

OCRA SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT
(July 1, 2010 - December 31, 2010)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES	2
A. Services are provided in a manner that maximizes staff and operational resources	2
1) Advocacy Reports.....	2
2) Analysis of Consumers Served	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	9
1) Consumer Satisfaction Survey	9
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.....	13
V. CONSUMER GRIEVANCES.....	14
VI. CONCLUSION.....	14

TABLE OF CONTENTS - PAGE TWO

<u>EXHIBIT LIST</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
EXHIBIT A (Staff Roster).....	1
EXHIBIT B (Statistics)	2
EXHIBIT C (Advocacy Report Fall 2010, Advocacy Report Winter 2010).....	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 California Department of Developmental Services (DDS), through Disability Rights California's Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy (OCRA). The current contract is effective through June 30, 2011. Disability Rights California was awarded a new contract, through the state competitive bidding process, effective July 1, 2011. This is the final semi-annual report under the current contract covering July 1, 2010, through December 31, 2010.

OCRA takes great pride in its accomplishments. The statistics and work product for the past six months, which are discussed throughout this report, give ample evidence of continuing effective advocacy. During the past six months, OCRA resolved over 4,863 issues for consumers. Additionally, OCRA staff participated in 205 trainings presented to approximately 10,141 people.

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

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

II. PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES

Disability Rights California's contract with DDS requires performance outcomes, as established in Exhibit E, Paragraph 3, of the above-referenced contract. Each of the specific required outcomes is discussed in the following Sections A through F.

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

OCRA continues its tradition of serving a large number of people with developmental disabilities. OCRA handled 4,863 issues for regional center consumers during the first 6 months of the fiscal year. The breadth of issues in these cases is staggering and OCRA staff remains knowledgeable about the current law in an effort to help consumers and parents understand recent changes and their rights. The statistics, attached as Exhibit B, are discussed below and show the wide variety of issues and the large number of cases handled by OCRA staff.

1) Advocacy Reports.

Each advocate provides on a quarterly basis a summary of at least one administrative hearing or other case that has unique situations from which others can learn and that can be used as examples of the advocacy that OCRA accomplishes. The summaries for Fall, 2010, and Winter, 2010, are compiled and attached as Exhibit C. OCRA is extremely pleased that such outstanding examples of advocacy are available to show the value of the work that OCRA accomplishes. A few examples of the advocacy:

Judge Rules That the IHSS Two-parent Household Rule Is Invalid.

E.P. is a minor with multiple disabilities, including seizures and a medical condition which most children do not survive past infancy. Due to the care provided by E.P.'s mother. E.P. is now four years old.

E.P.'s mother was a dental assistant before E.P. was born, but her mother can no longer work due to the care provided to E.P. E.P.'s mother applied for IHSS for E.P. and was denied because two parents were in the home. OCRA represented E.P. at her IHSS hearing and argued that the two-

parent household regulation is invalid because the statute does not allow it. At hearing, the IHSS supervisor admitted that she knew that the State was in the process of removing that regulation from the Department of Social Services Manual of Policy & Procedures.

A hearing decision was rendered in E.P.'s favor. The ALJ determined that E.P. had a need of more than 400 hours a month. She also determined that the two-parent household rule was contrary to the purpose of IHSS and therefore invalid. E.P. received 283 hours per month retroactive to the date of application.

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

K.G.'s mother contacted OCRA requesting assistance with a denial of SSI eligibility. K.G. is a 21-year-old with established regional center eligibility. His regional center case workers are very supportive.

OCRA agreed to represent K.G. at hearing. It was determined that K.G. met the listing for mental retardation and should have been found eligible for SSI previously. As a result of the failure of SSI to find him eligible, the ALJ found that K.G. was entitled to a retroactive payment to the date he initially applied for benefits. The ALJ awarded over \$16,000 in retroactive benefits.

OCRA Obtains Busing for Special Education Students Who Live in an Apartment.

M.J. is 5-years-old and lives with his family. He is very medically fragile, cognitively impaired and uses a wheel chair. For the last few years, the school transported M.J. from the door of his apartment to school. Last summer, the school informed the family that it was the district policy to NOT transport children within an apartment complex and that M.J. never should have been transported to his door.

M.J.'s family asked OCRA for assistance in getting M.J. bused to his door as M.J. can become very ill when he is outside in the elements, plus he is not able to get himself to the school bus stop outside of his apartment complex.

Because the family obtained documentation from the school that it was school district policy not to transport special education students to their door if they live in an apartment, OCRA filed a Compliance Complaint on behalf of all students in special education who live in an apartment building.

The CDE contacted 35 families in the school district and verified that students were delivered to their door if they lived in a house, but not if they lived in an apartment.

The school district was ordered to hold Individual Education Plan (IEP) meetings by the end of January, 2011, for all special education students who live in an apartment and to provide verification to CDE that families have been informed of their right to have door-to-door transportation if the student needs it and that all students who need the transportation are receiving it.

H.H. Gets His Security Deposit Back.

H.H. was living in a regional center group home and wanted to move into an apartment in a new area. After saving and preparing, H.H. signed the lease for his own apartment. The landlord required a substantial security deposit but H.H. agreed to it because he really wanted to live independently in that area. When H.H. contacted the electric company, H.H. discovered that the building did not receive electricity. The electric company suggested that H.H. contact the police department because the landlord had a reputation in the area for renting sub-habitable apartments.

H.H. decided not to rent any apartment from that landlord. When H.H. tried to get out of the contract and get his security deposit returned, the landlord refused.

OCRA helped H.H. and his mother draft a letter to the landlord citing the relevant laws regarding the return of security deposits and habitability generally. The landlord then agreed to return both the security deposit and the rent paid.

2) Analysis of Consumers Served.

OCRA handled a total of 4,863 cases from July 1 through December 31, 2010. 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, 1,422 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 728 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 3,482 consumers in the family home or 72 percent of the cases handled. The next largest group served is those living independently, with OCRA serving 674 people or 14 percent with this living arrangement.

OCRA's statistics on the ethnicity of consumers served from July 1, 2010, through December 31, 2010, show OCRA's continuing commitment to serve underserved communities.

The percentage of consumers from various ethnicities served by OCRA is¹:

¹ OCRA rounds off its representation numbers so the total might exceed 100 percent.

Ethnicity	% OCRA Clients 7/1/10 - 12/31/10	% OCRA Clients 7/1/09 – 12/31/09	% RC Clients Dec. 2007
African-American	9	9	10.35
Latino	34	35	31.92
American-Indian or Alaskan Indian	1	1	.41
Asian	4	4	5.90
Pacific Islander	1	1	2.46
White	44	45	41.74
Multicultural (Self- Identify)	4	4	Not listed
Refused to State/Other	4	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.

This six month period, the OCRA offices handled 910 education matters and 1,780 regional center matters. This continues to represent a change in trend in which OCRA had fairly consistently handled more special education matters than regional center. This can be accounted for by the many changes in the Lanterman Act which were implemented by the regional centers during the past year. Consumers and parents had many questions about the changes which OCRA attempted to answer. OCRA also handled this year approximately 871 cases dealing with income maintenance, which includes Social Security and In-Home Supportive Service, and over 100 cases each in abuse, conservatorship, finance, health, housing, and personal autonomy.

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

3) Outreach/Trainings.

OCRA recognizes that outreach and training are an essential part of providing effective advocacy for regional center consumers and also

recognizes that trainings are one of the best ways to maximize staff and operational resources. Therefore, OCRA offers training on a wide variety of issues to a large variety of participants, including consumers, parents, regional center staff, vendors, and other interested people. Topics covered include, but are not limited to, consumers' rights, abuse and neglect issues, special education, voting rights, Medi-Cal and Medicare issues, and conservatorships, among other topics.

During the past six months, OCRA staff presented at a total of 205 trainings with a combined attendance of approximately 10,141 people. This is an outstanding performance by OCRA staff .

OCRA understands the need to provide assistance to individuals from traditionally underserved communities. To further the goal of meeting this need, OCRA has each office target at least three outreaches per year to a specific group of persons who are underrepresented in the office catchment area. To help with this, OCRA appointed 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 a bi-annual basis. A detailed report on target outreach and training is included as Exhibit D.

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

From July 1, 2010, through December 31, 2010, OCRA resolved 4,863 issues for consumers. Of those served, all but 48 were resolved informally. This means that 99 percent of all the matters that OCRA handled were resolved informally. Data showing this is attached as Exhibit E.

C. Collaborative and harmonious working relationships are fostered.

If at all possible, OCRA staff 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 address 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 all of the regional center directors or designees to revise the existing MOUs. All of the MOUs have been completed and forwarded to DDS. The status of each revised MOU is discussed in Exhibit F.

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

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

Catherine Blakemore, Executive Director, Disability Rights California, Jeanne Molineaux, Director, OCRA, and Bob Baldo, Executive Director of the Association of Regional Center Directors, met in July, 2010. At that time, several outstanding issues were discussed 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.

Three hundred and fifty-seven surveys were mailed out. Eighty-seven people returned the survey, which represents 24 percent of the surveys mailed. Of those responding to the questions, 98 percent of the responders felt they were treated well by the staff, 94 percent understood the information they were provided, 95 percent believed their CRA listened to them, 92 percent believed they were helped by the CRA, and 98 percent would ask for help from OCRA again. 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 letters²:

The team recognizes the wonderful time you provided to clients and senior companions, as well as level of care staff. I know all who attended had a great time and everyone came away a "winner" with the great prizes you provided.

Your willingness to organize and implement Advocacy Bingo demonstrates your understanding of, and commitment to, the values of _____, specifically, leadership, serving others and respectful relationships. Please accept our sincerest thanks and congratulations for a job well done!"

"Thank you so much! I appreciate you taking the time to talk to me. I will keep your number handy in case I need you! I really appreciate the information you are passing along."

"You made a real difference in my girl's life and was a blessing to all of us."

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

“I would like to express my gratitude to the Office of Clients’ Rights Advocacy for all the support and services they have provided for my special needs child, and in turn my entire family. Your presence was vital for my special needs son in getting him the services and equipment that he really needed.

We greatly appreciate you for advocating for my son and every special needs family. As you know when you have a special needs family member every day life is a much bigger challenge than normal. Your organizations mission makes a huge difference in our lives and I hope you guys are around a very long time and continue to advocate for families like mine. Thank you for being there.”

“Thank you very much for your help. The information you sent was useful and provided me with some additional information I wasn’t aware of. My hearing today went well – I think the mediator will recommend in our favor with everything I presented. We will move forward from here and present to the board on 7/27 where we will be given an answer as to whether or not the appeal for the permit is granted or denied.”

“Today I received a call from the mother of _____. She simply wanted to thank your office for what we do and to say she has been very happy with our services and that our work is needed and appreciated.”

“Even though it took a long time to bring this to you, I want you to know that there’s not a lot of people like you in this world anymore. You took the time & patience to help my mom & me (a lot) I thank God for people like you everyday.”

“...Thank you so much for all your help in this Herculean effort. Your knowledge of the law, as it applied to IHSS, made the difference in crafting the arguments behind the appeal, and gathering supporting evidence.”

“I really appreciate all of your help and I am glad I met you and that I attended your class on IHSS and I am hoping that I will continue to attend other training sections from your organizations. Going to mediation was an opportunity and experienced of learning about how to defend the rights of my son. I really believed in what my son’s doctors told me that I will have to educate and take care of myself in order to take care of my son. I

definitely need to read the book on “Lanterman Law” and become more familiar with the law.

I definitely will keep in touch, I know you are a very busy person but I can tell that you really love your job defending people for what is right. You have a tough job but also rewarding knowing you are helping others in need. I have a lot of respect and admiration for the work you do.”

“Yo,____ padre legal y tutor de ____por este medio le doy las infinitas gracias con el servicio de avogacia que me brindo- Jackie Chiang y Jazmin Romer. Donde ahora, yo estoy satisfecho con los servicios que estoy recibiendo.” (“ I,____ legal father and tutor of ____ by this means give infinite thanks for the services of advocacy that has been rendered to me- Jackie Chiang and Jazmin Romero. Where now, I am satisfied with the services that I am receiving.”)

“...We got the shower chair.it was useful to mention the office of disabilities rights,I would like to write a appretition letter,where should I address the letter to. THANK YOU so much for all your help. You guys really make a big difference,specially in this hard time,that disable,and elderly people are under attack,that’s the way it feels,you guys are a little light at the end of the tunnel.Thank god that we still have u guys around .You guys are a great support.Thak you again and god bless you.”

“Thanks for your time and energy in editing our letter. It’s much more authoritative now. As always, we appreciate your invaluable assistance.”

“I AM WRITEING TO YOU ON THE BEHALF OF MYSELF, _____. FIRST OF ALL I WOULD LIKE TO THANK YOU ... FOR STICKING UP FOR ME AT MY ANEL REVIEW! THANK YOU!”

3) Cases will be handled in a timely manner.

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

measures its performance in this area by use of its consumer satisfaction survey, see Exhibit G, discussed more fully above. OCRA statistics show that 83 percent of all callers to OCRA received a call back within two days during the first half of this fiscal year. OCRA will continue to train on this requirement to ensure that it provides exceptional services for all callers.

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

OCRA works through the OCRA Advisory Committee to ensure that this performance outcome is achieved. The OCRA Advisory Committee, which is a standing committee of Disability Rights California's Board of Directors, meets twice a year at various locations throughout the state. Attached as Exhibit H is a list of the members of the Board OCRA Advisory Committee effective December 31, 2010.

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

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

DDS staff is invited and encouraged to participate in any of the meetings set for 2011. They are:

February 25, 2011	Sacramento
September 23, 2011	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 per year. Disability Rights California's contract with DDS mirrors this language. OCRA has been proactive in this matter and requires each of its offices to provide at least one self-advocacy training for consumers a year. Many offices provide more than one training. OCRA far exceeds the mandatory self-advocacy training requirement.

To date, OCRA has developed 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 were three Title 17 complaints 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.

Four first level grievances were filed by consumers or their families against OCRA during the last two quarters and one continued to the second level. 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 4,863 cases the last six months. Additionally, OCRA provided 205 trainings to over 10,141 consumers, their families and interested people. OCRA continues to meet each of its performance objectives. OCRA remains dedicated to ensuring that the rights of all of California's citizens with developmental disabilities are enforced.

OFFICE OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS ADVOCACY LISTING

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

Toll Free Number: 1-800-390-7032

Changes to office – **as of February 1, 2011** - Change is *italicized*.

ALTA CALIFORNIA REGIONAL CENTER

Jackie Coleman - CRA

Jacqueline Gallegos –Assistant CRA(On LOA)

Elizabeth Kennedy – Temp Administrative Assistant

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy

100 Howe Avenue, Ste. 240N

Sacramento, CA 95825

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

Email: Jackie.Coleman@disabilityrightsca.org

Jacqueline.Gallegos@disabilityrightsca.org

Elizabeth.Kennedy@disabilityrightsca.org.

