

OCRA ANNUAL REPORT
2007 – 2008

<u>TABLE OF CONTENTS</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES.....	1
A. Services are provided in a manner that maximizes staff and operational resources	2
1) Advocacy Reports.....	2
2) Analysis of Consumers Served	5
3) Outreach/Trainings.....	6
B. Issues and complaints are resolved expeditiously and at the lowest level of appropriate intervention.....	7
C. Collaborative and harmonious working relationships are fostered	7
1) Memorandums of Understanding	7
2) Meeting with Association of Regional Center Agencies (ARCA)	8
D. Consumer satisfaction	8
1) Consumer Satisfaction Survey	8
2) Letters of Appreciation	9
3) Cases will be handled in a timely manner	11
E. Coordination of services with the DDS contract manager, stake holder organizations, and multi-cultural community.....	11
F. Self-Advocacy Trainings.....	12
III. TITLE 17 COMPLAINTS.....	14
IV. DENIAL OF CLIENTS’ RIGHTS.....	14
V. CONSUMER GRIEVANCES.....	15

<u>TABLE OF CONTENTS</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
VI. ATTORNEYS FEES COLLECTED.....	15
VII. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ENHANCEMENT OF SERVICES	16
VIII. CONCLUSION.....	16

<u>EXHIBIT LIST</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
EXHIBIT A (OCRA Staff Roster)	1
EXHIBIT B (OCRA Statistics)	2
EXHIBIT C (Advocacy Report Spring, Advocacy Report Summer) ..	2
EXHIBIT D (Outreach and Training Annual Report).....	7
EXHIBIT E (Report by Service Level)	7
EXHIBIT F (Memorandums of Understanding)	8
EXHIBIT G (Consumer Satisfaction Surveys).....	11
EXHIBIT H (OCRA Advisory Committee and Meeting Minutes)....	11
EXHIBIT I (Title 17 Complaints).....	14
EXHIBIT J (OCRA Annual Denial of Rights).....	14
EXHIBIT K (OCRA Annual Consumer Grievances)	15
EXHIBIT L (OCRA Annual Attorneys Fees)	15

(Under Separate Cover)

OCRA SELF-ADVOCACY TRAINING EVALUATION BINDER

I. INTRODUCTION

Protection and Advocacy, Inc. (PAI) provides state-wide clients' rights advocacy services for regional center consumers pursuant to a multi-year contract, HD069010, with the Department of Developmental Services (DDS) through PAI's Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy (OCRA). The contract was renewed effective July 1, 2006, for a 5-year period. This is the Annual Report required under the contract, pursuant to Exhibit E, Paragraph 14. The contract is to be amended Fall, 2008, to show that PAI is changing its name to Disability Rights California.

OCRA takes great pride in its accomplishments. The statistics and work product for the past year, which are discussed throughout this report, give ample evidence of continuing effective advocacy. During the past year, OCRA resolved over 8,488 issues for consumers and participated in 332 trainings presented to approximately 18,634 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.

PAI 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

PAI's contract with DDS requires performance outcomes, as established in Exhibit E, Page 6, Paragraph 3, of the contract. Each of the specific required outcomes is discussed in the following Sections A through F. The contract does not set specific numbers for performance for the outcomes. OCRA is willing to establish specific numbers in consultation with DDS, if it so desires.

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

OCRA continues its tradition of serving a large number of people with developmental disabilities. OCRA handled 8,488 issues for regional center consumers during the fiscal year. The breath of issues in these cases is staggering and reflects the need for staff to know the current law that affects people with developmental disabilities in an extremely large number of areas. The statistics, attached as Exhibit B, are discussed below and show the wide variety of issues and the large number of cases handled by OCRA staff.

1) Advocacy Reports.

Each advocate provides on a quarterly basis a summary of at least one case that has unique situations from which others can learn and that can be used as examples of the advocacy that OCRA accomplishes. The summaries for Spring, 2008, and Summer, 2008, 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:

Bus Company Agrees to Add a Bus to Route and Provides Sensitivity Training to Staff.

OCRA filed a federal complaint against the local public bus company on behalf of two adult consumers who use wheelchairs. The consumers tried previously to resolve their problems with the bus company by telephoning the customer service department, complaining to the bus drivers and addressing their problems at public community meetings. The allegations of discrimination based on a disability included the refusal of the bus company to provide alternative transportation on the route frequented by regional center consumers. Riders often had to wait over one hour for the bus due to the occupancy of the two bus spaces designated for riders in wheelchairs. In addition, the complaint alleged that the bus staff did not treat consumers with dignity, often referring to them as “wheelchairs.” The Program Operations Director of the bus company contacted OCRA to discuss the complaint. Following discussions with OCRA, the bus company agreed to take corrective actions to address the allegations. The consumers and the CRA later met with the Operations Director. The bus company agreed to add another bus to the route, resulting in a pick up every half-hour, and to

provide extensive training to all bus staff on respectful communications with and about passengers who use wheelchairs. The bus company also agreed to the consumers' request to address their concerns at an upcoming company staff training. At this training, the Operations Director and the consumers will review the current plan of corrective action and determine if there is a need for additional improvements.

Creditor Relief.

W.S. is an adult with mild mental retardation who lives independently. Some months ago, W.S. purchased an "as is" used car. Shortly thereafter, breakdowns and repair problems began. With the help of her independent living skills worker, W.S. first tried to go back to the seller for relief, only to find that he had gone out of business. The vehicle became non-operational, and the estimated cost of repair exceeded the vehicle's value, so W.S. stopped payment on a check written for an insurance renewal.

When W.S. received a demand letter from the finance company for the payments that were due, W.S. came to OCRA for help. OCRA sent a rescission of contract letter to the finance company alleging fraud, misrepresentation, and failure of consideration, and offered to return the defective car. Issues of meaningful capacity to contract were also raised. A Fair Debt Collection Practices notice was given prohibiting further contact by the finance company, other than to collect (repossess) the car. Thereafter, the vehicle was reclaimed and the problem was resolved.

Subsequently, a demand letter or "bad check" letter was received by W.S. regarding the stopped payment insurance check. OCRA sent out another Fair Debt Collection Practices notice regarding the "bad check," in addition to raising defenses to alleged liability and civil penalties. Both the finance company and the check collection agency have ceased collection from W.S.

OCRA Gets Client Maximum IHSS Hours.

C.D.'s mother called OCRA when the county denied C.D. protective supervision hours. The evidence supported the need for protective supervision. C.D.'s physician and psychologist had confirmed that C.D.'s level of functioning was well below her chronological age. In addition, C.D.'s mother had a list of dangerous situations that C.D. had put herself in when nobody was watching. C.D.'s job coaches also agreed that C.D. needed 24-hour supervision.

