16	25	2	13	4	10	11	5	1	15	370
Grand Total	250	240	372	212	228	299	292	251	238	226	205	265	230	138	228	244	175	257	313	212	327	5202

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Memorandums of Understanding

REGIONAL CENTER	STATUS OF MOU
Alta	MOU dated 9/17/07.
Central Valley	MOU dated 12/19/06.
East Los Angeles	MOU dated 10/17/06.
Far Northern	MOU dated 11/17/06.
Golden Gate	MOU dated 3/07.
Harbor	Previous MOU dated 4/02. MOU needs final signatures.
Inland	MOU dated 4/10/07.
Kern	MOU dated 5/2007.
Lanternman	Previous MOU adopted 8/17/07.
North Bay	MOU dated 5/30/07.
North Los Angeles	MOU dated 11/1/09.
Redwood Coast	MOU dated 12/09.
Regional Center of East Bay	MOU dated 8/8/08.
Regional Center of Orange	MOU dated 9/07.
San Andreas	MOU dated 2/07.
San Diego	MOU dated 1/07.
San Gabriel/Pomona	MOU dated 7/30/07.
South Central	MOU dated 10/06.
Tri-Counties	MOU dated 10/06.
Valley Mountain	MOU dated 11/14/06.
Westside	MOU dated 4/07.



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

Memo

To: Disability Rights CA Board of Directors
From: Jeanne Molineaux, Director
Date: January 19, 2010
Re: Consumer Satisfaction Survey
July 1, 2009, through December 31, 2009

Attached are the results of the current Consumer Satisfaction Survey. The surveys were sent out for the period of July 1, 2009, through December 31, 2009. 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 and twenty-one surveys were mailed out. Eighty-three people returned the surveys. This represents a 12 percent return rate. Of those responding to the questions, 93 percent of the respondents who answered the questions felt they were treated well by the staff, 93 percent understood the information they were provided, 94 percent believed their CRA listened to them, 89 percent would ask for help from the Clients' Rights Advocate again, 87 percent were helped by the CRA, and 89 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.	77	6	
2. My call was returned within two (2) days	71	10	2
3. I could understand the information I got.	76	6	1
4. My Clients' Rights Advocate listened to me.	77	5	1
5. I was helped with my question/problem by my Clients' Rights Advocate.	72	11	
6. I would ask for help from the Clients' Rights Advocate again.	74	9	

Comments: ¹

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

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.

- Gracias a ustedes y su ayuda y pudimos recibir la ayuda que mi nieto necesitaba. Muchas Gracias. (Thanks to you and your help we were able to receive the help my grandson needed. Thank you very much.)
- Katie Meyer is a great resource!!
- Eleanor was an excellent advocate.
- Representative did not have enough time to help.
- Overall I was satisfied.
- They are great.
- A _____ said someone would call & they never did. I called _____ back & she called me & left mess. Matter resolved by me breaking down & crying 4 mos. later in a waste of time student study team mtg. the district required...
- I always find Ms. Meyer & Ms. Delgadillo to be very responsive and knowledgeable.
- Never help to us. I don't know why it exists.
- Mi defensora ayudo a mi hijo _____ muy bien y le agradezco mucho toda la ayuda mil gracias y dios la bendiga. (My advocate helped my son _____ very well and I appreciate all of the help one thousand thanks and God bless you.)
- Katie Meyer is great. Very helpful.
- I am happy with the services that the Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy has provided for me during my time of need, but I am unhappy about the fact that a lawyer was not able to come to the court hearing with me.
- The Advocate helped me decide whether it was wise to appeal the IRC ineligibility decision for our son.
- Don't understand meaning or question "I was listened to by my Client's Rights Advocate"?
- Jackie Chiang is an outstanding advocate! She went above and beyond the call of duty to support us in our efforts w/Regional Center and IHSS. I can't say enough about Jackie Chiang & efforts to shepherd us through the tangle of bureaucratic paperwork and in helping us understand our rights and responsibilities. She made a difficult process much more understandable and I genuinely felt she cared about the outcome of various efforts involved in securing the best treatment and services for our daughter...
- I wanted help with an appeal for SSI for my son, 19, who is a client of the _____. I was very disappointed to be told that I could not be

assisted by the Regional Center. I would think, and have been told in the past, that the Regional Center helps clients who are denied SS. My son has had SSI for about 5 years and when he had his assessment for turning 18, he was denied and was told he could work...