Supervised by Jeanne Molineaux

CENTRAL VALLEY REGIONAL CENTER

Kendra McWright - CRA

Kay Spencer- Assistant CRA (part-time)

Maricruz Magdaleno – Temp Assistant CRA

567 W. Shaw Avenue

Fresno, CA 93704

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

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

Kay.Spencer@disabilityrightsca.org,

Maricruz.Magdaleno@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Gail Gresham

EASTERN LOS ANGELES REGIONAL CENTER

Jackie Chiang - CRA

Lucy Garcia - Assistant CRA

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

Alhambra, CA 91802

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

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

E-mail: Jackie.Chiang@disabilityrightsca.org

Lucy.Garcia@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Katie Hornberger

FAR NORTHERN REGIONAL CENTER

Andy Holcombe - CRA

Lorie Atamian – Assistant CRA (part-time)

1280 East 9th Street, Unit E

Chico, CA 95928

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

E-mail: Andy.Holcombe@disabilityrightsca.org

Lorie.Atamian@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Jackie Coleman

GOLDEN GATE REGIONAL CENTER

Katy Lusson - CRA

Trina Saldana - Assistant CRA

35 Mitchell Blvd., Suite 9

San Rafael, CA 94903

Phone: (415) 499-9724

Fax: (415) 499-9728

Toll Free: (866) 833-6713

E-mail: Katy.Lusson@disabilityrightsca.org,

Trina.Saldana@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Gail Gresham

***HARBOR REGIONAL CENTER**

Eva Casas-Sarmiento – Interim CRA

Abigail Perez - Assistant CRA (part-time)

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy

13005 Artesia Blvd., Suite A214

Cerritos, CA 90703

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

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

Abigail.Perez@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Katie Hornberger

INLAND REGIONAL CENTER

Veronica Cervantes – CRA

Beatriz Reyes - Assistant CRA (on LOA)

Matthew O'Neill – Temporary 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,

Matthew.Oneill@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Jacqueline Miller

KERN REGIONAL CENTER

Mario Espinoza - CRA

Valerie Geary - Assistant CRA

Ana Pelayo - Administrative Assistant (part-time) (LOA)

3200 North Sillect Ave.

Bakersfield, CA 93308

Phone: (661)327-8531, Extension 313

Fax: (661)322-6417

E-mail: Mario.Espinoza@disabilityrightsca.org

Valerie.Geary@disabilityrightsca.org

Ana.Pelayo@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Gail Gresham

***FRANK D. LANTERMAN REGIONAL CENTER**

Tim Poe - CRA

Jazmin Romero – ACRA

Jordan Arciaga - Volunteer

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy

3580 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 925

Los Angeles, CA 90010

Phone: (213)427-8761, Extensión 3673

Fax: (213)427-8772

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

Jazmin.Romero@disabilityrightsca.org,

Jordan.Arciaga@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Katie Meyer

NORTH BAY REGIONAL CENTER

Yulahlia Hernandez - CRA

Annie Breuer - Assistant CRA

Victor Hurtado - Volunteer

Mailing Address is:

P.O. Box 3360

Napa, CA 94558

Phone: (707)224-2798

Fax: (707)255-1567

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

Annie.Breuer@disabilityrightsca.org,

Victor.Hurtado@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Gail Gresham

NORTH LOS ANGELES COUNTY REGIONAL CENTER

Ibrahim Saab - CRA

Ada Hamer - Assistant CRA

Gloria Flugum – Temp Clerical Support

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy

3580 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 925

Los Angeles, CA 90010

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

Fax: (213)427-8772

E-mail: Bebo.Saab@disabilityrightsca.org

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

Supervised by Irma Wagster

REDWOOD COAST REGIONAL CENTER - Eureka

Heriberto Herrera – Assistant CRA

525 Second Street, Suite 300

Eureka, CA 95501

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

Fax: (707) 444-2563

E-mail: Heriberto.Herrera@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Katie Hornberger

REDWOOD COAST REGIONAL CENTER - Ukiah

Jim Stoepler - CRA

1116 Airport Park Blvd.

Ukiah, CA 95482

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

Fax: (707) 462-3314

E-mail: Jim.Stoepler@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Katie Hornberger

REGIONAL CENTER OF THE EAST BAY

Megan Chambers - CRA

Celeste Palmer - Associate CRA

1330 Broadway, Suite 500

Oakland, CA 94612

Phone: (510) 267-1280

Fax: (510) 267-1281

E-mail: Celeste.Palmer@disabilityrightsca.org,

Megan.Chambers@disabilityrightssca.org

Supervised by Andrew Holcombe

REGIONAL CENTER OF ORANGE COUNTY

Jacqueline Miller - CRA

Cynthia Salomon – Assistant CRA

13272 Garden Grove Blvd.

Garden Grove, CA 92843

Phone: (714) 621-0563

Fax: (714) 621-0550

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

Cynthia.Salomon@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Irma Wagster

SAN ANDREAS REGIONAL CENTER

Rita Defilippis - CRA

Filomena Alomar - ACRA

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy c/o San Andreas Regional Center

300 Orchard City Drive, Suite 170

Campbell, CA 95008

Phone: (408) 374-2470

Fax: (408) 374-2956

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

Supervised by Katie Hornberger

SAN DIEGO REGIONAL CENTER

Wendy Dumlao - CRA

Alba Gomez - Assistant CRA

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy

1111 Sixth Avenue, Suite 200

San Diego, CA 92101

Phone: (619) 239-7877

Fax: (619) 239-7838

E-mail: Wendy.Dumlao@disabilityrightsca.org

Alba.Gomez@disabilityrightsca.org, Jose.Corona@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Jeanne Molineaux

SAN GABRIEL/POMONA REGIONAL CENTER

Aimee Delgado - CRA

Marisol Cruz - Assistant CRA

3333 Brea Canyon Road, Suite #118

Diamond Bar, CA 91765-3783

Phone: (909)595-4755

Fax: (909)595-4855

E-mail: Aimee.Delgado@disabilityrightsca.org

Marisol.Cruz@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Irma Wagster

SOUTH CENTRAL LA REGIONAL CENTER

Anastasia Bacigalupo - CRA

Christine Armand - Associate CRA

4401 S. Crenshaw Boulevard, Suite 316

Los Angeles, CA 90043-1200.

Phone: (323) 292-9907

Fax: (323) 293-4259

E-mail: Anastasia.Bacigalupo@disabilityrightsca.org

Christine.Armand@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Irma Wagster

TRI-COUNTIES REGIONAL CENTER

Katherine Mottarella – CRA

Gina Gheno - Assistant CRA

520 East Montecito Street

Santa Barbara, CA 93103

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

Fax: 805-884-7219

E-mail: Katherine.Mottarella@disabilityrightsca.org,

Gina.Gheno@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Irma Wagster

VALLEY MOUNTAIN REGIONAL CENTER

Leinani Walter – CRA

VACANT- Assistant CRA

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy

Valley Mountain Regional Center

702 N. Aurora Street

Stockton, CA 95202

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

Fax: (209) 462-7020

E-mail: Leinani.Walter@disabilityrightsca.org,

Kendra.McWright@disabilityrightsca.org,

Filomena.Alomar@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Gail Gresham

WESTSIDE REGIONAL CENTER

Katie Meyer - CRA

Luisa Delgadillo - Assistant CRA

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

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy

5901 Green Valley Circle, Suite 410

Culver City, CA 90230

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

Fax: (310)338-9716

E-mail: Katie.Meyer@disabilityrightsca.org

Luisa.Delgadillo@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Katie Hornberger

Sacramento OCRA

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

Los Angeles OCRA

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

Director:

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

Supervising Clients' Rights Advocates:

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

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

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

Support Staff Sacramento:

Alice Ximenez, Office Manager II

(916) 575-1615, Extension 8143

Email: Alice.Ximenez@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Jeanne Molineaux

Sacramento

Vanessa Ochoa-Alcaraz, Administrative Assistant I

(916) 575-1615, Extension 8141

Email: Vanessa.OchoaA@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Alice Ximenez

Sacramento

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

Rosana Orozco, Bilingual ACRA

(213) 427-8761

Email: Rosana.Orozco@disabilityrightsca.org

Supervised by Irma Wagster

Los Angeles

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

1.	Arciaga, Jordan	LRC (Volunteer)
2.	Alcaraz, Vanessa Ochoa	OCRASAC
3.	Alomar, Filomena	SARC
4.	Armand, Christine	SCLARC
5.	Atamian, Lorie	FNRC
6.	Bacigalupo, Anastasia	SCLARC
7.	Breuer, Annie	NBRC
	<i>Casas-Sarmiento, Eva</i>	<i>HRC</i>
8.	Cervantes, Veronica	IRC
9.	Chambers, Megan	RCEB
10.	Chiang, Jackie	ELACRC
11.	Coleman, Jackie	ACRC
12.	Cruz, Marisol	SGPRC
13.	Delgadillo, Luisa	WRC
14.	Delgado, Aimee	SGPRC
15.	Defilippis, Rita	SARC
16.	Dumlao, Wendy	SDRC
17.	Espinoza, Mario	KRC
18.	Flugum, Gloria	NLACRC
19.	Gallegos, Jacqueline	ACRC (on LOA)
20.	Garcia, Lucy	ELARC
21.	Geary, Valerie	KRC
22.	Gheno, Gina	TCRC
23.	Gomez, Alba	SDRC
24.	Gresham, Gail	OCRASAC
25.	Hamer, Ada	NLACRC
26.	Hernandez, Yulahlia	NBRC
27.	Herrera, Heriberto	RCRC-Eureka
28.	Holcombe, Andy	FNRC
29.	Hornberger, Katie	HRC
30.	Hurtado, Victor	NBRC (Volunteer)
31.	Kennedy, Elizabeth	ACRC
32.	Lusson, Katy	GGRC
33.	Magdaleno, Maricruz	CVRC (Agency Temp)
34.	McWright, Kendra	CVRC

35. Meyer, Katie	WRC
36. Miller, Jacqueline	RCOC
37. Molineaux, Jeanne	OCRASAC
38. Mottarella, Katherine	TCRC
39. Oppel, Margie	KRC (Special Project)
40. Orozco, Rosana	OCRALA
41. Ortega, Maria	OCRALA
42. Palmer, Celeste	RCEB
43. Pelayo, Ana	KRC (on LOA)
44. Perez, Abigail	HRC
45. Poe, Tim	HRC
46. Reyes, Beatriz	IRC (on LOA)
47. Romero, Jazmin	LRC
48. Saab, Ibrahim	NLACRC
49. Saldana, Trina	GGRC
50. Salomón, Cynthia	RCOC
51. Spencer, Kay	CVRC
52. Stoepler, Jim	RCRC-Ukiah
53. Wagster, Irma	OCRALA
54. Walter, Leinani	VMRC
55. Ximenez, Alice	OCRASAC

Updated as of February 1, 2011

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Semi-Annual Report - July 1, 2010 through December 31, 2010
Report by Age Group

AgeRange	ARC	CVRC	ELARC	FNRC	GGRC	HRC	IRC	KRC	LRC	NBRC	NLARC	RCEB	RCOC	RCRC	SARC	SCLARC	SDRC	SGPRC	TCRC	VMRC	WRC	Total
0-3	18	6	13	4	4	8	18	7	13	4	5	8	17		5	15	9	13	12	4	29	212
4-17	71	93	130	32	30	57	98	78	57	52	36	62	46	24	91	114	68	66	73	55	89	1422
18-22	33	33	42	22	16	23	29	22	13	22	19	27	16	19	26	22	21	16	34	39	47	541
23-40	33	30	43	57	35	16	40	42	15	50	23	49	26	35	26	24	37	28	49	28	42	728
41-49	15	10	10	27	24	5	8	11	4	24	16	5	8	12	4	7	10	11	16	13	23	263
50+	15	15	15	19	28	10	9	11	4	16	6	18	9	2	6	8	6	6	23	11	12	249
Unknown								2							1							3
Total	185	187	253	161	137	119	202	173	106	168	105	169	122	92	159	190	151	140	207	150	242	3418

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Semi-Annual Report - July 1, 2010 through December 31, 2010
Report by County

	ARC	CVRC	ELARC	FNRC	GGRC	HRC	IRC	KRC	LRC	NBRC	NLARC	RCEB	RCOC	RCRC	SARC	SCLARC	SDRC	SGPRC	TCRC	VMRC	WRC	Total
Alameda										1		140										141
Alpine	1																					1
Amador																					7	7
Butte				134																		134
Calaveras																					4	4
Contra Costa	1											92										93
Del Norte														4								4
El Dorado	14																					14
Fresno		121																				121
Glenn				4																		4
Humboldt														28								28
Imperial	1																12					13
Kern		1	1			2		250							1					1		256
Kings		14						1														15
Lake														37								37
Lassen				8																		8
Los Angeles	2		306	1		173	6	196			141		6	1		257		250	1		334	1674
Madera		15																				15
Marin					83							2										85
Mariposa		1			1																	2
Mendocino	1				1									37								39
Merced	1	20																				21
Monterey															15							15
Napa	2									52					1							55
Nevada	3																					3
Orange					2	1							223				3		2			231
Placer	23																					23
Riverside							128														2	130
Sacramento	166			1			1			1												169
San Bernardino			2				118									1		4				125

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Semi-Annual Report - July 1, 2010 through December 31, 2010
Report by County

	ARC	CVRC	ELARC	FNRC	GGRC	HRC	IRC	KRC	LRC	NBRC	NLARC	RCEB	RCOC	RCRC	SARC	SCLARC	SDRC	SGPRC	TCRC	VMRC	WRC	Total
San Diego	1						1						1				221					224
San Francisco	1				55							1										57
San Joaquin	3											1			2					116		122
San Luis Obispo						1									1				18			20
San Mateo					58																	58
Santa Barbara																			97			97
Santa Clara	1				2								1		149							153
Santa Cruz					1										19							20
Shasta				35																		35
Siskiyou				2																		2
Solano	3									120												123
Sonoma	1	6								91								1				99
Stanislaus		1																		54		55
Tehama				16																		16
Tulare	3	68																				71
Tuolumne																				4		4
Unknown	1							2														3
Ventura							1	2					1			1			220			225
Yolo	6									1												7
Yuba	4			1																		5
Grand Total	239	247	309	202	203	177	255	255	196	266	141	236	232	107	188	259	236	255	339	185	336	4863

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Semi-Annual Report - July 1, 2010 through December 31, 2010
Report by Disability

	ARC	CVRC	ELARC	FNRC	GGRC	HRC	IRC	KRC	LRC	NBRC	NLARC	RCEB	RCOC	RCRC	SARC	SCLARC	SDRC	SGPRC	TCRC	VMRC	WRC	Total
5th Category	13	12	9	17	22		5	10	3	11	6	8	9	3	6	7	2		17	3	12	175
Autism	44	57	127	27	19	54	69	40	64	37	35	56	54	11	67	65	52	39	65	25	102	1109
Cerebral Palsy	8	12	14	17	23	12	25	6	8	26	5	32	13	8	8	14	16	19	28	18	23	335
Dual Diagnosis - 5th Category	3		1	2						7	1	3				2	1		1		2	23
Dual Diagnosis - Autism		2		1	2	1	3		2	2	3	1		1	3		1		3		3	28
Dual Diagnosis - Cerebral Palsy		1		1		2	1	3		2	2	1	1	2	3	1			1	1		22
Dual Diagnosis - Epilepsy						1	1			1	3	2	1	1	1	1		2	2			16
Dual Diagnosis - Mental Retardation	5	10	3	7	9	6	7	5	3	10	4	9	5	9	5	3	3	2	12	2	5	124
Early Start	4	2	1	4	2	6	13	1	12		3	2			2	9	3	10	8	2	19	103
Epilepsy	5	15	7	19	8	3	18	6	7	2	5	6	4	3	7	8	12	9	7	12	21	184
Mental Retardation	78	90	82	83	67	44	87	106	24	89	44	68	36	65	57	75	71	63	72	105	93	1499
Unknown	40	18	35	6	5	7	17	17	7	5	8	5	15	5	16	23	14	18	25	15		301
Grand Total	200	219	279	184	157	136	246	194	130	192	119	193	138	108	175	208	175	162	241	183	280	3919

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
 Semi-Annual Report - July 1, 2010 through December 31, 2010
 Report by Ethnicity

Ethnicity	ARC	CVRC	ELARC	FNRC	GGRC	HRC	IRC	KRC	LRC	NBRC	NLARC	RCEB	RCOC	RCRC	SARC	SCLARC	SDRC	SGPRC	TCRC	VMRC	WRC	Grand Total	
American Indian	2			3	1			3		2		1		2					4	1		19	
Asian	7	3	30	2	12	14	1	2	11	5	2	17	15	1	22			3	10	3	2	6	168
Black or African American	28	15	4	2	19	8	25	15	7	16	8	40	3	2	3	52	7	10	4	19	36	323	
Hispanic / Latino	30	83	156	17	24	32	77	59	50	37	35	41	36	12	48	120	57	82	55	32	78	1161	
Multiracial	3	6	11	7	4	6	14	1	11	3	6	1	2	1	8	2	4	11	4	6	15	126	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Island	2		5	1	6	2	3	2	1	6	1	2			2		3			3	2	41	
Unknown	1	2	13		2		5		1		8	5	3		1	1		1	17	1	7	68	
White	112	78	34	129	69	57	77	91	25	99	45	62	63	74	75	15	77	26	120	86	98	1512	
Grand Total	185	187	253	161	137	119	202	173	106	168	105	169	122	92	159	190	151	140	207	150	242	3418	

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Semi-Annual Report - July 1, 2010 through December 31, 2010
Report by Gender

	ARC	CVRC	ELARC	FNRC	GGRC	HRC	IRC	KRC	LRC	NBRC	NLARC	RCEB	RCOC	RCRC	SARC	SCLARC	SDRC	SGPRC	TCRC	VMRC	WRC	Grand Total
Female	67	74	81	70	63	39	69	66	38	65	32	61	43	34	50	61	41	45	79	55	90	1223
Male	117	113	163	91	74	80	133	106	68	103	73	108	79	57	109	129	106	95	128	94	152	2178
Unknown	1		9					1						1			4			1		17
Total	185	187	253	161	137	119	202	173	106	168	105	169	122	92	159	190	151	140	207	150	242	3418

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Semi-Annual Report - July 1, 2010 through December 31, 2010
Report by Living Arrangement