OCRA appealed the county's denial and represented C.D. at hearing. OCRA argued protective supervision was needed as well as more hours in other personal services categories. As a result, the administrative law judge (ALJ) ordered that C.D. receive the maximum 283 hours. This included protective supervision as well as hours in other categories. The ALJ also ordered retroactive hours from October, 2007, to the present.

O.R. Receives Assistive Technology.

O.R. is diagnosed with mental retardation and is also deaf. O.R. lives in an adult residential facility whose care provider is fluent in American Sign Language. Initially OCRA was contacted by O.R.'s ex-foster parent to investigate whether O.R. wished to live in his current placement. After OCRA met with O.R., it was determined he was content with the placement. However, during that meeting, OCRA realized that O.R. did not have a communication device that would allow him to communicate with people in the community who are not deaf or do not know how to sign. The Assistant CRA turned her efforts into getting O.R. an appropriate communication device. An IPP was scheduled to discuss assistive technology (AT) services. There were no previous communication goals as part of O.R.'s IPP. The regional center added communication as a goal and assisted O.R. in finding a generic resource that would provide O.R. with an AT device. O.R. will receive a telephone for the deaf from California Telephone Access free of charge and will now be able to communicate with friends, family, and others.

OCRA Prevents School from Discriminating against Student.

R.J. is in a full-inclusion kindergarten class with a 1:1 aide. The school decided to extend the school day for the kindergartners but R.J. was only allowed to stay for the extended part of the day if his mother came to the class. R.J.'s mother requested that the school reconsider its position as it had singled R.J. out from his peers and compromised his performance in class. The school stated that it did not have money for the 1:1 to stay for the extended time and that the extended time was "optional". Therefore, it was not part of the IEP. OCRA investigated the issue with the Office of Civil Rights as a discriminatory act by the school. OCRA represented R.J. at an IEP. The school agreed to the 1:1 aide for the entire day.

2) Analysis of Consumers Served.

OCRA handled a total of 8,488 cases from July 1, 2007, through June 30, 2008. This represents a significant provision of advocacy service. Included as Exhibit B is the complete compilation of data for the fiscal year. The data has been compiled by:

1. Age
2. County
3. Disability
4. Ethnicity
5. Gender
6. Living Arrangement
7. Type of Problem (Problem Codes)
8. Service Level

The majority of the OCRA statistics remain consistent with OCRA's statistics for previous years. For example, the largest number of consumers served by age, 2,525 during this time period, has consistently been the 3-to-17 years-old age group. The next largest is the 22-40 age group with 1,271 people served. The ratio of males to females served also remains consistent. For those cases where gender is recorded, OCRA has traditionally served more males than females, with 63 percent of the consumers served being male and 37 percent being female. This roughly corresponds to the percentage of regional center consumers who are male versus female. As of January, 2008, 61.30 percent of all regional center consumers were male and 38.70 percent female.

The percentage of consumers residing in the parental or other family home remains by far the largest number of consumers served with 5,880 consumers in the family home or 69 percent of the cases handled. The next largest group served is those living independently, with OCRA serving 1,183 people or 20 percent with this living arrangement. This is an 8 percentage increase in the number of consumers living independently that OCRA helped this fiscal year versus last fiscal year.

OCRA's statistics on the ethnicity of consumers served for the year show OCRA's continuing commitment to serve underserved communities. The percentage of consumers from various ethnicities served by OCRA was:

Ethnicity	Percent OCRA Clients 7/1/07 - 6/30/08	Percent RC Clients 12/ 2008
Afro-American	9	10
Latino	32	31
American-Indian or Alaskan Indian	1	.4
Asian	4	6
Pacific Islander	1	3
White	42	42
Multicultural (Self-Identify)	4	Not listed
Refused to State/Other	7	7

OCRA's statistics show that OCRA's service to various ethnic groups is close to parity with the number of consumers of each ethnicity served by the regional center. OCRA's service to Latinos increased this year over last by 3 percent, which is a substantial increase. Otherwise, this year's statistics remain fairly consistent with last year's.

The vast majority of cases handled by OCRA assist consumers in accessing services or benefits from generic agencies. This year, OCRA handled 5,188 cases involving generic services. In addition to assistance with access to generic services, OCRA handled 2,577 regional center matters and 260 matters involving autonomy versus privacy, among other issues.

3) Outreach/Trainings.

OCRA recognizes that outreach and training are an essential part of providing effective advocacy for regional center consumers and also recognizes that trainings are one of the best ways to maximize staff and operational resources. Therefore, OCRA offers training on a wide variety of issues to a large variety of participants, including consumers, parents, regional center staff, vendors, and other interested people. Topics covered include, but are not limited to, consumers' rights, abuse and neglect issues, special education, voting rights, SSI, and conservatorships, among other topics.

During the last year, OCRA presented at 332 trainings with a total attendance of approximately 18,634 people at the various trainings. 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's catchment area. To help with this, OCRA has appointed Lisa Navarro as the northern California Outreach Coordinator and Anastasia Bacigalupo as the southern California Outreach Coordinator. The coordinators advise staff in implementation of their target outreach plans. Based upon an evaluation of the original outreach plans' results, and using new census data and 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, 2007, through June 30, 2008, OCRA resolved 8,488 issues for consumers. Of those served, all but 156 were resolved informally. This means that 98 percent of all the matters that OCRA handled were resolved informally. Data showing this is attached as Exhibit E.

C. Collaborative and harmonious working relationships are fostered.

OCRA staff makes every attempt to foster collaborative and harmonious working relationships with the consumers and parents who OCRA serve, regional center staff, stakeholders, and members of the general community. This philosophy is not only incorporated into PAI's contract with DDS, but is also a recognition that some of the most effective advocacy takes place because of interpersonal relationships and informal advocacy. The success of this philosophy is demonstrated by the number of calls we receive, by OCRA's many successes, and by its recognition as an excellent resource for people with developmental disabilities.

1) Memorandums of Understanding.

OCRA has established Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) with each regional center that 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 is meeting

with each of the regional center directors or designees to revise the existing MOUs. Copies of all MOUs have been forwarded to DDS. The status of each revised MOU is discussed in Exhibit F.

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).

Jeanne Molineaux, Director, OCRA, and Bob Baldo, Executive Director of the Association of Regional Center Directors, met on July 17, 2008. It was agreed that there are no outstanding issues at this time. Further meetings with ARCA will be convened, should concerns arise.

D. Consumers and families are satisfied with the services provided.

PAI recognizes that consumer satisfaction is a primary goal for the people whom it serves. OCRA is committed to reaching consumers and parents in a manner and with results that ensure consumer and family satisfaction with the services provided.

1) Consumer Satisfaction Survey.

OCRA measures consumer satisfaction by use of an instrument developed jointly by staff, the OCRA Consumer Advisory Committee, and DDS. From the results of the most recent survey, it is clear that consumers remain extremely satisfied with the services provided by OCRA.

Nine hundred and twenty-one surveys were mailed out. Two hundred and seventy-nine people returned the survey. This represents a 30 percent return rate of the surveys. This is an excellent return rate for mailed surveys.