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

thank you for your attention. I was for about 3 years trying to communicate by telephone with the regional center and they never answered my call until someone told me to directly go to ____ and complete all of my son's _____ information directly to the offices and they took my case and _____ regional center worker called me.)

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

DISABILITY RIGHTS CALIFORNIA BOARD
OCRA ADVISORY COMMITTEE
December, 2009

Committee Members:

Dan Owen	(Bishop)
Ted Cottini	(Oroville)
Spencer McClay	(Grass Valley)
Eric Ybarra	(Stockton)
Billy Hall	(Glendale)

OCRA ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES
September 11, 2009

Present: Ted Cottini, Billy Hall, Spencer McClay, Eric Ybarra

Absent: Dan Owen

Staff: Yulahlia Hernandez, Jeanne Molineaux, Celeste Palmer, and Alice Ximenez

Facilitators: Steve Austin, Chris Peterson, Larry Prosser, and Jenny Valentine

Eric Ybarra called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m.

Presentation: Yulahlia Hernandez, Clients' Rights Advocate, North Bay Regional Center, shared information regarding outreach efforts to the Spanish speaking community and recent case outcomes related to reduction in camping, respite, and important facts regarding appeals.

Budget Change Fact Sheets: Jeanne Molineaux and Yulahlia Hernandez reviewed all Disability Rights California Fact Sheets on budget cuts.

Presentation: Celeste Palmer, Clients' Rights Advocate, Regional Center of the East Bay, shared information regarding outreach efforts with focus on problem solving techniques, followed by discussion regarding recent cases related to communication devices, consumer placement, transportation, IHSS cuts, and co-counsel agreements with Regional Offices.

Activity: Yulahlia Hernandez facilitated a demonstration of introduction to Safety Preparedness Bingo for consumers and requested feedback from members regarding changes to bingo icons.

The meeting adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

ATTEST,

Eric Ybarra, Chair

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Self-Advocacy Trainings
July 1, 2009 - December 31, 2009

Self-Advocacy Trainings held:

Central Valley RC	September 17, 2009 November 18, 2009
East LA RC	December 14, 2009
Golden Gate RC	August 20, 2009 (1) August 20, 2009 (2) September 22, 2009 December 8, 2009
Kern RC	August 18, 2009 (1) August 18, 2009 (2) August 18, 2009 (3) August 18, 2009 (4) October 7, 2009
Lanternman RC	September 28, 2009
North Bay RC	September 25, 2009
North LA RC	August 28, 2009 September 5, 2009 September 18, 2009
RC of the East Bay	August 6, 2009
RC of Orange County	July 8, 2009 August 19, 2009 September 8, 2009 September 22, 2009
Valley Mountain RC	August 17, 2009 October 16, 2009
Westside RC	October 16, 2009

**OFFICE OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS ADVOCACY
SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT
JULY 1, 2009 – DECEMBER 31, 2009**

TITLE 17 REPORT

TITLE 17 LETTER	COMPLAINT (INITIALS)	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	STATUS	OUTCOME
7/24/09	S.A.	Various	Closed	Allegations not Supported

**OFFICE OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS ADVOCACY
SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT
(July 1, 2009 – December 31, 2009)**

DENIAL OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS

Regional Center	Good Cause	Right(s) Denied	Date Denial Began	Date of Review	Date of Restoration
ACRC09-06	O, D	C	6/1/09	6/30/09	7/1/09
HRC09-04	I	V, J	3/27/09	4/24/09	Ongoing Review
HRC09-04	I	V, J	3/27/09	5/28/09	Ongoing Review
HRC09-04	I	V, J	3/27/09	6/28/09	6/28/09
HRC09-05	I, O	V, J	6/19/09	6/19/09	Ongoing Review
HRC09-05	I, O	V, J	6/19/09	7/8/09	7/8/09
SD09-11	L	V	12/15/09	12/15/09	Ongoing Review

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, 2009 – DECEMBER 31, 2009**

CONSUMER GRIEVANCES WITH CONTRACTOR

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