	ARC	CVRC	ELARC	FNRC	GGRC	HRC	IRC	KRC	LRC	NBRC	NLARC	RCEB	RCOC	RCRC	SARC	SCLARC	SDRC	SGPFC	TCRC	VMRC	WRC	Total
Adult Residential Facility	11	9		7	1		10	10		3	3	5				1	9	2	7	6	6	90
Board and Care	9	1					4			5	2	1	1			1			5	1		30
Childrens Group Home	1	3					1	1		1		5							1	4		17
Community Residential Home		2			3		1			12	3					4			1	14		40
Detention Center	1				1		1															3
Developmental Center	1									3							2		1			7
Foster Care		2						2								5		1	1			11
Foster Family Home		4	2				2	1		4		2				1	1	2	1			20
Homeless	1	1	1	2	1		1							3			4		1			15
ICF DD							1				1								2	3		7
ICF DD-H											1	2	1				2	1				7
ICF DD-N		1			1														9	1		12
ICF/MR/Nursing Home										1											1	2
Independent Housing	21	29	7	95	32	9	22	60	21	38	27	31	21	38	13	16	50	10	67	26	41	674
Intermediate Care Facility/Nursing Home		1	2		2			3			1				1		4		1		1	16
Jail				2	1					3	2	1				1						10
Large Group Home (more than 3 beds)	4	7	1	2	17	6		14		36	9	12	2	4	7	3	2	6	2	2		136
Legal Detention	1					1		3		1												6
Municipal Detention Facility/Jail																	2					2
Nursing Home		6															1				4	11
Other	17	1	4		1	1		1	4						1		5	1	4	2	1	43
Other Federal Facility					2																2	4
Parental or Other Family Home	159	165	264	81	107	158	211	152	170	146	83	168	196	53	158	224	153	228	211	124	271	3482
Prison																					1	1
Private General Hospital Emergency Rooms													1									1
Private Institutional Hospital/Treatment Facility					1			3						2	1				1			8
Private Institutional Living Arrangement					3																	3
Private Institutional School		6									3	1										10
Psychiatric Wards of Private General Hospitals												1			1							2
Psychiatric Wards of Public General Hospitals			3		1	1				2												7
Public Institutional Hospital/Treatment Facility	2	1						1							1				2			7
Public Institutional Living Arrangement					5																	5
Public Residential School											1					1					2	4
Semi-independent Home or Apartment	2	7			20			1		3		1	1		2	1			3	1	4	46
Small Group Home (3 beds or less)		1	4	6		1		3	1	5	1	2	3	2	2			2	11			44
Specialized Nursing Facility/Nursing Home										2	1								3			6
Supervised Apartment				6	3					1	3	4	2	3					5		2	29
Unknown	9		21	1	1		1						4	2	1	1	1	2		1		45
Grand Total	239	247	309	202	203	177	255	255	196	266	141	236	232	107	188	259	236	255	339	185	336	4863

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Semi-Annual Report - July 1, 2010 through December 31, 2010
Report by Problem Codes

		ARC	CVRC	ELARC	FNRC	GGRC	HRC	IFC	KRC	LRC	NBRC	NLARC	RCEB	RCOC	RCRC	SARC	SCLARC	SDRC	SGPRC	TCRC	VMRC	WRC	Total	
4731 Complaint	4731 - Regional Center						1		1		4	3					2	3			1			15
	4731 - Service Provider	1							2												2	1		6
4731 Complaint Total		1					1		3		4	3					2	3			3	1		21
Abuse	Emotional / Psychological Abuse				1	1			3	1	1												1	8
	Exploitation / Coercion	1				1												1					1	4
	Financial Abuse			1	3	3			2	1	3			2	2		3	1					2	24
	Inappropriate Medical Treatment											1											1	1
	Other Abuse			1	1				3		1					2	1	1				2	12	
	Physical Assault	2	1	1	1	5			4		5		1		1	2						1	24	
	Physical Neglect	6	1		1													1					10	
	Physical Restraint / Seclusion		2		1						6	1											10	
	Sexual Assault	1				6			2	1	3					6	1						20	
	Verbal Abuse	1									1					1						1	5	
Abuse Total		11	4	3	8	16			14	3	20	3	1	2	3	11	6	3			6	4	118	
Assistive Technology	Assistive Technology - California Children's Services (CCS)					1								1							1		2	
	Assistive Technology - Medi-Cal	1											1									2	5	
	Assistive Technology - Regional Center	1											1	1							2	2	8	
Assistive Technology Total		1				1							1	1							2	2	8	
Consent	Capacity / Incapacity of Client										1	1											3	
	Informed Consent												1								2		4	
	Other Consent	1																					2	
	Substituted Decision Making (Ex. DPAHC)						1	2						1							1		5	
	Withhold Consent			1																			1	
Consent Total		1	1				1	2			1	1	1	1							3		15	
Conservatorship	Alternatives to Conservatorship	1		6	1	5	1	5	10	1	4		4	4			5	1	6	11	10		8	
	Change Conservatorship										2		3	1				1					8	
	Conservatee's Rights						1		1			7	1		2				2	3			18	
	Conservator's Duties	1		1					1		1				1								6	
	LPS Conservatorship																	4					4	
	Opposition to Petition		4											1		1							6	
	Petition	1	1	2									2	2		1					3	6	17	
	Termination of Conservatorship	1	1		1				2		1		1	2	1	3						2	13	
Conservatorship Total		3	6	9	2	5	2	5	14	1	8	7	11	9	3	5	5	2	12	17	18	11	155	
Criminal Justice / Forensic Mental	Competency	1				1																	2	
	Criminal Justice Issues - Rights				3	4	2		2				1	1									13	
	Diversion	1																2					3	
	Jail	1						1			1												3	
	Juvenile (Detention and Probation)	1																					2	
	Other Criminal Justice	1		1		2			4	1		1									1		11	
Criminal Justice / Forensic Mental Health Issues Total		5		1	4	6	2	1	6	1	1	1	1	1				2		1		1	34	
Discrimination (Other than Employment)	Civil Rights (Race, Religion, Sexual Orientation)			1																			1	
	Higher Education (Public and Private)				1																		1	
	Other Discrimination	1		3				3	1						1	2		1	1	2			16	
	Public Accommodations (Hotels, Restaurants, Etc.)	1	2	1	2				1			1	1	2		1		1	1	2	2		19	
	Transportation (Public and Private)		1		2		1					1									1		8	
Discrimination (Other than Employment) Total		2	3	5	5		1	3	1	1		2	1	2	1	3		2	2	5	2	4	45	
Education	Education - Adult Education Programs	2	4						1	1													8	
	Education - After School Programs								1														1	
	Education - Assessment	1	2	3	2			3		2	1		3	6		1	2		2	4		2	34	
	Education - Assistive Technology		1		3								1	1			1	2		2	1		12	
	Education - Behavioral Intervention, Services and Supports	1	2	4	1		2	3	1	2	3			3		12	4	1	3	1	4	1	48	
	Education - Compliance Complaint		2	1			1	3	2		3		2	1	2	2	1	3	3		6		32	
	Education - Discipline (Suspension / Expulsion / Other)		7	2			1	1	1	1	3					7			2	2	1	1	29	
	Education - Discrimination	1	1	1	1											2	1	1					8	
	Education - Due Process Appeals		1		1					4	3	3					6	2	1	1		3	25	
	Education - Early Intervention (Part B / Over Age 3)							1									1						3	
	Education - Eligibility		2			1		1					1			2	3		5			1	16	
	Education - Extra Curricular Activities						1																3	
	Education - Full Inclusion (Except Pre-School)			2									1						1				4	
	Education - Higher Education										1	1		1			1	1				1	6	
	Education - Home / Hospital Instruction		2		1						1					1				4	1		10	
	Education - IEP Development	21	23	18	10	3	10	12	30	14	20	2	4	7	2	14	12	5	14	12	5	5	243	
	Education - Least Restrictive Environment		2	4	1		1	5	2		1		6	1		7	2		4	1			37	
	Education - Mental Health Services (AB 3632)		1								1					1				5			10	
	Education - Non-Public School Placement			2		1			2			1	5	1						1	1		15	

	Education - Other Education	11	8	8	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	3	2	5	7	6	3	63						
	Education - Personal Injury (Tort Claim)	3	1					1						1			2	1	9					
	Education - Preschool Programs and Full Inclusion			1			2		2				2		1	4	1	1	14					
	Education - Public School Placement	2	8	6	1	2	1	3	8	4	4	7	1	1	13	9	2	10	8	3	4	97		
	Education - Related Services (Ex. OT / PT / S&L / 1:1 / Medical)	3	7	9	1	3	6	10	1	7	4	2	7	5	10	14	1	4	7		5	106		
	Education - Residential Placement		1									1	1		1							4		
	Education - Transition Planning (Any Age)		2	2	1				1	5		3	2		1	2		7				3	29	
	Education - Transportation	5	9	4	1		2	1		4	2	2	3		2	6			1			2	44	
Education Total		50	86	68	27	11	25	48	52	39	55	12	46	36	6	81	65	19	64	59	29	32	910	
Employment	Employment Discrimination: General / Hiring	1		2					1			1	2				1	2					10	
	Employment Discrimination: Reasonable Accommodations	1			2		1		1	1					2		1	1	1				12	
	Vocational Rehabilitation Services								1	3				2	1								7	
	Wrongful Termination			2		1									1								2	6
Employment Total		2	4	2	1	1	3	4	1	3	2	4	2	4	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	35		
Family	Adoption				1		1																2	
	Child Support			1	1	2					1	1		1				1	1		2		11	
	Custody Issues	2	3		7	1				1	1	1		3		1		1	1		2		24	
	Dissolution / Annulment					1																	1	
	Domestic Violence				2				1	2					1								7	
	Family Support Services	1		3				1							1						2	1	10	
	Foster Care	1			1																		2	
	Guardianship of Minors			1			1					1								2			6	
	Marriage																						2	
	Parental Rights	1		2				3	2		4			1	2	1	4		1		1	2	24	
Family Total		5	3	7	12	3	2	4	3	1	7	2	3	2	7	1	9	1	4	6	7	89		
Finance	Debtor / Creditor Issues	1	1	4	8	7	1	2	2	1		2	2	1	4	2	1	2	1	7	1	4	54	
	Estate Planning		1			2					2	1							1	4	2		15	
	Special Needs Trust	1		1	2	10	1	4	1			3	1	2		1			1	8	4	1	41	
Finance Total		2	2	5	10	19	2	6	3	1	2	6	3	3	4	2	2	2	3	19	7	110		
Health	CCS Eligibility																						2	
	CCS Services	1	1		1		1	1				1				1				1			8	
	EPSDT					1									2	2	1						6	
	In Home Nursing			1		2				2						5	2	1			1		14	
	Medi-Cal Eligibility			2		1	1		1	1	1	4	5		3	2		6					36	
	Medi-Cal Services		3	1	1	4	1	1	6	5	2		1	1	1	1	1	2					38	
	Medi-Cal Share of Cost / Co-Payment			3		2	1		2		1	4									4		20	
	Medical Treatment	1	2		1			4	1	1	2	1	3	2	2	1	4			2			29	
	Medicare					3			1	1											1		7	
	Medi-Medi			1													1	1	1				5	
	Other Health	3	1	4	1	1	2		4				2		1	1	1	1	1		3		28	
	Private Insurance	1				1						1							1	1			3	8
Health Total		6	7	12	4	5	14	2	10	11	10	6	13	9	4	3	9	16	6	21	4	29	201	
Housing	Eviction			1	2	2	1			3	4		3		4		1	2	1				30	
	Foreclosure				1									1									2	
	Habitability	1													1	1							3	
	Housing Discrimination (Zoning / Covenants)		1																				2	
	Landlord and Tenant Rights		1		20	1	2		4		3	1	4	1	3	1		1	1	4	4	5	56	
	Property Rights	1	1		1	1			1	1	1	3			1								13	
	Reasonable Accommodations	1	3		3	2					3									1	1		20	
	Section 8	2	2	1	2						1		2	2	2		1	1		1	1		18	
	Subsidized Housing				6	2				3					1	1							14	
Housing Total		5	8	2	35	8	3	5	7	12	2	13	4	12	4	2	4	2	6	9	15	158		
Immigration	Citizenship (Application / Interview)			3				1	2	1													7	
	Other Immigration			1					1			1				1		1					5	
	Public Charge						1									1							2	
Immigration Total		4	4	4	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	14		
Income Maintenance	AAP																						4	
	IHSS Eligibility	6	4	7	2		3	12	10	13	3	1	2	12	1	3	3	17	8		1	1	16	125
	IHSS Hours	7	8	10			5	6		7	1	5	16	10	5	14	22	10	4	2	4		141	
	IHSS Protective Supervision	4	4	8	9		2	7		5	1	7	2	5	2	1		5		7			82	
	IHSS Share of Cost			2		1	1						2								2		9	
	Other Income Programs	9	1	1	1	4	1			1	2			1	1			1	1	1			25	
	SSA - Child Benefits		1	1					1	3													7	
	SSA - DAC				1								3		2		1	2				1	3	13
	SSA - SSDI			2	1	2						1	1						1	1	1		3	14
	SSI - Eligibility	1	16	19	9	12	6	12	10	5	5	1	8	8	6	4	23	10	6	16	7	34	218	
	SSI - Other	6	6	10	7	6	6	1	3	2	1		1	4	6	1	1	6	6	4	5	17	99	
	SSI - Overpayment	2	8	12	2	17			4	4	3	3	5	2	1	3	5	7	1	13	3	7	102	
	SSI - Representative Payee	1		3	3	1					4	2	2	1	1		1	2	3	1	3		28	
	State Disability Benefits						1	1					3										5	
Income Maintenance Total		36	48	73	37	42	24	40	29	40	20	20	42	48	26	18	49	73	36	50	23	98	872	

Legal Referral	Civil (General)	1		6		1	1	3		6	3	1		4		1		2	2		5	36	
	Criminal (General) - Rights				2									1				1	1		2	7	
	Personal Injury		1	1	1		1	1	1	4	1			3		2		4	5	5	2	32	
	Public Defender	2					1												1			4	
	Small Claims			1								1						1	1			4	
Worker's Compensation							1		2												1	4	
Legal Referral Total		3	1	8	3	1	3	4	2	10	6	2		8	3		8	10	5	10	87		
Mental Health Issues	Mental Health - Complaint		1																	1		1	
	Mental Health - Eligibility																					1	
	Mental Health - Involuntary Commitment		1		1																	2	
Mental Health Issues Total		2	3	2	1	1				1				2	1	2		1			1	14	
Not Selected	Not Selected		1																			1	
Not Selected Total			1																			1	
Placement	Discharge Planning		1		1													1		2	1	6	
	Facility Conditions			1						1												1	3
	Facility Evictions																					1	1
	Health Facilities		1																				1
	Move from Institution to Community	1	2		1			1						1						1			7
	Support Services Needed for Placement		3		2			2			1				1	1	1	3			1	1	16
	Transitional Housing		1		1						1												3
	Unit / Facility / Institution Transfer	2	3					6			1												16
Placement Total		3	11	1	5			9		4				2	5	1	4		4	3	1	53	
Privacy/Personal Autonomy / Choices	Community Activities	1	1		1			2	1					1	2	1		1				11	
	Least Restrictive Environment				1	1				3				2		1				1	1	10	
	Mail	2										2										4	
	Other Privacy / Personal Autonomy / Choices	7	2	4	5	8	1	3	9	2	4	1	2	2	1	4	2	7		5	6	1	76
	Personal Property			1	1	1					3				1								7
	Privacy			1				3			1					1		3		1		10	
	Religion		1																			1	
	Sexuality	1			3						1						2				1	1	9
Telephone						2			1			1	1								1	6	
Privacy/Personal Autonomy / Choices Total		11	4	6	8	13	1	8	11	3	13	1	4	3	6	7	6	10	1	8	9	1	134
Records	Breach of Confidentiality																			1		1	
	Denial of Access							1						1								2	
	Erroneous Information							1		1												2	
Records Total							2		1			1						1			5		
Regional Center Services	Regional Center - 6500	1					1		2									1	2	1		8	
	Regional Center - Assessment of Needs	1	1	1	2		26	6		8	1		3	6	1	4	3	1	1		16	1	82
	Regional Center - Behavioral Services	5	7	11			11	6	3	10	2	7	5	12		2	15	5	5	16	4	5	131
	Regional Center - Case Management	1	1	4	8	3	1	14	11	7	8	8	11		3	3	12	5	5	11	1	14	131
	Regional Center - Crisis Services		1	1									3			1						1	7
	Regional Center - Day Program, Training and Activity	3	2	7	1	1	15	5		1	9	4	7	2		3	4	7	3	2	1	3	80
	Regional Center - DDS Policies / Procedures				1	1	7		2				2			1	8	1					23
	Regional Center - Early Start (Part C / Under Age 3)				1	4		4		1		3	3	11		2	7	3	1	3	1	15	59
	Regional Center - Eligibility for Regional Center services	17	25	15	14	16	11	52	21	4	20	7	18	24	5	16	23	19	30	23	8	19	387
	Regional Center - Fair Hearing Procedures (Information only; no repres	2	26		10	11	3	2	14	7	1	2	12			12	4	45	15	4	7		177
	Regional Center - Independent Living Services	2	7	3	2	3		1	1		2	2	1		1		2			4	4		37
	Regional Center - IPP (Development / Meeting / Compliance)	5	3	2	6	1	5	7	7	3	23	11	3		5	2	6	1	8	16	4	3	121
	Regional Center - Other Regional Center Services	41	8	17	1	8	7	6	22	9	1	11	14	16	1	7		12	9	10	9	20	229
	Regional Center - Prevention Services													1							1	1	6
	Regional Center - Respite	7	1	9	2	4	5	18	8	12	3	8	14	2		1	3	20	2	4	4	12	139
	Regional Center - Supported Employment	2		1				1			6		3			1			1	1			17
	Regional Center - Supported Living	6	1	5	1	11			1	1	17		4	9		4	3	5	1	12	1	5	87
Regional Center - Transportation	1	3	1	1	2	1		7	7	2	1		3	4		2	3		1	5	1	45	
Regional Center - Waiver			1			1	1						5			3			1	1		14	
Regional Center Services Total		92	62	104	40	63	96	131	85	79	101	63	90	106	20	45	99	93	118	123	60	110	1780
Grand Total		239	247	309	202	203	177	255	255	196	266	141	236	232	107	188	259	236	255	339	185	336	4863