Of those responding to the questions, 97 percent of the responders felt they were treated well by the staff, 96 percent understood the information they were provided, 95 percent believed their CRA listened to them, 90 percent believed they were helped by the CRA, and 95 percent would ask for help from OCRA again. See Exhibit G, which discusses the results of OCRA's survey.

2) Letters of Appreciation.

OCRA staff receive many letters of appreciation from consumers and others. Below are quotes from a few of the letters¹:

Congratulation and thank you so much for all the effort to help us. It worked and I never gave up hope that you win this case. It took a long time but patience paid off. I know I was sometimes very tensed—because I've seen how much was affected by...I will stay in touch with you. Katy you were always so pleasant to talk with. Wish you the very best, health and strength to attack some other cases.

This is just a small thank you for the huge appreciation we feel. Thank you so much for helping out with the 2008 Rett Syndrome conference. I've gotten nothing but rave reviews for your presentation and the information you shared.

Thank you so much for coming to an IEP and being _____'s advocate. Your support means so much to us. It keeps us to continue to be _____'s voice and her advocate. Thank you again for your prayers and your kindness.

I received my copy today, I am amazed. I am so grateful to you for your efforts. What a relief!

On behalf of ____ the parents and guardians who attended your recent seminar on Conservatorship options, we want to thank you for your participation. We are very appreciative that you took time out of your busy schedule to speak at this Saturday event. As you could tell by the attendance and the participation, the information you presented is very pertinent to the population (we) represent. While our organization has provided parents and caregivers with written information on this topic in the past, it was important that they have an opportunity to ask questions of an expert....

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

We cannot thank you enough for helping us through a very difficult and painful experience. It goes without saying that you understood the legal issues, but you also understood the emotional side of dealing with the health and welfare of our only child. You understood that we only want _____ to be safe and healthy and happy. Your advocacy was more powerful than we could have imagined or hoped for. Thank you again. Thank you again and again!

We are greatly appreciated for all your help on _____'s Due Process Hearing. Without your assistance, we could not have gone through the process more sufficiently. Thank you very much.

Thank you so much for coming to meet with my class. My students really enjoyed you! Next year we plan on incorporating self-advocacy and rights into our class and I hope to be able to use this information. ____High School.

A million, zillion thank-you's just wouldn't be enough... Thank You!! Love,

Thank you so much for coming to our parent group. It was so ironic, but when I got home from the meeting there was an IEP invitation for my son (unexpected addendum invitation). It was so wonderful that I had what you shared with us fresh in my mind—especially the next day I inquired about the invite and did not get straight answers. Through it all I felt confident since we had just had our meeting with you. Thank you so much.

Thank you por todo tu apoyo y ayuda. Muchisimas Gracias. (Thank you for all your support and assistance. Thank you very much.)

I just wanted to say Thank you so much for all your support. Attached are yesterdays pictures of _____'s first day at _____. This was only possible because we had your guidance, support and advocacy. So again, thank you so so much !!!

3) Cases will be handled in a timely manner.

It is important that advocacy services be provided in a timely manner. Consumers and families are frequently in emergency situations, in danger of losing their placement in the least restrictive environment, losing their source of income, unable to get their medical needs met and a myriad of other dangerous or difficult situations. For this reason, OCRA has, since its establishment, had a policy that all calls will be returned as soon as possible, but not later than closing of the next business day. OCRA measures its performance in this area by use of its consumer satisfaction survey, see Exhibit G, discussed more fully above. OCRA statistics shows that 86 percent of all callers to OCRA received a call back within two days during the fiscal year. This level of performance provides verification that cases are resolved in a timely manner. OCRA will continue to train on this requirement to ensure that it provides exceptional services for all callers.

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

OCRA works through the OCRA Advisory Committee to ensure that this performance outcome is achieved. Attached as Exhibit H is a list of the members of the committee effective June 30, 2008.

Members of the Advisory Committee are appointed by PAI's Board of Directors. In the selection process, the Board considers geographical diversity, both rural and urban and north and south, type of developmental disability represented, and ethnic background, in addition to the qualifications of the individual applicants. The current committee has four consumer members and two family members. There is one vacancy. In addition, most of the members are also members in stakeholder organizations.

The 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 in Sacramento on May 14, 2008, are attached as Exhibit H. The next meeting is to be held on August 22, 2008.

As a cost savings measure, we have made a decision to conduct most OCRA Advisory Committee meetings by videoconference from the PAI offices in Sacramento, Los Angeles, Oakland and San Diego. Additionally, Kern Regional Center has agreed to let OCRA use its video conferencing equipment in Bishop, as one of the committee members lives in that town. OCRA staff believe that the exchange of information can be conducted as well by video conferencing as if the entire committee were together. This is anticipated to save OCRA significant amounts of money over the next year. DDS staff is invited and encouraged to participate in any of the meetings.

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. PAI's contract with DDS mirrors this language. OCRA has been proactive in this matter and requires each of its offices to provide at least one self-advocacy training for consumers a year, so OCRA far exceeds the mandated number of trainings. Many offices provide more than one training.

To date, OCRA has developed five separate packets of information for OCRA staff to use in the mandated trainings:

Clients' Rights Information (Several versions of basic materials are used.)
Voting Rights
Clients' Rights Bingo
Hands off My \$\$\$
Being Your Own Boss

Additionally, OCRA has agreed to work with DDS on a self-advocacy training being developed by DDS for consumers on consumer safety. DDS is sponsoring a training of the trainers day for OCRA, tentatively set in Sacramento for December 9, 2008.

Samples of the OCRA self-advocacy packets (most are in both English and Spanish), were provided separately in a binder marked OCRA Training Materials with last year's Annual Report. In discussions with DDS's Contract Manager, it was decided that OCRA should not submit duplicate

training packets in this year's report. As always, OCRA welcomes comments from DDS on any training packets.

An advocate may use information from any packet in presenting his or her self-advocacy training to consumers. Additionally, OCRA is required to report in its Annual Report an evaluation of the trainings. OCRA has randomly selected consumer training satisfaction evaluations and included copies of them in the OCRA Self-Advocacy Trainings' Evaluation binder under separate cover. Almost without exception, consumers are pleased with OCRA's self-advocacy trainings.