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Semi-Annual Report - July 1, 2010 through December 31, 2010
Report by Service Level

	ARC	CVRC	ELARC	FNRC	GGRC	HRC	IRC	KRC	LRC	NBRC	NLARC	RCEB	RCOC	RCRC	SARC	SCLARC	SDRC	SGPRC	TCRC	VMRC	WRC	Total
Pending			1					7		8				1								17
Information/Referral	30	60	113	31	83	103	45	39	70	36	24	33	23	23	32	46	8	68	46	150	131	1194
Rights Information/Consultation (RC/Generic)	165	65	61	23	18	36	177	52	86	94	70	74	134	65	22	183	67	173	199	9	154	1927
Rights Information/Consultation (Other)	3	42	95	92	13	25	1	90	5	71	20	76	43	10	89	3	122	3	87	18	8	916
Abuse/Neglect Investigation	8	2		6	1			4	1	8					1		2					33
Special Education Compliance Complaint	1											3		2	1		2				2	11
IEP		16	2	7	2		1	21	1	5		1	4		4	6	1		1	1	1	74
IPP/IDT		7		2				1		8	6					2	2	2			2	33
W&I 4731			1			1					1		1		1		1					6
Technical Assistance	16	1	19	10	27	3	1	14	1	3	5	5	17	4	5	3	13	9		1	4	161
Evaluation and Assessment	11	45	10	25	48	5	3	22	17	28	1	21	8	1	4	7	4	2	1	2	11	276
Informal Regional Center / Provider Problem Resolution	1	2		1	7		16	3	5	2	7	12		1	11	4	4		2		4	82
Informal Generic Service Agency Problem Resolution	1	1	1	4	2	1	6		6	2	2	9			13	3	2				12	65
Case Settlement Prior to Informal Meeting, Mediation or Hearing			1	1			3		2	1	1				1		1				1	12
Direct Representation in RC "Voluntary Informal Meeting"	1	1			1	1		1	1						1				1			8
Direct Representation in Mediation / RC Fair Hearing	1		1		1	2	2				1				1	1	2				2	14
Direct Representation in an Appeal for Generic Services		3	3						1		3	2	2			1	5		2		7	29
Court Litigation	1	2	1					1														5
Grand Total	239	247	309	202	203	177	255	255	196	266	141	236	232	107	188	259	236	255	339	185	336	4863

ADVOCACY REPORT

OFFICE OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS ADVOCACY

Fall, 2010

BENEFITS

In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS)

Client Awarded Maximum IHSS Hours, Including Retroactive Service Hours.

J.S. is a 19-year-old with autism, an intellectual disability, and seizures who was denied protective supervision under the In-Home Support Services (IHSS program). The County awarded him 132.8 hours per month of services without protective supervision. The County's position was that J.S. did not engage in self endangering acts. The County also told the parents of J.S. that it was their legal responsibility to supervise J.S. and that all individuals with autism required on-going supervision.

OCRA agreed to represent J.S. at hearing and obtained medical records from his treating physicians, a psychological report from the regional center and school records which documented that J.S. had significant deficits in memory, orientation and judgment and required 24-hour supervision. OCRA worked closely with the family to document the types of dangerous behaviors J.S. engages in if left alone.

At hearing, OCRA presented testimony from J.S.' parents, who gave recent examples of when they had to quickly intervene to prevent J.S. from injuring himself. OCRA also argued that the County could not legally require the parents of an adult recipient to provide services without pay. The hearing officer ruled in favor of J.S. and awarded 283 hours per month with retroactive payments for the prior ten months. This represents an increase of 150.2 hours per month of IHSS services and retroactive payment of more than \$14,000. Tim Poe, CRA, Kendra McWright, Interim CRA, Harbor Regional Center.

Protective Supervision Granted for Adoption Assistance Program Recipient.

C.S. has Down's syndrome and was adopted as an infant. As she became a teenager, C.S. began to require more supervision in addition to the personal care services she needed. C.S.'s mother had just turned 70 and was finding it difficult to supervise C.S. due to the mother's own physical condition and C.S.'s increasing needs. C.S. was at risk for out-of-home placement. C.S.'s mother had been privately paying two different people to supervise C.S. so there could be a break. The family also received respite from the regional center. C.S.'s mother applied for IHSS for C.S.

C.S. was denied IHSS. The handwritten notice from the County stated that IHSS was denied because C.S. received funds from the foster care system. However, C.S. is not in foster care and does not receive foster care funding. C.S.' mother did receive Adoption Assistance Payment (AAP). OCRA researched whether a child could receive IHSS while the parent was receiving AAP. Although the law is not clear, it appeared as though C.S. would be entitled to IHSS because she was receiving Medi-Cal through AAP. OCRA asked the regional center to fund a nursing assessment, and it agreed.

OCRA also convinced the County Appeals Specialist that C.S. could receive IHSS despite the AAP benefits. An agreement was reached which required the County to reassess C.S. It took several months for the County to perform the reassessment. OCRA filed for hearing again. Finally, the worker scheduled the reassessment. OCRA attended the reassessment, provided the IEP, psychological evaluation, and nursing assessment, and requested protective supervision. About a week after the reassessment, C.S. jumped out of a moving car, into oncoming traffic, and was hit by another car. She was hospitalized again. The County approved IHSS protective supervision shortly after being informed of the most recent incident. C.S. will receive the maximum of 195 hours per month of IHSS retroactive to September, 2009. The retroactive monetary award is \$21,060.00. These services enable C.S. to stay in her family home. Katie Meyer, CRA, Luisa Delgadillo, Assistant CRA, Westside Regional Center.

Judge Rules That the IHSS Two-parent Household Rule Is Invalid.

E.P. is a minor with multiple disabilities, including seizures and a medical condition which most children do not survive past infancy. Due to the care provided by E.P.'s mother. E.P. is now four years old.

E.P.'s mother was a dental assistant before E.P. was born, but her mother can no longer work due to the care provided to E.P. E.P.'s mother applied for IHSS for E.P. and was denied because two parents were in the home. OCRA represented E.P. at her IHSS hearing and argued that the two-parent household regulation is invalid because the statute does not allow it. At hearing, the IHSS supervisor admitted that she knew that the State was in the process of removing that regulation from the Department of Social Services Manual of Policy & Procedures.

A hearing decision was rendered in E.P.'s favor. The ALJ determined that E.P had a need of more than 400 hours a month. She also determined that the two-parent household rule was contrary to the purpose of IHSS and therefore invalid. E.P received 283 hours per month retroactive to the date of application. Wendy Dumlao, CRA, Alba Gomez, Assistant CRA, San Diego Regional Center.

OCRA Assists G.C. with Obtaining IHSS Protective Supervision.

G.C. was receiving IHSS when G.C.'s mother first contacted OCRA. Based on a review of G.C.'s regional center chart and educational records, OCRA believed G.C. would qualify for protective supervision. OCRA advised G.C.'s parents regarding protective supervision and how to initiate the process. OCRA attended the reassessment meeting with G.C. and his parents. The IHSS social worker reviewed the documents that G.C.'s parents jointly prepared with OCRA and stated that she believed that G.C. would be approved for protective supervision. Recently, OCRA received news that G.C. has been approved for 283 hours of protective supervision. Jackie S. Chiang, CRA, Jazmin Romero, Assistant CRA, Katie Meyer, Supervising CRA, Lanterman Regional Center.

R.M. Obtains Protective Supervision and Retroactive IHSS Benefits.

OCRA was contacted by R.M.'s mother, who reported that she applied for IHSS services on behalf of her son in February, 2010. R.M.'s mother indicated she received a Notice of Action (NOA) granting her only 32.4 hours per month. Subsequently, R.M.'s mother contacted her son's IHSS social worker and requested protective supervision. The social worker conducted a reassessment and another NOA was issued stating that there was no change to the previous evaluation and R.M.'s IHSS hours would remain the same.

OCRA agreed to provide direct representation to R.M. in his IHSS appeal. OCRA assisted R.M.'s parent with filing for hearing. A Conditional Withdrawal was signed with the County in July, 2010, to allow its staff to reassess R.M. for protective supervision. After its second reassessment, the County found R.M. eligible for protective supervision. R.M. was awarded retroactive benefits dating back to January, 2010. Ibrahim Saab, CRA, Ada Hamer, Assistant CRA, North Los Angeles County Regional Center.

Benefits Reinstated for Brothers.

E.G. and P.G. are brothers who are IHSS and Medi-Cal recipients who were on the Medi-Cal Waiver, which was renewed for 2010. In June, the parent was informed that there was a share of cost, and as of June 1, 2010, no IHSS would be funded. In addition, E.G. and P.G.'s parent was asked to pay back payments received due to the share of cost.

The parent contacted OCRA for assistance. P.G.'s parent informed OCRA that the regional center records showed that the waivers were updated, and that there should not be a problem with E.G. and P.G.'s benefits. However, the Medi-cal social worker kept insisting that the waivers were never provided to Medi-Cal. After OCRA contacted the regional center Medi-Cal liaison for further information, it was discovered that due to the recent changes within the Medi-Cal office, social workers that were handling the waiver cases were not properly trained. The social worker for E.G. and P.G. had not properly entered their information, and this error had caused E.G. and P.G. to lose their benefits. OCRA worked closely with the liaison to correct the problem. E.G. and P.G. regained their Medi-Cal benefits with retroactive payment for IHSS back to June 1, 2010. Jacqueline Miller,

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

Medi-Cal

Two Consumers Receive Aid Paid Pending Their Hearings.

Two consumers called OCRA because they did not receive their aid paid pending, although they appealed their nursing reductions within 10 days. In both cases, the parents were told that they did not write that they wanted aid paid pending on their hearing request, so it was not provided.

After OCRA spoke to the medical case management representative about the regulations regarding aid paid pending, the representative admitted that the only requirement is that the recipient appeal within 10 days. She immediately resolved the problem and issued both consumers aid paid pending. Wendy Dumlao, CRA, Alba Gomez, Assistant CRA, San Diego Regional Center.

Social Security

SSI Overpayment Quickly Resolved in J.C.'s Favor.

J.C.'s mother received an overpayment notice from the Social Security Administration (SSA) in the exact amount of the check she received each month as J.C.'s IHSS worker. J.C.'s mother contacted OCRA for assistance.

OCRA assisted J.C.'s mother in completing a request for reconsideration, as the IHSS wages are not to be considered in computing the child's Social Security grant. Within 30 days, J.C.'s mother received the retroactive payments for the monies held back by the SSA. Anastasia Bacigalupo, CRA, South Central Los Angeles Regional Center.

Employee Does Not Have To Pay Back SS Overpayment.

K.H. works as a janitor for a school district and was receiving both SSI and regular SS benefits, making him a "concurrent beneficiary." He regularly provided a copy of his paycheck stubs to the local SSA office with the assistance of his Independent Living Skills (ILS) instructor, and even got

his stubs stamped “received.” One day, he received a notice from the SSA that he had an overpayment of almost \$21,000. Further, his son, who was receiving benefits based on K.H.’s earnings record, also had a \$10,000 overpayment.

K.H. went with his ILS instructor to the local SSA office to ask about the overpayment since K.H. had always reported his income. The representative told K.H. that he “reported it to the wrong program,” meaning that the representative applied his wages solely to his SSI record, and never posted anything to his SS record. As a result, the SS program did not know K.H. was working. Further, as SS did not know about the income and kept paying K.H., a large overpayment resulted.

K.H. came to OCRA for assistance. OCRA drafted a request for a waiver of overpayment recovery for K.H. and alleged that the overpayment was not K.H.’s fault but rather the SSA’s fault since K.H. reported his income regularly. It was not his fault that the SSA representatives did not post his earnings to both programs. OCRA also attached a Government Accountability Office report criticizing SSA for its treatment of concurrent beneficiaries such as K.H. K.H. hand-delivered the waiver request to the SSA office, but months went by with no decision.

OCRA called the Area Work Incentives coordinator, who determined that the local office never entered the waiver request into the computer. She then entered it. The local office denied the request. OCRA represented K.H. at the informal conference. At that meeting, it was clear the SSA representative did not understand the waiver standard. OCRA contacted the Area Director’s Office with concerns after the informal conference. OCRA also spoke to a supervisor in the SSA office and made the waiver argument to her. Two weeks later, OCRA received notice that the waiver had been approved. The SSA waived the \$21,000 overpayment on K.H.’s record and the \$10,000 overpayment for his son. Katie Meyer, CRA, Luisa Delgadillo, Assistant CRA, Westside Regional Center.

CONSUMER FINANCE

Debt Waived.

K.S. resides in a treatment facility for individuals having both developmental and psychiatric conditions. K.S. was out on a two-hour pass when he took a coke from a grocery store and left without paying. He is not usually without a staff person at his side, but on that occasion he was. K.S. did not know that he was committing a crime.

A law firm that represents the grocery store sent him a demand letter asking him to pay \$300, or risk being sued. K.S. does not have a job and receives SSI benefits as his sole income. OCRA sent a letter to the law firm explaining that K.S. is unable to make any payments at this time and that this situation is not likely to change. The law firm ceased its attempts to collect. Katy Lusson, CRA, Trina Saldana, Assistant CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

OCRA Assists C.R. with Debt Collection.

C.R. is a young adult who was the victim of identity theft several years ago. OCRA had written the creditor, sent copies of the police report, had phone conversations, and believed that the issue was resolved. C.R. was not contacted for over a year and then received another collection letter. OCRA called the firm handling the debt and arranged for the firm to send C.R. an Affidavit of Fraud with a promise not to contact C.R. again. Katy Lusson, CRA, Trina Saldana, Assistant CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

CONSUMERS' RIGHTS

OCRA Assists Consumers Following Complaints of Abuse.

OCRA and the Area Board became aware of allegations of abuse at a day program because a group of consumers contacted OCRA and the Area Board after a self-advocacy training was provided to consumers at their day program. The alleged abuse included such things as blanket restraints, screaming obscenities at the consumers, and placing clients in isolation in

separate rooms. At the request of the consumers, OCRA and the Area Board immediately assisted with the filing of reports to Adult Protective Services and Community Care Licensing. 4731 complaints were filed by the consumers regarding the day program staff's actions. OCRA provided direct representation for consumers at related IPP's.

Following the reporting and investigation, staffing changes were made at the day program. Additional training was provided regarding the use of restraint. OCRA and the Area Board have committed to providing a series of additional training sessions to the staff at the program regarding clients' rights and the responsibility of each individual staff member as a mandated reporter of abuse.

OCRA and the Area Board will continue to meet with individual consumers and to provide self-advocacy trainings in order to ensure that consumers remain free from harm. Yulahlia Hernandez, CRA, Annie Breuer, Assistant CRA, North Bay Regional Center.

E.V. Allowed to Keep Dog in Apartment.

E.V. is a 6-year-old who lives with his family in an apartment complex. When E.V.'s parents signed their lease agreement they were told that they could not have pets. The parents later saw that other tenants had pets and they got a dog as a companion for E.V. After a period of time, the manager told the family that it could only have the dog if the family had a doctor's letter saying that it was necessary. The family complied and was then told that the letter "wasn't enough." OCRA advised the family to ask the doctor for a more detailed letter, stating that it was medically necessary for him to have a companion animal. The doctor made a call to the manager and the family was then told that E.V. could keep his companion dog. Katy Lusson, CRA, Trina Saldana, Assistant CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

HOUSING

H.H. Gets His Security Deposit Back.

H.H. was living in a regional center group home and wanted to move into an apartment in a new area. After saving and preparing, H.H. signed the

lease for his own apartment. The landlord required a substantial security deposit but H.H. agreed to it because he really wanted to live independently in that area. When H.H. contacted the electric company, he discovered that the building did not exist. The electric company suggested that H.H. contact the local police department because the landlord had a reputation in the area for renting sub-habitable apartments.

H.H. decided not to rent any apartment from that landlord. When H.H. tried to get out of the contract and get his security deposit returned, the landlord refused.

OCRA helped H.H. and his mother draft a letter to the landlord citing the relevant laws regarding the return of security deposits and habitability generally. The landlord then agreed to return both the security deposit and the rent paid. Jim Stoepler, CRA, Redwood Coast Regional Center.

PERSONAL AUTONOMY

Consumer Returns Home after Years in a Facility.

OCRA was first contacted by K.O. in 2006. K.O. wanted to move to a facility closer to her family. A probate conservatorship had been established and K.O. had been placed in a secured residential facility. K.O.'s goal was to return to her own home and live with her husband and daughter. K.O.'s return home was consistently opposed, partly due to the poor condition of the family home.

OCRA worked with the public defender's office, the public guardian's office, and the regional center to return K.O. to her family. The regional center offered to assist in repairing K.O.'s home and developed a supportive relationship with the family.