Self-Advocacy Trainings held last year are as follows:

Alta RC	September 15, 2007 December 13, 2007 December 27, 2007 March 12, 2008
Central Valley RC	May 12, 2008 September 19, 2007
East Los Angeles RC	June 3, 2008
Far Northern RC	April 21, 2008 April 3, 2008 May 15, 2008
Golden Gate RC	July 24, 2007 July 26, 2007 December 6, 2007 March 6, 2008
Harbor RC	July 21, 2007 October 22, 2007
Inland RC	June 24, 2008
Kern RC	July 17, 2007
North Bay RC	August 18, 2007 February 5, 2008
North LAC RC	October 6, 2007
RC of East Bay	April 8, 2008
Redwood Coast RC (Ukiah)	September 10, 2007 February 4, 2007
RC of Orange County	June 26, 2008
San Andreas RC	July 24, 2007

San Diego RC	August 10, 2007
	March 1, 2008
	April 9, 2008
San Gabriel/Pomona RC	July 24, 2008
South Central LA RC	September 21, 2007
Tri-Counties RC	December 6, 2007
	May 30, 2008
Valley Mountain RC	July 26, 2007
	April 25, 2008
Westside RC	July 2, 2007

III. TITLE 17 COMPLAINTS

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

IV. DENIAL OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS

CCR, Title 17, Section 50530, sets forth a procedure whereby a care provider may deny one of the basic rights of a consumer if there is a danger to self or others or a danger of property destruction caused by the actions of a consumer. The CRA must approve the procedure and submit a quarterly report to DDS by the last day of each January, April, July, and October. OCRA is including the reports concurrently with the contractual date to provide OCRA's reports. If this is not acceptable to DDS, OCRA will submit duplicate reports as requested. Attached as Exhibit J 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 PAI 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 grievances were filed by consumers or their families against OCRA during the past year. Most actions of OCRA were upheld in the grievances. Information concerning the grievances has previously been submitted to DDS. Attached as Exhibit K is a chart detailing the grievances filed against OCRA during this period.

VI. COLLECTION OF ATTORNEYS FEES

OCRA does not charge consumers, their families or advocates fees for services nor does OCRA seek to recover costs from these individuals. Clients' Rights Advocates who are licensed to practice law in California, or Assistant or Associate Clients' Rights Advocates working under the supervision of an attorney, can collect attorney's fees and costs similar to those collected by private attorneys or advocates for special education cases or other cases where there are statutory attorney's fees. OCRA collects fees only in special education cases or Writs of Mandamus. Fees and costs may be negotiated at mediation or can be received in those cases where an Administrative Law Judge has made a determination that the petitioner is the prevailing party. Fees are collected from the opposing party, which is normally a school district. Costs include any expenses to the Petitioner or OCRA for suing, such as filing fees or costs of expert evaluations. Neither PAI nor OCRA ever collect attorney's fees from consumers.

The amount collected for any individual case depends upon several factors such as the geographical location where the consumer lives, and the years of experience of the attorney who handled the case. Attached as Exhibit L is a chart showing the amount and source of any attorney's fees collected by OCRA during the past fiscal year.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ENHANCEMENT OF SERVICES

The contract between DDS and PAI requires that on an annual basis PAI make recommendations to DDS as to potential methods of enhancement of the services that OCRA provides for regional center consumers. In the past, OCRA has expressed concerns about the number of consumers who request a greater level of service than OCRA is able to provide due to lack of sufficient staff. OCRA has been especially concerned that one advocate is mandated to serve the consumers of each regional center even though the number of consumers that a regional center serves may vary by thousands of people. Additionally, at several offices, the number of calls for advocacy services is extremely high. PAI can only theorize why some offices have consistently for years received extraordinary requests for services.

OCRA recognizes and is extremely appreciative of the fact that DDS has supported this organization in its efforts to provide effective statewide advocacy to all consumers. PAI will continue to explore with DDS ways in which OCRA can increase services at the larger regional centers or those offices receiving an extraordinary number of requests for services. PAI also acknowledges, as PAI assumes that DDS does, that the state's fiscal concerns preclude any increase in advocacy services to regional center consumers during the upcoming fiscal year.

PAI remains extremely appreciative of the state's on-going confidence placed in OCRA's ability to provide advocacy services to people with developmental disabilities.

VIII. CONCLUSION

OCRA's statistics show its staff's continuing commitment to the protection of the rights of people with developmental disabilities. OCRA handled over 8,488 cases the last year, provided 332 trainings to over 18,634 people, and met each of its performance objectives. OCRA remains dedicated to ensuring that the rights of all of California's citizens with developmental disabilities are enforced.

OFFICE OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS ADVOCACY LISTING

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

Toll Free Number: 1-800-390-7032

Changes to office – as of August 13, 2008 – Change is *italicized*.

ALTA CALIFORNIA REGIONAL CENTER

Jackie Coleman – CRA

Jacqueline Gallegos – Assistant CRA (on leave)

Elizabeth Kennedy – Interim Assistant CRA

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy

100 Howe Avenue, Ste. 240N

Sacramento, CA 95825

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

Email: Jackie.Coleman@pai-ca.org

Jacqueline.Gallegos@pai-ca.org, Elizabeth.Kennedy@pai-ca.org

Supervised by Jeanne Molineaux

CENTRAL VALLEY REGIONAL CENTER

Arthur Lipscomb - CRA

Kay Spencer – Assistant CRA (part-time)

Ernie Moreno – Assistant CRA (part-time)

NEW OFFICE LOCATION:

567 W. Shaw Avenue

Fresno, CA 93704

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

E-mail: Arthur.Lipscomb@pai-ca.org,

Kay.Spencer@pai-ca.org/Ernestine.Moreno@pai-ca.org

Supervised by Tom Di Verde

EAST LOS ANGELES REGIONAL CENTER

Matthew Pope – CRA

Lucy Garcia – Assistant CRA

1000 S. Fremont Avenue, Suite 1083

P.O. Box 7916

Alhambra, CA 91802

Ph: (626) 576-4437/(626) 576-4407

Fax: (626) 576-4276

E-mail: Matthew.Pope@pai-ca.org/Lucy.Garcia@pai-ca.org

Supervised by Tom Di Verde

FAR NORTHERN REGIONAL CENTER

Andy Holcombe – CRA

Lorie Atamian – Assistant CRA (on leave)

Hannah Williford – Interim 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@pai-ca.org, Lorie.Atamian@pai-ca.org,

Hannah.Williford@pai-ca.org

Supervised by Jackie Coleman

GOLDEN GATE REGIONAL CENTER

Katy Lusson – CRA

Amanda St. James - Assistant CRA

35 Mitchell Blvd., Suite 9

San Rafael, CA 94903

Phone: (415) 499-9724

Fax: (415) 499-9728

Toll Free: (866) 833-6713

E-mail: Katy.Lusson@pai-ca.org, Amanda.St.James@pai-ca.org

Supervised by Gail Gresham

HARBOR REGIONAL CENTER

Katie Casada-Hornberger – CRA

Abigail Perez – Assistant CRA

Lisa Navarro – Interim Assistant CRA

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy

13017 Artesia Blvd., Suite D124

Cerritos, CA 90703

Phone: (562) 623-9911

Fax: (562) 623-9929

E-mail: Katie.Hornberger@pai-ca.org, Abigail.Perez@pai-ca.org,

Lisa.Navarro@pai-ca.org

Supervised by Jeanne Molineaux

***INLAND REGIONAL CENTER**

Veronica Cervantes – CRA

Beatriz Reyes – Assistant CRA

NEW OFFICE LOCATION:

1585 South D Street, Suite # 206

San Bernardino, CA.