During recent court proceedings, OCRA participated in negotiations with the County and an agreement was reached regarding K.O.'s return home to her husband and daughter. K.O. returned home to her family for a court-ordered 30-day trial period, after which it is believed K.O. will remain permanently. Arthur Lipscomb, CRA, Kay Spencer, Assistant CRA, Maricruz Magaleno, Temporary Assistant CRA, Central Valley Regional Center.

J.B. Asserts His Rights at Day Program/Supported Employment.

J.B. is working in the electronics department at his day program/supported employment. The manager that oversees him would hit him and other clients on the arm in what she considered to be a joking manner. When they would get a new order to complete, she also would tell J.B. and other clients “don’t screw this up” – again what she considered to be in a joking manner. J.B. came home upset and showed his mother a red mark on his upper left arm from when this manager had hit him. He told the manager that it hurt and she replied that he was too sensitive.

J.B., his mother, the manager, and her supervisor had a meeting the next day that J.B. returned to work. The manager admitted that she hit J.B., used the phrase “don’t screw this up,” and that this was done in a joking manner. J.B. was told that she was sorry and this would not occur again. The staff was required to attend a Disability Awareness and Boundaries Counseling Training. If J.B. wanted to move to a different area to work he could. The area that he likes to work in is the one where the manager still worked. He chose to continue working in this area.

J.B. and his family did not believe the actions taken by the day program against the manager were sufficient and contacted OCRA for assistance.

OCRA assisted J.B. in filing a 4731 Complaint with the regional center. As a result of the Complaint, J.B. is able to continue to work in the area that he prefers. While it was determined that the supervisor did not intentionally mean to hurt J.B., and that she had been joking, J.B. will no longer have direct contact with her. As part of the resolution, the regional center will provide additional training to the day program staff on the rights of individuals with disabilities. There will also be retraining of the day program case managers on the proper uses of the Grievance Policy, and changes to the day program employment policy to include immediate involvement by a Human Resource Manager in any incident involving both staff and clients. Jackie Coleman, CRA, Elizabeth Kennedy, Temporary Assistant CRA, Alta California Regional Center.

REGIONAL CENTER

A.A.'s Regional Center Case Reactivated after 14 Years.

A.A. is an adult who applied for regional center services and was denied eligibility after an assessment by the regional center. A.A.'s sister contacted OCRA for advocacy assistance. A.A. had lived with his mother, who recently passed away, and now requires supports to live independently. During the consultation, OCRA became aware that A.A. had been found eligible and received services from another regional center in the past. After further inquiry, OCRA also became aware that the regional center where A.A. had just applied, had placed A.A.'s case on inactive status in June, 1996.

In an attempt to negotiate a resolution, OCRA wrote a letter to the regional center stating that A.A. was erroneously treated as a new applicant since he is a consumer with an inactive case. The CRA requested that the regional center immediately reactivate A.A.'s case, assign a consumer services coordinator, and hold an Individual Program Plan meeting (IPP) to discuss appropriate services and supports. After review, the regional center agreed to reactivate A.A.'s case and comply with OCRA's other requests. Veronica Cervantes, CRA, Beatriz A. Reyes, Assistant CRA, Inland Regional Center.

Eligibility Case Resolved for D.C.

D.C. was originally found eligible for services by one regional center. When D.C. was six, he and his family moved to another geographic area with a different regional center. D.C. was evaluated by the new regional center. The new regional center determined that D.C. was no longer eligible for regional center services.

OCRA was contacted by the family. Based on a review of the available records and history from the prior regional center, OCRA determined that a comprehensive neuropsychological evaluation was warranted. D.C. was evaluated at the UCLA Autism Clinic and diagnosed with autistic disorder.

Prior to fair hearing, OCRA shared the written report from UCLA with the new regional center. Based on the UCLA findings and diagnosis, the new regional center found D.C. eligible. Mario Espinoza, CRA, Valerie Geary, Assistant CRA, Kern Regional Center.

Client Became Eligible for Regional Center Services after Being Denied Four Times.

D.A. is an 18-year-old who is diagnosed with Prader-Willi syndrome and developmental delays. D.A.'s family applied for and was denied eligibility for D.A. for regional center services for four times between 1993, and 2009. The family contacted OCRA to assist in the appeal process. OCRA gathered additional records and obtained a neuropsychological evaluation of D.A. The new evaluation supported regional center eligibility. OCRA send the regional center the new information and requested an informal meeting to discuss the case. OCRA met with the regional center staff and urged that D.M. should be found eligible for regional center services based on the new evidence of developmental disability. The regional center psychologist requested two weeks to review the new records. After the regional center reviewed additional records, D.M. was found eligible for regional center services. Leinani Neves, CRA, Filomena Alomar, Assistant CRA, Gail Gresham, Supervising CRA, Valley Mountain Regional Center.

Two Children Will Continue to Receive Social Skills Training.

OCRA provided technical assistance to two unrelated children in two different hearings involving the same issue.

A.G. is a young girl who had been receiving social skills training funded by the regional center. A.G.'s mother received a notice that the funding will be terminated, effective six months from the notice date, because social skills' training is a "time-limited" service. The regional center held no IPP meeting and did not discuss this termination with A.G.'s family. A.G. appealed and received aid paid pending.

OCRA helped the mother gather evidence that would support her argument. OCRA also drafted the exhibit and witness lists, prepared the evidence packet, helped draft witness questions, and wrote the closing brief for A.G. A.G. received a favorable decision that said the regional center must continue funding social skills.

J.M. is a pre-teenage boy who was receiving social skills funded by the regional center. It was also terminated with no discussion or meeting under the guise that social skill training is a “time limited” service. J.M. had made many improvements with social skills training, but as a teenager, his needs were continuing to evolve and he still required the service.

OCRA again provided technical assistance by reviewing and editing the opening and closing statements, and drafting witness questions for the social skills provider, who testified at the hearing. Like A.G., J.M. also received a favorable hearing decision but from a different judge, so J.M. will continue to receive social skills training. Katie Meyer, CRA, Luisa Delgadillo, Assistant CRA, Westside Regional Center.

Success in Obtaining Needed Out-of-Home Respite Placement.

T.W. is a 16-year-old consumer living at home with his mother. T.W. is dual diagnosed and has a very challenging home situation. T.W. and his mother were participating in a program in order to receive comprehensive and coordinated behavioral health, school, and community support services. T.W. was not doing well at home or school and there was concern that removal from the home was imminent, so T.W.’s mother and social worker contacted OCRA.

What T.W.’s mother and social worker believed was needed was a brief stay in a safe place for T.W whose IPP specified that he was to get 21 days of out-of-home respite a year. The regional center had not been able to make the much-needed placement. Upon intervening, OCRA learned that due to T.W.’s needs and “history of being a fire starter,” the regional center had not been able to locate an out-of-home respite placement. Progress towards placement was at an impasse.

The CRA’s investigation confirmed that the “fire starting” was a one-time incident over five years ago. A coordinated strategy to find a respite placement with additional supports in place was developed by the regional center, OCRA, and the family. The regional center proceeded with the preparation and submission of a new placement packet for T.W. Within a week, not only was a temporary out-of-home respite placement found, but a permanent out-of-home placement option was also located.

T.W.'s mother elected to try the temporary out-of-home respite first. OCRA has been informed that the placement was successful, and has helped greatly to reduce stressors at home. Andrew Holcombe, CRA, Far Northern Regional Center.

E.G.'s Counseling Services Reinstated.

E.G. received counseling services from the regional center for 12 years. When the changes in the Lanterman Act went into effect in August, 2009, E.G. received a NOA from the regional center that her counseling services were being terminated. E.G. contacted OCRA for assistance with appealing the regional center's decision.

The Assistant CRA discussed the issues with E.G.'s counselor and was able to obtain a letter from the counselor written on E.G.'s behalf. The letter stated that E.G. was in need of additional counseling services due to her developmental delays which affect her ability to handle the stressors of her physical condition, family dysfunction and past childhood experiences. The counselor went on to state that E.G. would be at risk for psychiatric hospitalization without continued counseling services.

E.G. appealed the regional center's decision to terminate her counseling services. OCRA represented E.G. at the informal hearing where OCRA explained that E.G.'s counseling services should be considered a medical therapy. OCRA also maintained that E.G. qualified for an exemption from reduction of services since counseling is the primary means E.G. has for ameliorating the effects of her seizure disorder and intellectual disability.

The regional center decided to reinstate E.G.'s counseling and provide additional counseling sessions for the months of July and August that were missed due to the termination of her counseling services. Lorie Atamian, Assistant CRA, Far Northern Regional Center.

Brothers Awarded Regional Center Eligibility.

M.S. and R.S., both foster children, were denied regional center eligibility on two occasions but neither the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) nor previous foster care homes followed up on regional center eligibility for the brothers. The boys were placed with a new foster parent who fell in love with the boys and began the process to adopt them.

The foster parent contacted OCRA for assistance. OCRA evaluated the case and contacted a DCFS psychologist who had previously assessed the boys. The psychologist agreed to review records (including the assessments conducted by regional center vendored psychologists) and reassess the boys if necessary. The psychologist conducted additional testing. The original assessment and the addendum from the psychologist were submitted to the regional center for consideration. Unfortunately, the regional center issued a denial of eligibility for both boys.

OCRA filed for fair hearing and requested an informal meeting with the regional center. The foster parent and OCRA attended the informal meeting. The foster parent answered all the questions from the regional center staff and affirmed the behavioral, cognitive, and adaptive limitations the boys had demonstrated at home, in the community, and at school.

Two weeks later, the regional center revoked its initial denial of eligibility and made the boys eligible for services. Anastasia Bacigalupo, CRA, South Central Los Angeles Regional Center.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Client Receives Post Secondary Education Services until Age 23.

R.B. was referred for an initial special education evaluation in August, 2009, the summer before his senior year in high school. The school district did not perform the evaluation. R.B.'s parents contacted OCRA in August, 2010, when they were informed that R.B. had aged out of high school and no more educational services would be provided. OCRA immediately contacted the district administrator and requested that the assessments be completed and an Individual Education Program (IEP) meeting held.

At the IEP, R.B. was offered post secondary education services. These services will last until he turns 23 years old. This includes one year of compensatory services for failure to timely assess and identify him for special education. R.B. is now receiving appropriate educational services. Rita Defilippis, CRA, San Andreas Regional Center.

District Agrees to Provide ABA Services During Summer School.

T.N. is a 5-year-old student with autism. Pursuant to his IEP, T.N.'s special education services include 3.5 hours of applied behavior analysis (ABA) services per day. The school district informed the family that ABA services would not be provided during summer school. The family contacted OCRA as it was concerned that T.N. would regress without continued services. OCRA contacted the Director of Special Education and explained that related services, such as ABA, must be provided pursuant to the IEP for the duration of summer school. The district agreed to provide the ABA during summer school program. Rita Defilippis, CRA, Eleanor LoBue, Assistant CRA, San Andreas Regional Center.

District Agrees to Build an Appropriate Restroom for Students with a Disability.

M.C. is in second grade at her local school. Her mother contacted OCRA, concerned that M.C. had fallen off a changing table while being diapered at school. Upon investigation, OCRA discovered that students were being diapered in the main classroom in a makeshift changing area that was not safe and did not provide any privacy. The small area in the back of the room was not wheelchair accessible. It was merely an area of the room cordoned off by a shower curtain. Any student being changed could be seen by others in the room because the shower curtain was not large enough to fully cover the area. There was also no backrest or hand rail for students to grasp for support.

OCRA contacted the Director of Special Education and explained the situation and how it violated the rights of students with disabilities. Construction immediately began for a student restroom. The new restroom is wheelchair accessible, safe, and meets the privacy needs of the students. Rita Defilippis, CRA, Eleanor LoBue, Assistant CRA, San Andreas Regional Center.

A.L. Remains in the Least Restrictive Environment.

A.L. lives with his family and attends a special education program at a public school. Due to A.L.'s disability, he demonstrates behaviors, some of which are aggressive towards school staff and students. As a result, the school district proposed to change A.L.'s placement to a more restrictive, non-public school placement. The school district also began suspending

A.L. for each behavioral incident in its attempt towards changing A.L.'s placement.

A.L.'s mother contacted OCRA for assistance. OCRA agreed to represent at an IEP meeting. At the meeting, OCRA maintained that the school district failed to provide all services and supports necessary to maintain A.L. in his current least restrictive placement. The school district had not implemented a behavior support plan (BSP), had not completed a functional analysis assessment (FAA), and had not provided A.L. with 1:1 support staff, among other less restrictive alternatives. The school district agreed to draft, and implement a BSP based on the FAA's recommendations. Before the BSP could be implemented, A.L. was suspended yet again, triggering a manifestation determination meeting to determine if the behavior that A.L. had exhibited was a result of his disability. OCRA represented A.L. at the manifestation determination IEP meeting and maintained that the behaviors were a manifestation of A.L.'s disability and a direct result of the school district's failure to provide necessary services and supports. The school district agreed and did not proceed with an expulsion. Veronica Cervantes, CRA, Beatriz A. Reyes, Assistant CRA, Inland Regional Center.

K.R. Receives Transportation Services and Attends School.

K.R.'s mother called OCRA because the school bus had not picked up K.R. in two days. K.R.'s father was able to drive him on one of the days but K.R. had missed his second day of school. The mother is a monolingual Spanish-speaker. Despite many efforts by the mother to get information, no one could give her an answer as to when transportation would start for K.R.

OCRA had previously worked with K.R. and was familiar with K.R.'s IEP. The IEP clearly stated that K.R. would be provided transportation to his new middle school. OCRA called the Director of Special Education and informed her that K.R. was not in school because transportation was not being provided. The director ensured that transportation would be provided and that K.R. would attend school the following day, which happened. Yulahlia Hernandez, CRA, Annie Breuer, Assistant CRA, North Bay Regional Center.

OCRA Advocates for Disability Related Transportation.

OCRA was contacted because S.M.'s parents disagreed with a school evaluation and S.M. was not being transported to school. Due to S.M.'s medical condition, she needs special care on the school bus. OCRA provided direct representation at an IEP meeting. The school district agreed to provide the needed air conditioned bus with a licensed vocation nurse. S.M. will be the last child picked up and first child off the bus thus reducing her travel time on the bus. The district also agreed to provide a new assessment. Arthur Lipscomb, CRA, Kay Spencer, Assistant CRA, Maricruz Magaleno, Temporary Assistant CRA, Central Valley Regional Center.

Least Restrictive Placement Is Preserved.

D.V.'s mother had worked hard over many years to have D.V. attend an elementary school in her community and participate in mainstreaming. D.V.'s mother was devastated when she was informed during an IEP meeting that D.V.'s placement would be changed to a more restrictive setting. D.V.'s mother did not agree with this proposed action and did not sign the IEP. D.V.'s mother contacted OCRA for assistance. OCRA provided technical assistance to D.V.'s mother to prepare for an additional IEP meeting. At the IEP meeting, the school agreed that D.V. would be allowed to stay in her current least restrictive placement. Aimee Delgado, CRA, Marisol Cruz, Assistant CRA, San Gabriel/Pomona Regional Center.

OCRA Helps A.S. with School Services.

A.S. is a six-year-old student who is fully included in the second grade. A.S.'s mother contacted OCRA to request assistance in advocating for services at school for A.S. A.S.'s mother is monolingual Spanish speaking. She did not understand some of the services included in A.S.'s current IEP. She did not agree with the district's recommendation for placement in a special day class. A.S.'s mother wanted him to remain fully included with the supports necessary for him to progress. A.S.'s mother also wanted A.S. to have a 1:1 instructional aid and occupational therapy. The district agreed to conduct an occupational therapy assessment to review A.S.'s sensory issues, as well as his fine and gross motor problems. The district also clarified the specialized academic instruction identified on A.S.'s current IEP, which consisted of 1:1 instruction in the regular education

classroom from the Resource Specialist Instructional Assistant for 30 minutes per day. Another IEP meeting will be scheduled to review the occupational therapy assessment as well as the mother's request for a 1:1 instructional aid. At this time, A.S. will remain in his fully included second grade class. Kathy Mottarella CRA, Gina Gheno, Assistant CRA, Tri-Counties Regional Center, Jazmin Romero, Assistant CRA, Lanterman Regional Center.

OUTREACH/TRAINING

Consumer Advocates Play Clients' Rights Mega-Bingo!

OCRA was invited to participate in the Area Board 6 Self-Advocacy Council quarterly meeting on August 6, 2010, in Modesto. The Area Board 6 Self-Advocacy Council includes the counties of Stanislaus, San Joaquin, Tuolumne, Calaveras, and Amador counties. Consumer advocates traveled from each county and over 250 self-advocates enjoyed a fun day of learning about their rights.

Many people yelled out answers and ideas about clients' rights throughout the Clients' Rights' Bingo game. The crowd had lots of fun learning new things and sharing ideas.

Clients' Rights Mega-Bingo always manages to keep the group active and makes for a fun time. Consumer advocates received prizes for each bingo and when time was running out, OCRA passed out prizes to everyone. The packed community hall was roaring with laughter and filled with smiles by the end of the game. Leinani Walter, CRA, Filomena Alomar, Assistant CRA, and Gail Gresham, Supervising CRA, Valley Mountain Regional Center.

ADVOCACY REPORT

OFFICE OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS ADVOCACY

Winter 2010

BENEFITS

Multiple Categories of Benefits

OCRA Helps M.D. Access Public Benefits.

M.D. is a child with autism. She was found eligible for regional center services in 2008. M.D.'s mother contacted OCRA because M.D. was denied Medi-Cal, and then SSI and IHSS due to not having Medi-Cal.

OCRA agreed to review M. D.'s records and provide technical assistance in appealing all benefits. As a result of M.D.'s appeals, M.D. has been approved for Medi-Cal and SSI. However, M.D.'s denial of IHSS did not change, so OCRA contacted the County regarding the issue.

The County agreed to a conditional withdrawal and authorized an in-home assessment. Wendy Dumlao, CRA, Alba Gomez, Assistant CRA, San Diego Regional Center.

In Home Supportive Services (IHSS)

Sucessful IHSS Hearing Due to Technical Assistance from OCRA.

C.M. is a child with autism. C.M.'s mother contacted OCRA to request information about more IHSS hours for her son. C.M. received 195 hours per month, but his mother thought C.M. needed more due to his significant behaviors. OCRA provided C.M.'s mother with Disability Rights California's IHSS self-assessment packet and explained the self-assessment to her. OCRA also provided her with

on-going technical assistance to help her prepare for C.M.'s IHSS hearing.

With OCRA's assistance, C.M.'s mother prepared an evidence packet, reviewed C.M.'s IHSS file and prepared witness questions for the IHSS worker. The ALJ determined that C.M. was severely impaired and entitled to 283 hours of IHSS per month. Wendy Dumlao, CRA, Alba Gomez, Assistant CRA, San Diego Regional Center.

Parents Wins Hearing to Obtains Protective Supervision for Child.

O.G. requires supervision and assistance with her self-care. O.G.'s mother is not able to work full-time because she must care for O.G. and her older brother, who also has autism. O.G. applied for IHSS and was denied. Her parents appealed, represented her, and agreed to allow the County to assess her needs again. She was again denied. OCRA prepared O.G.'s parents to represent her at hearing. OCRA helped the parents to gather evidence and form arguments based on O.G.'s needs and the law. At hearing, the County asked the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) to dismiss the case because the parents did not appeal timely. The ALJ denied the request finding that because the notice of action was inadequate the timeline did not expire.

O.G.'s mother is monolingual Spanish-speaking, and asked for an interpreter, but the state did not provide an interpreter at the hearing. O.G.'s father speaks English and represented O.G. as best he could without O.G.'s mother's input. Despite this, O.G.'s parents received a favorable hearing decision that awarded protective supervision to O.G. who will now receive 195 hours per month of IHSS. She is also entitled to \$26,000 in retroactive benefits from the date of application for benefits. Katie Meyer, CRA, Luisa Delgadillo, Assistant CRA, Westside Regional Center.

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

OCRA was initially contacted by J.J.'s mother, a monolingual-Spanish speaker, questioning the County's determination that her 16-year-old

son was ineligible for additional hours under the IHSS program. The County authorized J.J. a total of 53.6 hours per month of IHSS personal care services. However, no time was allocated by the County for related services.

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

At hearing, OCRA maintained that J.J. was entitled to receive both personal care and related services. The ALJ agreed with OCRA's interpretation of the regulations and concluded that J.J. was entitled to an increase of 17.32 hours a week for related and personal care services. This resulted in an increase of 75 hours per month of IHSS retroactive to January 1, 2010. Ibrahim Saab, CRA, Ada Hamer, Assistant CRA, North Los Angeles County Regional Center.

P.G. Obtains Protective Supervision.

P.G.'s mother appealed a denial of protective supervision by IHSS. The mother requested assistance from OCRA because P.G. was displaying dangerous behaviors such as eloping and generally showing poor judgment regarding his safety. OCRA represented P.G. at hearing, and the County was ordered to reassess P.G.'s need for protective supervision. The CRA and the regional center service coordinator attended the assessment to advocate for P.G. P.G. is now receiving the protective supervision that he requires in order to live safely at home. Jacqueline Miller, CRA, Cynthia Salomon, Assistant CRA, Regional Center of Orange County.

J.G. Awarded Additional Personal and Related Services.

J.G.'s mother appealed J.G.'s assessed amount of personal and related IHSS services because J.G.'s needs were greater than the social worker had documented. At the hearing, the County was ordered to conduct a reassessment. After reassessment, the County further reduced J.G.'s personal and related services. J.G.'s mother

kept a log of the actual time it took to meet J.G.'s needs, and requested assistance from OCRA. The CRA noted all of J.G.'s needs and the time for tasks in a brief, and represented J.G. at hearing. The ALJ found that J.G. required the additional 37.5 hours per month that were requested at hearing, and also granted 1.5 years of retro-active service hours. Jacqueline Miller, CRA, Cynthia Salomon, Assistant CRA, Regional Center of Orange County.

Medi-Cal

Appropriate Wheelchair Obtained.

M.S.'s mother had been struggling for over two years with a home health vendor to get an electric wheelchair that met M.S.'s needs. The vendor insisted on delivering an electric wheelchair that was not accessible for M.S. to use in her home. M.S.'s mother contacted OCRA for assistance. The CRA assisted M.S.'s mother in coordinating with the regional center occupational therapist for an assessment to determine the appropriate type of wheelchair that meets M.S.'s needs. The assessment determined that the wheelchair the vendor was trying to deliver was not appropriate. As a result, M.S. will have her accessible electric wheelchair delivered within the month. Aimee Delgado, CRA, Marisol Cruz, Assistant CRA, San Gabriel/Pomona Regional Center.

Social Security

J.A. Found Eligible for SSI.

J.A. is a 19-year-old consumer. He contacted OCRA through his case workers to request assistance in obtaining Supplemental Security Income (SSI). J.A. had been denied SSI by the Social Security Administration (SSA) on the basis that he was not disabled.

OCRA agreed to represent J.O. at hearing and obtained documentation and support about his disability from a number of different sources. J.A.'s Independent Living Skills (ILS) workers, regional center case files, IPP's, and treating physicians all provided valuable information.

At hearing, OCRA argued that J.A. met the severity standard for SSI's listings for a number of different categories including autism, affective disorder, and mental retardation. OCRA maintained that SSI's evaluations were not adequate.

At hearing, the ALJ found OCRA's documentation and arguments to be persuasive. In a fully favorable decision, the ALJ found J.A. eligible for SSI, which will enable him to live independently in the community. Arthur Lipscomb, CRA, Kay Spencer, Assistant CRA, Maricruz Magaleno, Temporary Assistant CRA, Central Valley Regional Center.

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

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

Twins Continue to Be Eligible for SSI.

A.S. and M.S. are 14-year old twin boys with autism. Their grandmother called OCRA for assistance after having received a notice of action from the SSA stating that the twins no longer qualified for SSI due to not meeting the resource limit. Although an appeal was submitted within the timeframe to receive aid paid pending, the SSA stopped its payments. After reviewing records, the Assistant CRA (ACRA) discovered that the income used to determine the twins' ineligibility was exempt income and should not have been counted towards a resource. OCRA had many discussions with the SSA staff about exempt income and resource limits. In the end, the SSA agreed that it had made an error, reinstated the twins' monthly benefits, including several months of retroactive payments, and

rescinded the overpayments which had resulted from the mistake. Veronica Cervantes, CRA, Beatriz A. Reyes, Assistant CRA, Inland Regional Center.

CONSUMER FINANCE

OCRA Intervention Prevents Prosecution for Overdraft.

D.W. is a young man whose neighborhood friends encouraged D.W. to write checks. There were insufficient funds in D.W.'s bank account to cover the checks. The bank was attempting to collect the money from D.W. and was planning to contact the police.

OCRA worked with D.W. and assisted him with his own police report. Following OCRA intervention, the bank decided that D.W. was himself a victim of crime and did not press charges. Katy Lusson, CRA, Trina Saldana, Assistant CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

CRIMINAL LAW

All Counts of SARB Infraction Charges Are Dismissed.

M.K. and B.K. are husband and wife. They are both consumers of the regional center. M.K. and B.K. have an adolescent daughter. The daughter had multiple unexcused absences from school.

M.K. and B.K.'s service coordinators contacted OCRA seeking assistance for M.K. and B.K. They were in the midst of School Advisory Review Board (SARB) proceedings. Large fines were being imposed as a result of their daughter's alleged truancy. The parents were found guilty of infractions on six counts of truancy and sentenced with informal probation on the condition that they attend parenting classes and that their daughter returns to class. M.K. and B.K. failed to fulfill the conditions for probation as they did not have transportation and faced other challenges. Further, E.K., failed to attend school as directed. As a result, M.K. and B.K. were brought back to court.

OCRA received the referral a week before the hearing was to be held. OCRA attended the Juvenile Court proceedings and successfully requested a continuance in order to secure legal representation for the parents. OCRA agreed to attend an IPP meeting for both M.K. and B. K.

OCRA secured private special education counsel. The private attorney agreed to take the case on a pro bono basis. Another SARB hearing was held on August 30, 2010. The case against the consumer parents was dismissed and all charges against M.K. and B.K. were dropped. All fines that had been imposed were waived. In addition to assisting M.K. and B. K., the private attorney secured special education services for their daughter. Kendra McWright, Interim CRA, Filomena Alomar, Assistant CRA, Valley Mountain Regional Center.

HOUSING

Client Able to Maintain Housing Voucher.

H.P. lived in a public housing complex for years. He was doing very well living independently but then began to express his sexuality in the public areas of the housing complex. H.P. contacted OCRA because he was afraid he would be evicted from his apartment and become homeless.

OCRA advocated for H.P. to receive additional support services. OCRA attended a meeting with the management company regarding H.P.'s status at the housing complex. The management company agreed not to formally evict H.P. since his Section 8 housing voucher might be in jeopardy with the eviction. Instead, H.P. agreed to look for different housing which would offer him more personal privacy. H.P. also wanted to continue counseling services.

H.P. was very relieved to know he would have time to move and that he would not be at risk of being homeless. Yulahlia Hernandez, CRA, Annie Breuer, Assistant CRA, North Bay Regional Center.

OCRA Successfully Advocates for Restoration of Section 8 Voucher.

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

The housing authority was unwilling to reinstate C.P.’s Section 8 voucher. OCRA met with the housing authority and explained the nature of C.P.’s disability and the need for subsidized housing. The housing authority agreed to reinstate the Section 8 voucher. Katy Lusson, CRA, Trina Saldana, Assistant CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

Z.D. Stays in Her Home of Choice.

Z.D. visited numerous apartments, group homes, and facilities before finally settling in her own room in an assisted living facility. All of her care needs are met and she is close to her community college and public transportation. The facility recently changed ownership, and the new owners felt that Z.D. did not fit in socially since most of the residents were elderly. Z.D. prefers to live with older people, and was devastated to be served an eviction notice. The notice said the facility could no longer meet her needs.

OCRA researched the regulations that govern residential care facilities for the elderly (RCFEs) and eviction requirements. The facility did not comply with the requirements because it did not state with specificity the reason for eviction. OCRA sent a request letter asking the facility to reconsider its decision. The facility chose to revise its notice. However, the notice was still defective because to be evicted, Z.D.’s needs would have had to change. OCRA attempted to negotiate with the executive director, who could not change the decision of the new owners.

OCRA hired a nurse to evaluate Z.D.’s needs and her ability to perform certain activities of daily living. The nurse found that Z.D.’s needs had not changed since she moved into the facility, and also that she could eat on her own, though the facility had alleged differently. OCRA also asked for Z.D.’s treating physician’s opinion. He said that her needs had not changed and she could eat on her own. OCRA then partnered with an attorney from Bet Tzedek Legal Services and drafted a complaint to the California Department of

Social Services, Community Care Licensing (CCL) Division alleging wrongful eviction. The first CCL investigation report appeared favorable but stated, "inconclusive." OCRA and Bet Tzedek asked for a review. CCL sent its own nurse to evaluate Z.D. The nurse found that Z.D.'s needs had not changed. Because of this, CCL found no grounds for eviction and issued a new report which substantiated the complaint of wrongful eviction. The facility rescinded its eviction notice and Z.D. is now able to stay in her home. Katie Meyer, CRA, Luisa Delgadillo, Assistant CRA, Westside Regional Center, Jody Speigel, Attorney, Bet Tzedek Legal Services.

Client Is Released from Psychiatric Facility in Time for the Holidays.

A.B. is a 34-year old consumer who is dually-diagnosed and was living in a group home. A.B. had previously spent several years living in developmental centers because of behavior problems. A.B. began displaying self-injurious behavior and was placed on a 72-hour involuntary psychiatric hold. A.B.'s mother contacted OCRA requesting assistance in getting C.J. out of the psychiatric facility because A.B.'s 3-day hold had been extended and his depression appeared to be getting worse.

The CRA visited A.B. at the psychiatric facility and spoke with facility administrators regarding what barriers to discharge existed to prevent A.B. from returning to his group home. The CRA then arranged for a discharge-planning meeting to take place with facility, group home, and regional center staff, and A.B.'s mother.

Unfortunately, the CRA discovered that the facility had a policy of not allowing patients to be present at their own treatment team meetings because the facility did not have any appropriate meeting rooms within the locked section of the facility. After a review of records, the CRA also found questionable practices regarding informed consent procedures.

The CRA advocated for A.B. to be present and an active participant at his discharge planning meeting. He was allowed outside the boundaries of the locked units to take part in his meeting. A.B. was able to express his fears and concerns regarding his stay at the

facility and to listen to what his treatment team expected from him in order to meet discharge criteria. His mother was also able to address various concerns she had regarding conditions at the unit. His doctors agreed to adjust his medication and his discharge behavior goals. The regional center agreed to hold his group home placement for an additional month and the group home operator agreed to accept A.B. back upon discharge. A.B. was able to be discharged back to his group home in time for the end of year celebrations. Eva Casas-Sarmiento, CRA, Lucy Garcia, Assistant CRA, Eastern Los Angeles Regional Center.

PERSONAL AUTONOMY

Consumer Decides How to Spend Small Inheritance.

B.M. lives with his brother and receives Supported Living Services (SLS). The SLS agency contacted OCRA because B.M.'s father had recently died. The person managing his finances was going to give B.M.'s brother all of the money in the father's checking account. The SLS agency was concerned that B.M.'s brother would spend the money and that B.M. would not receive his share of the small inheritance.

OCRA met with B.M. After discussing the situation with him, OCRA advocated for B.M. B.M. knew what he wanted to do with his share. It was agreed that B.M. receive a check representing his share of the inheritance. The amount was not large enough to impact B.M.'s benefits. B.M. went shopping. His SLS worker agreed to go shopping with him so that B.M. could purchase what he wanted with his share of his father's inheritance. Katy Lusson, CRA, Trina Saldana, Assistant CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

Petition to Terminate Conservatorship Granted.

In conjunction with the Public Defender's Office, OCRA assisted K.O. in terminating her conservatorship. A.B. is a 60-year-old woman living with her husband and daughter. A.B. had been conserved since 2002.

A.B. was removed from her family home when she was conserved in 2002, and has lived in a variety of group homes. Her goal was always to live again with her family. A.B. has attempted to terminate her conservatorship multiple times since its inception in 2002.

This time, A.B. was allowed to return to her family home with supports for a trial period while her conservatorship was being challenged. OCRA attended the hearings needed to terminate the conservatorship. Technical assistance was provided to the public defender. Multiple witnesses testified during the course of the hearing.

The Court found that while A.B.'s lifestyle and manner of living was different than what may be typical, this did not demonstrate an inability to meet her own needs. The conservatorship was terminated. A.B. is now living with her family and free of conservatorship. Arthur Lipscomb, CRA, Kay Spencer, Assistant CRA, Maricruz Magaleno, Temporary Assistant CRA, Central Valley Regional Center.

G.L. Is Connected with Her Public Defender.

G.L. did not want her parents to obtain conservatorship of her, and was very upset because she did not have someone representing her at all the court hearings that she attended with her parents. Prior to attending the hearings, G.L.'s parents would tell G.L. what to say to the judge. G.L. did not want to tell the judge that she wanted her parents to be her conservator, but she was afraid not to do as her parents suggested. G.L.'s service coordinator requested legal assistance from OCRA for G.L., so that she could tell the judge that she did not want to be conserved. G.L. was never informed that she had a right to a public defender or that she had been assigned one. OCRA was able to contact the Public Defender's Office to locate and connect G.L. with her public defender. Jacqueline Miller, CRA, Cynthia Salomon, Assistant CRA, Regional Center of Orange County.

REGIONAL CENTER

DDS Approves Transfer and Community Placement Following 4731 Appeal.

T.C. moved from a developmental center in southern California to Sonoma Developmental Center (SDC) in northern California. He wanted to live closer to his sister. Although T.C. had moved years prior, his services never transferred from the regional center in southern California to the regional center in northern California. After living at SDC for years, T.C. decided that he wanted to move into the local community. When T.C. made this request at his IPP meeting, he was told that his regional center services would need to transfer directly to the regional center in the north. T.C.'s sister then requested that T.C.'s regional center services be transferred. The request was denied.