Phone: (909) 383-1133/FAX (909) 383-1113

E-mail: Veronica.Cervantes@pai-ca.org, Beatriz.Reyes@pai-ca.org

KERN REGIONAL CENTER

Vacant - CRA

Valerie Geary – Assistant CRA

Ana Pelayo – Administrative Assistant (part-time)

3200 North Sillect Ave.

Bakersfield, CA 93308

Phone: (661)327-8531, Extension 313/Fax: (661)322-6417

E-mail: Valerie.Geary@pai-ca.org, Ana.Pelayo@pai-ca.org

Supervised by Irma Wagster

FRANK D. LANTERMAN REGIONAL CENTER

Debbie Doitch – Interim CRA

Guadalupe Marquez – Assistant CRA (part-time)

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy

3580 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 925

Los Angeles, CA 90010

Phone: (213)427-8761/Fax: (213)427-8772

E-mail: Debbie.Doitch@pai-ca.org, Guadalupe.Marquez@pai-ca.org

Supervised by Katherine Mottarella

NORTH BAY REGIONAL CENTER

Yulahlia Hernandez – CRA

Trina Saldana - Assistant CRA

Mailing Address is:

P.O. Box 3360

Napa, CA 94558

Phone: (707)224-2798/Fax: (707)255-1567

E-mail: Yulahlia.Hernandez@pai-ca.org, Trina.Saldana@pai-ca.org

Supervised by Gail Gresham

NORTH LOS ANGELES COUNTY REGIONAL CENTER

Ibrahim Saab – CRA

Ada Hamer – Assistant CRA

Gloria Hernandez – Support Staff (Agency Temp)

15400 Sherman Way, Ste. 300

Van Nuys, CA 91406

Phone: (818) 756-6290/Fax: (818) 756-6175

E-mail: bebo.saab@pai-ca.org, Ada.Hamer@pai-ca.org,

Gloria.Hernandez@pai-ca.org

Supervised by Tom Di Verde

REDWOOD COAST REGIONAL CENTER

Jim Stoepler – CRA

525 Second Street, Suite 300

Eureka, CA 95501

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

Fax: (707) 444-2563

Reg workweek: Thurs/Fri

E-mail: Jim.Stoepler@pai-ca.org

Supervised by Irma Wagster

1116 Airport Park Blvd.

Ukiah, CA 95482

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

Fax: (707) 462-3314

Reg workweek: Mon/Tues/Wed

REDWOOD COAST REGIONAL CENTER

Douglas Harris – CRA

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy

14624 Lakeshore Drive, Space B

Clearlake, CA 95422

Phone: (707) 995-5066/Fax: (707) 995-7050

E-mail: Doug.Harris@pai-ca.org

Supervised by Jim Stoepler

REGIONAL CENTER OF THE EAST BAY

Anna Leach-Proffer - CRA

Celeste Palmer – Associate CRA

1330 Broadway, Suite 500

Oakland, CA 94612

Phone: (510) 267-1280/Fax: (510) 267-1281

E-mail: Anna.Leach-Proffer@pai-ca.org, Celeste.Palmer@pai-ca.org

Supervised by Jeanne Molineaux

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@pai-ca.org, Cynthia.Salomon@pai-ca.org

Supervised by Irma Wagster

SAN ANDREAS REGIONAL CENTER

Rita Difilippis – CRA

Eleanor-Rosa LoBue – Assistant CRA

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

300 Orchard City Drive, Suite 170

Campbell, CA 95008

Phone: (408) 374-2470/Fax: (408) 374-2956

E-mail: Rita.Difilippis@pai-ca.org, Eleanor-Rosa.Lobue@pai-ca.org

Supervised by Gail Gresham

***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@pai-ca.org, Alba.Gomez@pai-ca.org,

Supervised by Tom Di Verde

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@pai-ca.org, Marisol.Cruz@pai-ca.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@pai-ca.org, Christine.Armand@pai-ca.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@pai-ca.org, Gina.Gheno@pai-ca.org

Supervised by Irma Wagster

VALLEY MOUNTAIN REGIONAL CENTER

Leinani Neves – CRA

Filomena Alomar – Assistant CRA

Melissa Demetral – Volunteer

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy

Valley Mountain Regional Center

702 N. Aurora Street

Stockton, CA 95202

Phone (209) 955-3329/Leinani's direct line (209)955-3314/Fax (209) 462-7020

E-mail: Leinani.Neves@pai-ca.org, Filomena.Alomar@pai-ca.org,

Melissa.Demetral@pai-ca.org

Supervised by Gail Gresham

***WESTSIDE REGIONAL CENTER**

Katie Meyer - CRA

Luisa Delgadillo – Assistant CRA

Martha Padilla – Volunteer

Mailing Address:

(DO NOT INCLUDE “WESTSIDE REGIONAL CENTER” ON MAILING ADDRESS PLEASE, OR MAIL WILL NOT BE DELIVERED TO OCRA STAFF)

Office of Clients’ Rights Advocacy

5901 Green Valley Circle, Suite 410

Culver City, CA 90230

Phone: (310)258-4205 (ACRA)/(310) 258-4206 (CRA)

Fax: (310)338-9716

E-mail: Katie.Meyer@pai-ca.org, Luisa.Delgadillo@pai-ca.org

Supervised by Supervised by Katie Hornberger

Sacramento and Los Angeles OCRA Office information on next page.

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) 575-1625

Los Angeles OCRA

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

Director:

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

Supervising Clients' Rights Advocates:

Tom Di Verde San Diego (Email: Tom.DiVerde@pai-ca.org)
(619) 239-4796, Extension 3416
(on leave)

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

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

Support Staff Sacramento:

Alice Ximenez, Office Manager II

(916) 575-1615, Extension 8143

Email: Alice.Ximenez@pai-ca.org

Sacramento

Lisa Navarro, ACRA for Special Projects

(916) 575-1615, Extension 8148

Email: Lisa.Navarro@pai-ca.org

Supervised by Gail Gresham

Sacramento

Manuella Osborn, Administrative Assistant I

(916) 575-1615, Extension 8141

Email: Manuella.Osborn@pai-ca.org

Supervised by Alice Ximenez

Sacramento

Support Staff Los Angeles:

Maria Ortega, Office Manager I

(213) 427-8761, Extension 3171

Email: Maria.Ortega@pai-ca.org

Supervised by Alice Ximenez

Los Angeles

Support Staff San Diego:

Ngozi Agbo, Legal Secretary (part-time) (on leave)