T.C. filed a 4731 complaint regarding the denial of his request to transfer regional centers. The regional center in the north refused to grant the CRA's proposed resolution which was for the new regional center to accept the transfer. OCRA helped T.C. file an appeal of the denial with the Department of Developmental Services (DDS). After discussions with DDS, it was determined that SDC should move into the community. T.C. is currently setting up the support services he needs to live near his family. He plans on moving out of SDC in the next few months. Yulahlia Hernandez, CRA, Annie Breuer, Assistant CRA, North Bay Regional Center.

H.M. Determined Eligible for Regional Center Services.

H.M. is a 16-year-old girl who was previously denied regional center eligibility. The regional center based the denial on H.M. having a learning disorder. OCRA met with H.M. and reviewed H.M.'s school and medical records. Following a review of the records, OCRA obtained a psychological evaluation of H.M. by an expert that concluded that H.M. had a diagnosis of autism. OCRA agreed to represent H.M. at a regional center eligibility hearing. OCRA then wrote a letter to the regional center explaining how H.M. met the eligibility requirements for regional center services based on autism and the "fifth category." The regional center reviewed the letter and

the psychological report and determined that H.M. was eligible for regional center services. Timothy Poe, CRA, Abigail Perez, Assistant CRA, Kendra McWright, Interim CRA, Harbor Regional Center.

Prone Restraints Removed from Behavioral Plan and Change In Regional Center Policy.

T.T. is a 23-year-old with autism and a history of self injurious behaviors. Prior to OCRA being contacted by T.T.'s parents/conservators on T.T.'s behalf, he had gone through three SLS providers and several day programs.

T.T. was receiving SLS services from the last available local provider at the time OCRA was contacted. T.T. was the only resident in a rented house due to his behaviors, and he had a 2:1 staffing ratio. If that placement did not succeed, the only apparent alternative was an out-of-town placement.

T.T.'s parents were greatly concerned about his behavioral plan that called for prone restraints. The parents felt the plan did not explore alternative, less intrusive means of addressing behavioral problems. Of additional concern was that T.T. suffered from pulmonary problems, thus placing him particularly at risk in prone restraints. There was also concern regarding several occasions of repeated and extended use of prone restraints over the course of a day.

The CRA intervened by communicating with the regional center regarding prone restraints. The CRA also went to T.T.'s SLS home and met with his staff and the behavioralist to discuss the concerns and alternatives

With the help of OCRA's intervention, T.T. got a new behavioral plan without the use of restraints. The new plan utilizes positive reinforcements and non-intrusive means to stop or change injurious behaviors. T.T.'s self injurious behaviors have been significantly reduced and the placement has become a success. In addition, the regional center has put restrictions on the use of physical restraints on all its SLS providers, pending a complete review and analysis of

the appropriateness and safety of such restraint protocols. Andy Holcombe, CRA, Far Northern Regional Center.

Respite for Two Sisters in the Foster Care System.

M.O. and S.O. received separate notices of intended action reducing their respite hours from 25 hours per month to 10 hours per month each. Their foster mother, who was in the process of filing a guardianship petition for both sisters, immediately filed for a fair hearing on behalf of the sisters. The regional center informed the foster mother she had no legal standing to file the appeal because her guardianship petition had not been approved by the court.

The foster mother contacted OCRA asking for assistance in this matter. OCRA called the public defender who had been assigned to represent both girls at the guardianship hearing. The public defender agreed to appeal the regional center's decision in time to request aid paid pending to continue current services until the matter could be heard by an ALJ.

OCRA attended an informal meeting with the regional center to help resolve the matter. OCRA used the regional center's matrix to calculate the appropriate number of hours each girl was eligible to receive. The regional center agreed to settle the matter by continuing to provide 20 hours of respite per month for M.O. and 25 hours per month for S.O. Mario Espinoza, CRA, Kern Regional Center.

E.M Is Able to Take Her Daughter into the Community.

E.M. has a disability that prevents her from utilizing public transportation so her supported living provider transports E.M. E.M.'s provider was told by the regional center that staff was not permitted to transport E.M.'s child anywhere even though the provider was willing to transport E.M.'s child when it transported E.M. E.M. was concerned because she was not able to go to the grocery store, doctor's appointments, or almost anywhere in the community without having to pay a taxi or a babysitter. E.M. wanted to be able to bring her child anywhere she went, just as other parents do.

E.M. appealed the denial of transportation and requested assistance from OCRA. The CRA attended pre-hearing meetings, an Informal Meeting and Mediation to assist E.M. with obtaining appropriate transportation. With OCRA's assistance, E.M. was able to successfully negotiate transportation for her child when E.M. goes into the community. E.M. was also able to increase SLS hours. Jacqueline Miller, CRA, Cynthia Salomon, Assistant CRA, Regional Center of Orange County.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

School District Agrees to Provide Occupational Therapy.

S.R., an elementary school student who needs occupational therapy (OT), was denied it by her school district, even though an evaluation by S.R.'s medical doctor stated that she needed the therapy. When S.R.'s mother requested an independent OT evaluation by the district, it refused. OCRA assisted S.R. by filing a Compliance Complaint with the California Department of Education (CDE). The complaint was upheld. When the school district filed for a due process hearing, OCRA, represented S.R. at mediation, where the school district agreed to provide S.R. with 30 minutes per week of individual OT, in addition to group therapy. Celeste Palmer, Associate CRA, Regional Center of the East Bay.

OCRA Obtains Busing for Special Education Students Who Live in an Apartment.

M.J. is 5-years-old and lives with his family. He is very medically fragile, cognitively impaired and uses a wheel chair. For the last few years, the school transported M.J. from the door of his apartment to school. Last summer, the school informed the family that it was the district policy to NOT transport children within an apartment complex and that M.J. never should have been transported to his door.

M.J.'s family asked OCRA for assistance in getting M.J. bused to his door as M.J. can become very ill when he is outside in the elements, plus he is not able to get himself to the school bus stop outside of his apartment complex.

Because the family obtained documentation from the school that it was school district policy not to transport special education students to their door if they live in an apartment, OCRA filed a Compliance Complaint on behalf of all students in special education who live in an apartment building.

The CDE contacted 35 families in the school district and verified that students were delivered to their door if they lived in a house, but not if they lived in an apartment.

The school district was ordered to hold Individual Education Plan (IEP) meetings by the end of January, 2011, for all special education students who live in an apartment and to provide verification to CDE that families have been informed of their right to have door-to-door transportation if the student needs it and that all students who need the transportation are receiving it.

With just one client, OCRA was able to make a difference for all special education students in the district who live in an apartment, including M.J. Jackie Coleman, CRA, Elizabeth Kennedy, Temporary Assistant CRA, Alta California Regional Center.

OCRA Helps Mother to Advocate for Health Aid at School.

E.P. is a 6-year-old student who is fully included in the first grade. Her mother contacted OCRA to request assistance in advocating for 1:1 health assistant services at school because E.P. was scheduled to have orthopedic surgery which would require the temporary use of a wheelchair and walker. E.P.'s mother requested an IEP meeting to discuss the supports E.P. would need when she returned to school after her surgery. OCRA advised E.P.'s mother of her daughter's right to health care services at school along with E.P.'s right to return to school after her surgery. At the IEP meeting, E.P.'s mother strongly advocated for the supports E.P. would need in the school setting following her surgery. The school nurse, however, told E.P.'s mother that E.P. could not return to school until she was fully recovered even though E.P.'s surgeon said that she could return to school one week after her surgery. OCRA offered to write a letter to the school district. In the meantime, the school nurse reversed her

decision calling E.P.'s mother to arrange a meeting with the school occupational therapist so a plan could be developed for a 1:1 health aide for E.P. at school along with any special accommodations necessary. E.P. had her surgery in November and subsequently returned to school with a 1:1 health aide support. Kathy Mottarella CRA, Gina Gheno Assistant CRA, Tri-Counties Regional Center.

Placement in School Program Due Process Continues.

R.G. is a child who is dually diagnosed. She was placed at Fred Finch Youth Center (FFYC) in 2008 to access necessary mental health services. R.G.'s parents were forced to place her at FFYC by Child Welfare Services due to the child's aggressive behaviors. None of the agencies involved would pay the residential portion of the placement, although R.G. had AB 3632 mental health services and was receiving full scope Medi-Cal.

OCRA represented R.G. at an administrative hearing against the County Mental Health, the Adoption Assistance Program and the Department of Social Services. The ALJ determined that the County should have funded R.G.'s residential portion at FFYC. The ALJ ordered that the County reimburse R.G.'s parents for their out of pocket expenses. FFYC would not submit a treatment authorization request (TAR) in order for Medi-Cal to process the reimbursement, so R.G.'s parents ultimately received nothing from the County.

Since R.G. was also receiving AB 3632, OCRA then filed for due process against the school district and County Mental Health for failure to properly assess R.G. and failure to provide appropriate related services. At mediation, the school district and R.G.'s parents agreed to a settlement for partial payment. Because County Mental Health refused to attend mediation, the due process will continue against it. Wendy Dumlao, CRA, Alba Gomez, Assistant CRA, San Diego Regional Center.

Student Able to Communicate as a Result of OCRA's Advocacy.

J.L. is 14 years old. English is her second language. Due to problems stemming from a cleft palate, and moderate hearing loss, J.L.'s speech is difficult to understand. For that reason, her school

provided a speech device four years ago. At each subsequent IEP, the school noted that J.L. was not using her speech device; that her lack of spelling skills made it difficult for her to use the device; that she found the device too limiting as she was unable to express much of what she wanted to communicate.

J.L.'s IEP's over the past three years showed a lack of progress since she had the same annual goals each year. The school acknowledged that J.L. was unable to use her speech device to communicate, yet it did nothing to remedy the situation.

Several months prior to OCRA becoming involved, a triennial IEP was held. The school lead J.L.'s mother to believe that there was no need to do any assessments, as it was clear that J.L. still qualified for special education services. J.L.'s mother agreed to not have triennial assessments performed.

J.L.'s regional center service coordinator contacted OCRA for assistance at J.L.'s IEP meetings. The ACRA attended several IEP meetings, one of which ended abruptly when the school refused to acknowledge OCRA as the advocate for J.L. The ACRA requested that a facilitator be present at each subsequent IEP meeting. With a facilitator present, the IEP meetings became more productive. OCRA was able to get the school to do the triennial assessments along with an independent communication assessment.

At the next IEP, the school contended that J.L. was successfully using a "Fusion" device to communicate. When OCRA asked that J.L. do a demonstration of her command of the Fusion device, it became clear that the only thing she was learning from the device was how to type. The ACRA successfully advocated for an independent speech therapist to work with J.L. and her family in programming a more appropriate speech device that would give J.L. the ability to communicate with others.

The ACRA spoke with J.L.'s mother a month after the IEP was held. Her mother reported that J.L. is now using her speech device on a daily basis to communicate with others. Lorie Atamian, Assistant CRA, Far Northern Regional Center.

A.L. Returns to Her Original Placement.

A.L., a student with an intellectual disability, was suspended and the school district refused to allow her back into her original school. A.L. did not want to change schools. Further, the district had found that the behavior for which she was suspended was directly related to her disability.

A.L. contacted OCRA for help in maintaining her current placement. OCRA met with the parent, student, and the school administrator. OCRA explained the laws regarding least restrictive environment, behavior assessments, and appropriate related services. A.L. was immediately returned to her original placement. A behavior assessment was conducted and a positive behavior plan was developed. A.L. is now receiving conflict management counseling services as part of her behavior plan. The district also agreed to compensate A.L. for the lost instructional time for the days it refused to allow her to attend the original placement. Rita Defilippis, CRA, San Andreas Regional Center.

District Agrees to Develop a Behavior Plan to Assist Student with a Hearing Impairment.

B.N. is a 10-year-old special education student with a significant hearing impairment. He has not made meaningful progress on IEP goals for two years. B.N.'s parents contacted OCRA to advocate for appropriate educational services at an IEP meeting. OCRA soon discovered that for two years B.N. had refused to wear his hearing aids at school. The district had not addressed the problem, claiming that it did not have anyone to provide this service. As a result, the hearing aids were not used at school for two years and B.N. was unable to fully participate and make progress on his goals. At the meeting, the district agreed to provide a hearing specialist and a behavior specialist to assess the problem and develop a behavior plan and IEP goals to increase B.N.'s tolerance of the hearing aids. Rita Defilippis, CRA, San Andreas Regional Center.

S.Y. Starts the School Year.

S.Y. has significant disabilities that require that she have a 1:1 aide on the bus. She lives almost an hour one-way, over mountainous roads, from her school. The school district had attempted to fill the aide position but could not find anyone willing to take the job. OCRA became involved and discovered that the school was advertising the position as a 2-hour per day shift, split between 8:00 to 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 to 4:00 p.m.

In November, OCRA began working with the school district to get S.Y. into school. CRA convinced the school district to make the position more desirable by doubling the shift, from 2 to 4 hours per day. A bus aide was promptly hired. S.Y. finally started school and will receive compensatory education to make up for the time she was out of school. Jim Stoepler, CRA, Redwood Coast Regional Center.

G.C. Obtains Special Circumstance Instructional Assistant.

G.C. is a 9-year-old with an intellectual disability and SCAD, a metabolic disorder. Due to G.C.'s complicated medical needs, his parents requested that an assistant be assigned to their son at school. Originally, the district refused to assign an assistant to G.C. After several incidents involving G.C. getting hurt at school, the parents contacted OCRA for assistance with advocating for an assistant to remain with G.C. during his entire school day.

OCRA requested a copy of G.C.'s educational records and advised the parents on requesting an assessment. The district conducted a Special Circumstance Instructional Assistant (SCIA) assessment and provided a temporary instructional assistant for G.C. The school district was planning on presenting the SCIA assessment at the next IEP meeting. OCRA advised G.C.'s parents that they had a right to request a copy of any assessments that were to be presented at an IEP meeting in advance of the meeting. G.C.'s parents requested that the meeting be rescheduled and asked for a copy of the assessment. G.C.'s parents and OCRA reviewed the assessment. At the IEP meeting, the school district offered the SCIA to continue for G.C. for the entire school day until the next annual review. Jackie

S. Chiang, CRA, Jazmin Romero, Assistant CRA, Lanterman Regional Center.

OUTREACH AND TRAINING

OCRA Provides Educational Outreach and Follow-Up.

Advocates for consumers at GGRC conducted numerous outreach trainings throughout the counties of San Mateo, San Francisco, and Marin during 2010. The topic areas varied depending on the needs of consumers and families. Participants repeatedly reported that they found the training events to be valuable.

Recently, OCRA presented a topic at a Matrix Center. Matrix is a parent network and resource center for families. At the training, OCRA explained about its services and facilitated a discussion about regional center services. The families felt comfortable asking questions. They gained a deeper understanding about OCRA. The discussion about regional center services was very informative. The participants learned about the IPP process, the intake process, ILS, and more. The participants appreciated that OCRA came to the location. A few days after the training, OCRA received three intake calls as a result of the training. Katy Lusson, CRA, Trina Saldana, Assistant CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

Training to Latino Family Support Group on Social Security Benefits Educates Consumers and Family Members.

OCRA contacted the leader of “Unidad y Fuerza,” a Latino family support group for children with special needs (including children with developmental disabilities), to ask if the support group would be interested in a training by OCRA. The support group leader identified social security disability benefits as one area in which families had many questions. OCRA agreed to provide a training on social security benefits and how to appeal denials and overpayment notices. The CRA and ACRA worked together to develop training materials, and the ACRA translated all the materials into Spanish and provided Spanish interpretation at the training. Over twenty persons attended the training. OCRA received subsequent calls from members of the support group in which OCRA provided individual assistance on

social security issues, as well as other benefits and regional center matters. Timothy Poe, CRA, Abigail Perez, Assistant 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.disabilityrightsca.org

MEMORANDUM

TO: Jeanne Molineaux, Director
FROM: Anastasia Bacigalupo, OCRA Outreach Coordinator
RE: Semi-Annual OCRA Outreach Report
July – December 2010
DATE: January 25, 2011

The demand for OCRA to conduct outreach trainings and presentations every year is always extremely high and the past six months has been no exception. During this review period, OCRA staff conducted more than 200 outreach trainings and presentations. Below is a breakdown of the distinct types of outreach that staff provide (self-advocacy trainings, general and targeted outreach) statewide. With general and targeted outreach, OCRA staff contributed their thoughts as to why the highlighted outreaches were unique and/or impactful.

Self-Advocacy Trainings

Normally, each OCRA office conducts a minimum of one self-advocacy training per contract year. During this review period, OCRA staff conducted 19 self-advocacy trainings to 772 attendees. Topics presented during this review period were Emergency Preparedness/ Being Safe, Feeling Safe, Self-Advocacy/ Client's Rights, Hands off My Money/ Money Management, Voting Rights, and Community Living Options/ My Own Choice.