Phone: (619) 239-7877

Email: Ngozi.Agbo@pai-ca.org

Supervised by Tom Di Verde

San Diego

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

1. Agbo, Ngozi	OCRASAN DIEGO (on leave)
2. Alomar, Filomena	VMRC
3. Armand, Christine	SCLARC
4. Atamian, Lorie	FNRC (on leave)
5. Bacigalupo, Anastasia	SCLARC
6. Cervantes, Veronica	IRC
7. Coleman, Jackie	ACRC
8. Cruz, Marisol	SGPRC
9. Delgadillo, Luisa	WRC
10. Delgado, Aimee	SGPRC
11. Demetral, Melissa	VMRC (Volunteer)
12. Di Verde, Tom	OCRASANDIEGO (on leave)
13. Difilippis, Rita	SARC
14. Doitch, Debbie	LRC
15. <i>Dumlao, Wendy</i>	<i>SDRC</i>
16. Gallegos, Jacqueline	ACRA (on leave)
17. Garcia, Lucy	ELARC
18. Geary, Valerie	KRC
19. Gheno, Gina	TCRC
20. Gomez, Alba	SDRC
21. Gresham, Gail	OCRASAC
22. Hamer, Ada	NLACRC
23. Harris, Doug	RCRC
24. Hernandez, Gloria	NLACRC (agency temp)
25. Hernandez, Yulahlia	NBRC
26. Holcombe, Andy	FNRC
27. Hornberger, Katie	HRC
28. Lipscomb, Arthur	CVRC
29. LoBue, Eleanor-Rosa	SARC
30. Lusson, Katy	GGRC
31. Marquez, Guadelupe	OCRALA
32. Meyer, Katie	WRC
33. Miller, Jacqueline	RCOC
34. Molineaux, Jeanne	OCRASAC
35. Moreno, Ernestine "Ernie"	CVRC

36. Mottarella, Katherine	TCRC
37. Navarro, Lisa	OCRASAC
38. Neves, Leinani	VMRC
39. Ortega, Maria	OCRALA
40. Osborn, Manuella	OCRASAC
41. Palmer, Celeste	RCEB
42. <i>Padilla, Martha</i>	<i>WRC (Volunteer)</i>
43. Pelayo, Ana	KRC
44. Perez, Abigail	HRC
45. Pope, Matthew	ELARC
46. <i>Leach-Proffer, Anna</i>	<i>RCEB</i>
47. Reyes, Beatriz	IRC
48. Saldana, Trina	NBRC
49. Salomón, Cynthia	RCOC
50. Spencer, Kay	CVRC
51. St. James, Amanda	GGRC
52. Stoepler, Jim	RCRC
53. Wagster, Irma	OCRALA
54. Williford, Hannah	FNRC
55. Ximenez, Alice	OCRASAC

Updated as of August 13, 2008
F:\docs\Alice\CRALIST.doc

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Annual Report - July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008
Report by Age Group

AgeRange	ARC	CVRC	ELARC	FNRC	GGRC	HRC	IRC	KRC	LRC	NBRC	NLARC	RCEB	RCOC	RCRC	SARC	SCLARC	SDRC	SGPRC	TCRC	VMRC	WRC	Total
0-3	6	4	8	5	6	18	11	9	8	5	7	6	6	1	3	15	6	7	3	17	13	164
3-17	47	142	165	83	70	128	211	144	119	57	51	102	73	41	218	205	99	158	187	93	132	2525
17-22	21	35	58	19	31	34	50	49	16	30	45	39	19	30	49	35	29	29	76	58	54	806
22-40	54	45	62	65	88	45	63	72	13	51	61	75	50	55	67	42	55	26	105	106	71	1271
40-50	30	18	19	29	40	11	29	29	10	12	29	39	8	22	22	11	20	11	31	47	29	496
50 and above	27	17	21	22	50	11	25	22	3	21	23	23	15	19	13	17	25	19	42	41	30	486
Unknown	58	14	48	5	2	6	2	14	4	31	2	7	13	3	1	1	37	0	2	8	3	261
Total	243	275	381	228	287	253	391	339	173	207	218	291	184	171	373	326	271	250	446	370	332	6009

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Annual Report - July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008
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					4							255			2							261
Amador																				6		6
Butte				185																		185
Calaveras	1																			23		24
Contra Costa				1								157										158
Del Norte													20									20
El Dorado	8																					8
Fresno		259													1	1			1	2		264
Glenn				15						1											1	17
Humboldt														61								61
Inyo								3														3
Imperial																	8					8
Kern	1	3						428														432
Kings		13																				13
Lake														68								68
Lassen	1			2												1						4
Los Angeles			510	1		383	2	264	2	264			6			448	1	359			505	2745
Madera		34																				34
Marin	1				151					2												154
Mariposa		2																				2
Mendocino				1										52								53
Merced		31												1							1	33
Modoc				1																		1
Monterey															40							40
Napa	1									56												57
Nevada	1																					1
Orange	1					4	2						348									355
Placer	26																					26
Plumas	2			3																		5
Riverside							198						1			2	1					202
Sacramento	266			1						1		1										269
San Benito	1						1								5							7
San Bernardino		1					273	1	2				1		2				2			282

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Annual Report - July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008
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										378					379
San Francisco					119												1					120
San Joaquin	1														1					254		256
San Luis Obispo										1									59			60
San Mateo					168					1		1			1							171
Santa Barbara		5																	158			163
Santa Clara	2									2		2			355							361
Santa Cruz															41							41
Shasta				53						2												55
Sierra	1																					1
Siskiyou				6																		6
Solano										132												132
Sonoma	1									200				1							1	203
Stanislaus							1													149		150
Sutter	4																					4
Tehama				39																		39
Trinity				7																		7
Tulare	20	75		1	1		1															98
Tuolumne	1																			17		18
Unknown																						0
Ventura							1			1	2								399			403
Yolo	14									2										1		17
Yuba	6																					6
Total	360	423	510	316	443	387	480	432	266	403	266	416	356	203	448	452	389	361	618	454	505	8488

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Annual Report - July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008
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	69	20	8	27	38	3	13	19	16	22	15	31	7	8	20	6	5	5	23	18	24	397
Autism	31	85	153	37	42	84	136	72	88	48	44	75	68	16	137	108	68	94	115	43	125	1669
Cerebral Palsy	13	19	17	29	28	23	57	25	14	16	17	37	18	20	34	15	29	18	60	27	50	566
Dual Diagnosis - 5th Category	9	2		1	1	3		2		8		9	1	1	1				1	1	3	43
Dual Diagnosis - Autism		1		1		4	6		2	4	3	3	2		2	1			4	1	2	36
Dual Diagnosis - Cerebral Palsy		2		2	1	4	1		1	9	3		3	1	5		29		8	4	1	74
Dual Diagnosis - Epilepsy		1		1	1	1	2	1		3	1				1		1	2	3	4		22
Dual Diagnosis - Mental Retardation	8	10	4	6	17	17	13	7	2	16	20	18	6	12	10	8	4		20	18	6	222
Early Start	4	4		6	8	17	19	3	12	3	9	12	5	1	11	22	2	14	5	12	14	183
Epilepsy	3	20	15	17	19	3	32	9	3	3	9	13	10	6	20	9	10	19	30	23	29	302
Mental Retardation	92	102	169	100	157	80	165	220	39	85	97	133	62	109	130	131	131	94	195	247	119	2657
Unknown	54	40	52	28	5	34	26	29	18	7	22	4	36	30	36	55	53	45	49	46	12	681
Total	283	306	418	255	317	273	470	387	195	224	240	335	218	204	407	355	332	291	513	444	385	6852