Outreach Trainings and Presentations Statewide

OCRA is required to conduct a minimum of 160 trainings per contract year, so over the past six months OCRA met and surpassed our annual goal with

205 trainings to 10,141 attendees. Although staff have established contacts in their respective catchment areas, they are encouraged to seek new or innovative ways to connect with their community and the professionals that serve them. What follows is a description by staff of new or innovative outreach trainings and presentations they provided over the review period:

- **Summer Institute on Neurodevelopment Disorders:** *“People from all over the state attended this institute that focused primarily on Autism. We had a table and set up an intake clinic to answer individual questions from attendees.”*
- **Logan’s Run:** *“The event was aimed at raising awareness about individuals with Autism. The event was particularly important for our office because it was held within our catchment area in the San Fernando Valley and afforded us the opportunity to partner with Jay Nolan Community Services, a service provider that assists many consumers of NLACRC.”*
- **Dominican College Autism Fair:** *“This fair catered to consumers, family members, professionals, care providers and regional center staff. What was really wonderful about the fair was that it really did cover Autism from infancy to adulthood. I saw several teens and adults that I had worked with when they were very young.”*
- **Client's Rights Training to Hope House:** *“This outreach was unique because we were asked by the administration of Hope House CCF to provide a training to its staff on Clients’ Rights. This outreach was impactful for the clients living in this facility because staff did have questions that they sent in advance and participated in discussion during the training.”*
- **UCLA Early Childhood Partial Hospitalization Program:** *“It was important for our office to provide this outreach because often times parents in the program have children who have been recently diagnosed with Autism and they are very interested in and appreciative of the information we share. It is impactful to our community because these parents find out about OCRA for the first time, feel extremely relieved that they can come to us with any legal questions they have, and they share what they learned about OCRA with other parents.”*
- **In Service at Travis Fairfield Air Force Base:** *“This outreach was unique because we actually were able to do outreach to the air force*

base community which is constantly changing. It is a challenge for us to outreach there because of all of the security issues and maintaining a contact on the base. The audience was comprised of air force base hospital staff (nurses, medical technicians, and social workers), parent advocates, and parents.”

Targeted Outreach:

Organizationally, OCRA has made a commitment to actively outreach to and serve people with developmental disabilities from traditionally underserved communities. Of the 22 offices statewide, 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 social service agencies.

OCRA staff are encouraged to seek new or innovative ways to connect with their targeted communities. What follows is a description by staff of new or innovative targeted outreach trainings and presentations they provided over the review period:

- **Congreso Familiar:** *“We love participating in this event because it covers the entire Bay Area, and people come from all over because it is the main event for Latino families from our regional center. There are classes that parents and others can take. The booths and tables are ready for display in the courtyard, for when the participants break for lunch. During lunch, the participants enjoy live entertainment performed by consumers. The atmosphere was warm and welcoming.”*
- **Hmong Healthy Families Fair:** *“This was an impactful outreach to the Hmong community because many attendees were recent immigrants to this country.”*
- **8th Annual LAUSD Special Education Resource Fair:** *“This was impactful for the Latino community because we were able to educate the community about our office and the legal services we offer in the area of special education.”*
- **Native American Tribal Council Pow-Wow:** *“This was an impactful event because we educated the Native American community about*

developmental disabilities, regional center and OCRA. We conducted intake on site and provided answers to individual legal questions.”

- **Urban League Harvard Head Start:** *“This outreach connected our office to additional Urban League head starts serving the African-American community within our catchment. This outreach was impactful for us because there was a nice balance of disabled and non-disabled children and the parents were very appreciative of the information because they did not know much about over age 3 services at the regional center.”*
- **Asian Pacific Islanders with Disabilities of California Statewide Disabilities Conference:** *“This outreach was unique because it brought together professionals of different disciplines who provide services to people with disabilities who also happen to be Asian Pacific Islander. The professionals shared their experiences working with the Asian Pacific Islander community. It was also unique because consumers and parents were given the opportunity to share their experiences and provide helpful advice with other conference attendees regarding the Individualized Education Program process and the Regional Center system.”*
- **Solano County Outreach on Special Education:** *“We planned this with the Area Board and Matrix in response to complaints from families and professionals regarding basics rights violations at IEPs in the county. It was unique because we were working with other agencies and collaborating to outreach to a community who seemed in need of some very basic information. There are a lot of Latinos in Solano County and the parent advocates were mainly Spanish speaking.”*

I am excited to see what the next six months brings as we close not only the 2010-2011 outreach year but our two year plan spanning 2009-2011.

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

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Semi-Annual Report - July 1, 2010 through December 31, 2010
Report by Service Level

	ARC	CVRC	ELARC	FNRC	GGRC	HRC	IRC	KRC	LRC	NBRC	NLARC	RCEB	RCOC	RCRC	SARC	SCLARC	SDRC	SGPRC	TCRC	VMRC	WRC	Total
Pending			1					7		8				1								17
Information/Referral	30	60	113	31	83	103	45	39	70	36	24	33	23	23	32	46	8	68	46	150	131	1194
Rights Information/Consultation (RC/Generic)	165	65	61	23	18	36	177	52	86	94	70	74	134	65	22	183	67	173	199	9	154	1927
Rights Information/Consultation (Other)	3	42	95	92	13	25	1	90	5	71	20	76	43	10	89	3	122	3	87	18	8	916
Abuse/Neglect Investigation	8	2		6	1			4	1	8					1		2					33
Special Education Compliance Complaint	1											3		2	1		2				2	11
IEP		16	2	7	2		1	21	1	5		1	4		4	6	1		1	1	1	74
IPP/IDT		7		2				1		8	6					2	2	2			2	33
W&I 4731			1			1					1		1		1		1					6
Technical Assistance	16	1	19	10	27	3	1	14	1	3	5	5	17	4	5	3	13	9		1	4	161
Evaluation and Assessment	11	45	10	25	48	5	3	22	17	28	1	21	8	1	4	7	4	2	1	2	11	276
Informal Regional Center / Provider Problem Resolution	1	2		1	7		16	3	5	2	7	12		1	11	4	4		2		4	82
Informal Generic Service Agency Problem Resolution	1	1	1	4	2	1	6		6	2	2	9			13	3	2				12	65
Case Settlement Prior to Informal Meeting, Mediation or Hearing			1	1			3		2	1	1				1		1				1	12
Direct Representation in RC "Voluntary Informal Meeting"	1	1			1	1		1	1						1				1			8
Direct Representation in Mediation / RC Fair Hearing	1		1		1	2	2				1				1	1	2				2	14
Direct Representation in an Appeal for Generic Services		3	3						1		3	2	2			1	5		2		7	29
Court Litigation	1	2	1					1														5
Grand Total	239	247	309	202	203	177	255	255	196	266	141	236	232	107	188	259	236	255	339	185	336	4863

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	MOU dated 4/02.
Inland	MOU dated 4/10/07.
Kern	MOU dated 5/2007.
Lanterman	Previous MOU adopted 8/17/07.
North Bay	MOU dated 5/30/07.
North Los Angeles	MOU dated 11/1/08.
Redwood Coast	MOU dated 1/13/10.
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.disabilityrightscalifornia.org

Memo

To: Disability Rights California Board of Directors
OCRA Advisory Committee

From: Jeanne Molineaux, Director

Date: January 18, 2011

Re: Annual Consumer Satisfaction Survey
July 1, 2010, through December 31, 2010

Attached are the results of the current Consumer Satisfaction Survey. The surveys were sent out for the period of July 1, 2010, through December 31, 2010. Every fourth closed case was randomly selected from OCRA's computer intake system to receive a survey, which included a self-addressed stamped envelope.

Three hundred fifty seven surveys were mailed out. This is a significantly smaller number than the same time period last year as temporary staff were used to complete the process. One permanent staff person has now been assigned to this project.

Of the 357 surveys mailed, eighty-seven returned the surveys. This represents a 24 percent return rate. Of those responding to the questions, 98 percent of the respondents who answered the questions felt they were treated well by the staff, 94 percent understood the information they were provided, 95 percent believed their CRA listened to them, 98 percent would ask for help from the Clients' Rights Advocate again, 92 percent were helped by the CRA, and 83 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.	84	2	1
2. My call was returned within two (2) days	69	14	4
3. I could understand the information I got.	81	5	1
4. My Clients' Rights Advocate listened to me.	81	4	2
5. I was helped with my question/problem by my Clients' Rights Advocate.	77	7	3
6. I would ask for help from the Clients' Rights Advocate again.	82	2	3

Comments: ¹

- I'm sincerely grateful for Lucy's savy, skill and patience; we couldn't succeed without her much! Thank you for all you do!
- Doug Harris = knowledgeable+ fantastic....
- Lo que el defensor me dijo que hiba a recibir el nino no se le dieron, lo mismo que tenia antes eso mismo tiene ahora (What the advocate told me the boy would receive was not given. The same as what he had is the same as he has now.)
- OCRA has been there for the 4-5 years Thank you.
- Que cuando los defensores de Derechos al cliente salgan a entrenamientos y vacaciones haya ,as asistensia para cubrirlos y el servicio no sea lento en ese entonces. Mas asistencia en espanol. (That when the advocate of Rights goes out to trainings or on

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.

vacations and there be more assistance to cover them and for it not to be slow in that instance. More assistance in Spanish. Thank you.)

- I needed some help w/legal terms but w/translation I did.
- This is a very useful service almost invaluable.
- Quiero que se encuentre la forma de obligar al distrito ha que pague una escuela privada para mi hijo _____. El distrito no tiene el personal capacitado para cuidar a mi hijo ellos lo han maltratado fisicamente. (I want is for there to be a way to get the school district to be forced to pay for a private school for my son, _____. The school district does not have capable personnel to take care of my son. They have mistreated him physically.)
- WONDERFUL! HELPFUL!
- Todo la informacion fue de suma impotrancia para mi y pude obtener los servicios de terapia para mi hijo. El trato de Kathy y Gaby es excelente. (All of the information was of major importance to me and I was able to obtain the therapy services for my son. The way we were treated by Kathy and Gaby was excellent.)
- They are nice and very good to help _____.
- Mi defensora fue muy atenta rapida y amable, muchas gracias. (My advocate was attentive fast and friendly thank you very much.)
- Thank you.
- Solamente que el personal que tienen este mas accesibles porque las veces que e necesitado solo me dicen que no pueden ayudarme ya que el señor Mario lo tiene que consular y siempre tiene mucho trabajo. (Only that the personnel should be more accessible because the times I've needed help they tell me they can't help me and that _____ has to be consulted always and he has a lot of work.)
- Thank you
- Yo, _____ tengo 2 hijos especiales _____ y _____ 13 anos con diagnostic retraso mental y quisiera hablar cde un problema. Yo quisiera por que ellos no califican p ara el disability. (I, _____ have 2 special sons _____ and _____ 13 years, with diagnosis of MR. I'd like to talk to someone about a problem I would like to know if they qualify us for disability.)
- I appreciated your help very much.
- Que no se tarden tanto en dar soluciones a los casos. (That they not take so long in finding solutions to cases.)
- Services rendered has always been great whether or not the problems still exists.

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

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

- This office of client's rights advocacy is excellent I which it will be developing more and protecting more clients' rights forever I loved and appreciated this office.
- I did not enjoy services that much!?
- Thank you for all of your help.
- Ms. Delgado provided the services with a very pleasant personality and a good manner as always glad I am happy to have her help for my sons care :)
- Thank you for your time and help.

- Disability Rights is critical for many families right now.
- We received excellent guidance and assistance
- Your paid employees were no help to me at all!!! As an idea you might want to set up better training program.
- I want her to visit me again, please.
- Si no existiera este servicio me hubiera sido muy difícil poder ayudar a defender a los derechos de mis hijos Gracias! (If your services didn't exist it would be very difficult to help and defend the rights and services of my children. Thanks)
- They referred me to another agency who didn't call me back. I know they have people there on staff that could help they were just busy with other cases. It was frustrating.
- Excellent Staff they really cared about my daughters best interest. A rare concept these days!
- So very professional Ms Katie Meyer is outstanding at Culver City Ofc.
- Excelente(excellent)
- Gracias a ustedes por brindar su ayuda y apoyo cuando nuestros hijos con necesidades especiales cuando ellos lo necesitan.(Thank you for offering your help and support when our special needs children need it.)
- Muchas Gracias por todo cambiaron muchísimas cosas respecto a mi niño en la escuela. (Thank you for everything so many things have changed as far as my son's school)

DISABILITY RIGHTS CALIFORNIA BOARD
OCRA ADVISORY COMMITTEE
January, 2011

Committee Members:

Eric Ybarra	(Stockton)
Billy Hall	(Glendale)
Izetta Jackson	(Oakland)
Amy Kalivas	(San Diego)
Dianne Millner	(Oakland)

OCRA Advisory Committee Minutes
Friday, September 24, 2010

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

Staff: Cara Armstrong, Evelyn Abouhassan, Catherine Blakemore, Maxine Dalaza, Jeanne Molineaux, Dara Schur, Milanka Radosavljevic, Katie Hornberger, Katie Meyer, Andy Mudryk and Alice Ximenez

Facilitators: Jennifer Estabillo, Valerie Carlos and Monica Huevo

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

March 5, 2010 Minutes: Members M/S/C (Hall/Ybarra/Kalivas) to approve minutes of last meeting.

ADA Celebration: Billy and Eric both shared their experience of public speaking during celebration. The event was held at the State Capitol and was well-attended.

Westside Regional Center Update: Katie Meyer, Clients' Rights Advocate, Westside Regional Center, discussed a case where client received waiver approval when dealing with issues surrounding concurrent beneficiaries.

Supervising Clients' Rights Advocate Report: Katie Hornberger, Supervising Clients' Rights Advocate, discussed the transition from CRA to Supervising CRA and the various changes in staffing for OCRA.

Annual Report: Jeanne Molineaux shared information from the OCRA Annual Report including staffing changes, significant increase in OCRA cases due to Lanterman Act changes, advocacy reporting trends, and a Far Northern Regional Center Section 8 housing case that has changed the way regional centers handle Section 8 housing issues. The Emergency Preparedness Training requirement from DDS has been met by OCRA.

Capitol People First Trainings Status and Implementation: Jeanne Molineaux gave update on plans for implementation of the facility trainings to be scheduled. Two trainings have been completed at this time.

Samantha C., Brian S., and Michael K. Update: Dara Schur gave update on these cases which included the news that DRC lost on the Michael K. case. More work to be done. More fact sheets are being developed at this time. People are looking more at autism spectrum disorders and await the new DSM to be released. This will change how we work our eligibility cases.

Legislative and Public Affairs Report: Evelyn Abouhassan gave update on current budget status stating that preliminary budget was announced and that final budget was forthcoming.

Recruiting Public Membership: Members M/S/C (Kalivas/Hall/Ybarra) that OCRA staff be encouraged to recruit public members to apply.

The meeting adjourned at 12:50 p.m.

ATTEST,

Eric Ybarra, Chair

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Self-Advocacy Trainings
July 1, 2010 - December 31, 2010

Self-Advocacy Trainings held:

Central Valley RC	July 22, 2010
	August 20, 2010
East LA RC	September 7, 2010
Kern RC	July 15, 2010
	August 20, 2010
Lanternman RC	July 19, 2010
North Bay RC	August 13, 2010
North LA RC	November 15, 2010
RC of Orange County	September 16, 2010
San Andreas RC	July 9, 2010
South Central LA RC	August 12, 2010
Tri-Counties RC	November 29, 2010
Valley Mountain RC	November 22, 2010
	December 17, 2010
Westside RC	October 26, 2010

**OFFICE OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS ADVOCACY
SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT
JULY 1, 2010 – DECEMBER 31, 2010**

TITLE 17 REPORT

TITLE 17 LETTER	REGIONAL CENTER	COMPLAINT (INITIALS)	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	STATUS	OUTCOME
9/22/10	Alta California Regional Center	G.M.	Various denials of rights by care provider	Closed	Some allegations upheld; some denied; some not substantiated.
11/12/2010	Alta California Regional Center	G.M.	Various denials of rights by care provider and regional center	Closed	Some allegations upheld; some denied; some not substantiated.
11/12/2010	Alta California Regional Center	G.M.	Various denials of rights by care provider and regional center	Closed	Some allegations upheld; some denied; some not substantiated.

**OFFICE OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS ADVOCACY
SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT
(July 1, 2010 – December 31, 2010)**

DENIAL OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS

Regional Center	Good Cause	Right(s) Denied	Date Denial Began	Date of Review	Date of Restoration
HRC10-06	I	V, T	7/23/10	8/20/10	8/20/10
IRC10-01	I	P	5/11/10	7/2010	7/2010

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, 2010 – December 31, 2010**

CONSUMER GRIEVANCES WITH CONTRACTOR

DATE OF RESOLUTION LETTER	COMPLAINT (INITIALS)	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	STATUS	OUTCOME
8/27/10	E.E.	Failed to Represent at I.E.P.	Closed	OCRA actions upheld
9/1/10	C.F	1 st Level - Failed to Represent in Negligence action.	Closed	OCRA actions upheld
10/2/10		2 nd Level Complaint- Failed to Represent in Negligence action.	Closed	OCRA actions upheld
9/23/10	C.H.	Failure to Represent at SSI hearing.	Closed	OCRA actions upheld
11/1/2010	C.A.	Failure to Represent at Conservatorship hearing.	Closed	OCRA actions upheld