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Annual Report - July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008
Report by Ethnicity

Ethnicity	ARC	CVRC	ELARC	FNRC	GGRC	HRC	IRC	KRC	LRC	NBRC	NLARC	RCEB	RCOC	RCRC	SARC	SCLARC	SDRC	SGPRC	TCRC	VMRC	WRC	Grand Total
American Indian	3	1		9	1			6	1	2				8			1		2		1	35
Asian	3	9	38	1	24	16	6	2	6	2	7	34	13	1	57	2	3	19	4	10	7	264
Black (Not Hispanic/Latino Origin)	14	10	1	5	29	28	46	27	15	31	19	70	4	4	12	126	10	10	4	26	54	545
Hispanic/Latino	42	97	226	31	49	84	138	122	72	48	63	63	46	11	110	168	92	128	127	87	102	1906
Multicultural (Self-Identified)	17	7	17	5	18	22	37	8	8	3	9	6	4		13	8		21	20	8	19	250
Pacific Islander	1	1	6	5	12	9	5		3	5	5	9	3		8	1	3	12	4	4	2	98
Unknown	7	22	29	172	13	9	23	4	7	4	8	5	12	6	6	6	23	7	6	5	18	392
White (Not Hispanic/Latino Origin)	156	128	64		141	85	136	170	61	112	107	104	102	141	167	15	139	53	279	230	129	2519
Total	243	275	381	228	287	253	391	339	173	207	218	291	184	171	373	326	271	250	446	370	332	6009

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
 Annual Report - July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008
 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	95	94	124	90	126	86	140	147	51	73	95	120	60	66	119	109	113	74	163	136	126	2207
Male	144	179	247	137	161	165	251	191	121	132	122	170	123	104	253	216	150	175	282	232	203	3758
Unknown	4	2	10	1	0	2	0	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	1	1	2	3	44
Total	243	275	381	228	287	253	391	339	173	207	218	291	184	171	373	326	271	250	446	370	332	6009

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Annual Report - July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008
Report by Living Arrangement

	ARC	CVRC	ELARC	FNRC	GGRC	HRC	IRC	KRC	LFC	NBRC	NLARC	RCEB	RCOC	RCRC	SARC	SCLARC	SDRC	SGPRC	TCRC	VMRC	WRC	Total
Adult Residential Facility	15	5	2	15	4	1	24	10	1	4	12	50	1		1	1	20	1	22	35	2	226
Board and Care	39	2	1	1	1		4			2	13	1					6	7	4			81
Childrens Group Home			1	1	1	1	1	6		5	1	4	1			1	1	1	9	3	3	40
Community Residential Home		1	2					6		7	12				1	7				34		70
Detention Center	1		1			1										2	1					6
Developmental Center	23			2		3	1				6		2	1		1	4		3			46
Federal Prison																						0
Foster Care	2	1		2	4	1	3			7		3		2	1	8	2		2	1		39
Foster Family Home	2	5			1		2	1		7	1	1				9				3	1	33
Halfway House									1													1
Homeless	2		3	4	3					2	1	2	2			2				1	1	23
ICF DD							2			1									4	3		11
ICF DD-H					10						3	5		1					3	5		27
ICF DD-N					1		2					1								5		9
ICF/MR/Nursing Home														1				1		1		3
Independent Housing	82	117	5	119	79	21	33	85	7	59	36	55	56	68	29	41	53	27	54	68	89	1183
Intermediate Care Facility/Nursing Home			1	2		1		1	1		1			2		2			9			20
Jail	3	1	1		3	2		1		9	5	2	2	2	2	5	1		4	3		46
Large Group Home (more than 3 beds)	10	23	1		74	14		7	1	11	10	2	14	6	33	3	2	3	10		2	226
Legal Detention				2							3					1			1			7
Municipal Detention Facility/Jail	1									2												3
Nursing Home	1		3	3	1	2						1	1		1		2	1	1			17
Other	1	3	2	2	1	6	3	1	10		1	1	1		1		4	1	1		1	40
Other Federal Facility			1		1														1			3
Parental or Other Family Home	146	239	467	141	212	324	392	301	240	253	140	254	254	109	360	361	279	314	432	274	388	5880
Prison		2		1			3	1							1						1	9
Private General Hospital Emergency Rooms																						0
Private Institutional Hospital/Treatment Facility		1	3	1				5			1	1				1	1	1		1	2	18
Private Institutional Living Arrangement			2	1					1	4					1					1		10
Private Institutional School						1		1	1	1		3									3	10
Psychiatric Wards of Private General Hospitals	2					1					1	1		1					1			7
Psychiatric Wards of Public General Hospitals	1	1				4	1			1	1	3		1					1			14
Public Institutional Hospital/Treatment Facility		2		2	5		3	1		3	4	1	3		4		4		1	1		34
Public General Hospital Emergency Rooms													2							4		6
Public Institutional Living Arrangement					3			1		1			2							1		8
Public Residential School					1				2	4												7
Semi-indepent Home or Apartment	1	1	2	2	16		1	2		5	2	2	5	1	5	2			40		9	96
Small Group Home (3 beds or less)	1	9		2	2	1		1		7			3	2	2	1	1	1	9		1	43
Specialized Nursing Facility/Nursing Home	3		1		2	1	1				2	1								1		12
Supervised Apartment	14			6	14					4	6	19	2	5	3				1	1	1	76
Unknown	10	10	11	7	3	2	4	1	1	4	4	3	5	1	3	4	8	3	5	8	1	98
Total	360	423	510	316	443	387	480	432	266	403	266	416	356	203	448	452	389	361	618	454	505	8488

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Annual Report - July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008
Report by Problem Codes

	ARC	CVRC	ELARC	FNRC	GGRC	HRC	IFC	KRC	LRC	NBRC	NLARC	RCEB	ROCC	RCRC	SARC	SCLARC	SDRC	SGPFC	TCRC	VMRC	WRC	Total
4731 Complaint																						
4731 Complaint	3	2		1		4	6	2	1	3	2	2	3			4			2			35
4731 - Service Provider	10							2		1	3		1			1					1	19
Total	13	2		1		4	6	4	1	4	5	2	4			5			2		1	54
Abuse																						
Coercion										1			1									2
Dissolution																		1				1
Exploitation (Financial)	1			1	3	1	1	1	1	3		4		3	3		1		1	2	1	27
Exploitation (Physical / Emotional)					1					2		2	1				1					7
Inappropriate / Excessive Medical Treatment	1			1				1														3
Inappropriate / Excessive Physical Restraint	1			1	4								1	1						2		10
Inappropriate / Excessive Seclusion						1				1										1		3
Other Abuse	3	2	1		6		5				1	1		2		1			5	5	1	33
Physical Assault	2	1		2	14		4	3	1	3		1		1	1	2	1	1	3	1	3	44
Sexual Assault	1	3	1		14		3	3		3	3		1	1	2				1	2	1	39
Staff Attitude / Behavior			1		18		1	2			1				2							28
Staff Retaliation	1											1		1	1		1					5
Verbal Abuse								1		1		1		1	1		1				3	9
Total	10	6	3	5	60	2	14	11	2	14	5	10	3	10	9	5	5	2	10	16	9	211
Assistive Technology																						
California Children's Services (CCS)					2		1		1			1		1							5	11
Medi-Cal					1														2			3
Medicare																	1					1
Other AT	1		1		1								3		1		1	1			1	10
Regional Center	1	1			1								3									6
Total	2	1	1		5		1		1			1	6	1	1		2	1	2	5	1	31
Consent																						
Capacity / Incapacity of Client	1						1		1	1	3	2		2			1			4	5	22
Informed Consent			1					1		2	1	1	1	2			1			4	1	16
Substitute Judgment	1							1	2													4
Total	2		1				1	1	2	5	4	3	1	4			2		8	6	2	42
Conservatorship																						
Change of Conservators	2			2						1						1		1	3			10
Conservatee's Rights	4	2	2	2	1	1		1		1	10	2		3	2					9	1	41
Conservator Duties		1	2					2		1				1	1		1			1	1	11
Establishing Conservatorship (General)	2	2			2	2	13	2	2	4	1		3		5	14	10	11	35	6		114
Establishing Conservatorship (Limited)			15		1	6	5	19		2	15	8	1	1	2	3	1	3	17	8	23	130
LPS Conservatorship											1											1
Termination of Conservatorship	1	3		2				3			1	1	1	1						2	6	21
Total	9	8	19	6	4	9	18	27	2	9	28	11	5	6	10	18	12	15	58	30	24	328
Consumer Finance																						
Debt Collection	13	2	5	9	26	2	2	6	1	7	2	9	2	6	4	1	7		2	5	9	120
Other Consumer Finance	14	1	12	8	6	3		6	3	6	4	8		7	7	4	7	1	5	11	3	116
Special Needs Trust	1	2	6		2			1		2	7	5	1	1			2		6	1	5	42
Total	28	5	23	17	34	5	2	13	4	15	13	22	3	14	11	5	16	1	13	17	17	278
Discrimination (Other than Employment)																						
Architectural Barriers				1																		1
Discrimination		2	2	2	2	1	2		1	2	3	3	1	3		1	1	2	1	1	4	34
Higher Education (Public and Private)		1										1					1					3
Insurance Discrimination		1																			1	2
Public Accommodations (Hotels, Restaurants, Etc.)		1				1	2	1		3		1			1			1			4	15
Public Services (Federal, State, Local)	3						4		2		1	1	3	2	3					1	1	21

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Annual Report - July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008
Report by Problem Codes

	ARC	CVRC	ELARC	FNRC	GGRC	HRC	IFC	KRC	LRC	NBRC	NLARC	RCEB	RCOC	RCRC	SARC	SCLARC	SDRC	SGPPFC	TCRC	VMRC	WRC	Total	
Transportation (Public and Private)					3	2	1	2			1		3				1		2		8	23	
Total	3	5	2	3	5	4	9	3	3	5	5	6	7	5	4	1	3	3	3	7	13	99	
Education																							
Adult Education Programs		1	1	1				5						1	1				1			11	
Assessment	1	3	5		1	3		2	3	3		1	3	1	6	4	4	1	9	2	11	63	
Complaint Procedures	1	7	12	2	2	8	16	11	6	8	3	11	1	3	4	3	9	6	9	11	13	146	
Day Care	1									2									1			4	
Due Process Procedures		3	10		2		6	1	1	3	2	3	1		7	8	4	3	4	3	7	68	
Eligibility		1	1	5		2	3	1	5		1	1			1			4	4			29	
Extra Curricular Activities			1	1				1					1		1		1					6	
Full Inclusion (Except Pre-School)					4	1			3	5		3		1	2	1		1	3	3		27	
Higher Education			1	1				1							1			1				5	
Home / Hospital Instruction							1	1	1	1			1	1			1	1	1	1		10	
IEP Development	5	31	61	51	25	24	24	42	32	37	5	8	18	8	85	19	18	82	33	5	17	630	
Least Restrictive Environment		1	4	5	7	1	4	2	5	3		7	4	2	9	5		4	3	2	2	70	
Mental Health Services						1	1						1		1	2			1	1	1	9	
Non-Public School Placement		1	8		2	3		4	8	4		3			2	3	4	2	4	4	4	52	
OT / PT	3	2			2		1	1	5	1				2	3	2	1	4	1	2	1	31	
Other Education	5	7	8	1	5	8	12	10	6	6		4	3		27			7	10	8	4	131	
Part C - Early Start / Early Intervention						16		1			3	10	1		1	9	1	2				48	
Positive Behavioral Intervention	2	3	8		1		1	1	4			6	9		7	12			7	3	1	65	
Preschool Full Inclusion		2	3		1				3				1			1						11	
Preschool Programs		6	2	1		1	5	3	5	1		3			3	4	1	5	2		2	44	
Public School Placement	7	13	14	2	12	13	14	24	11	3	1	9	5	8	27	20	9	10	11	9	4	226	
Related Services	3	12	28	1	7	34	10		5	11		11	5	6	20	27	7	15	6	4	15	227	
Residential Placement							2				1	1				2						6	
Suspension / Expulsion	2	6	2	2	3	1	1	11	1	1	1	3	1		8		2	2	5	4		56	
Transition Planning		4	2	3	5	3		1	2		1	8		3	7	4	2	1	3	4	1	54	
Transportation		5	5	2	4	1	2	10		1		3	2	1	17	2	5	3	5	4	1	73	
Total	30	108	176	78	83	120	103	133	106	90	18	95	57	37	240	128	69	154	123	66	88	2102	
Employment																							
Employment		1	6	3						1	1				1		1		2	4	2	22	
Employment Discrimination: Firing		1			1	1	2			1	1		2	3		2			2	2	1	19	
Employment Discrimination: General	1	5	1	2	2	2	1			1				2	2	1			3	1		24	
Employment Discrimination: Hiring			1									2			1		1		2	1		8	
Employment Discrimination: Reasonable Accommodations																1			7		2	10	
Long-Term Disability Benefits					1																	1	
State Disability Benefits							1															1	
Supported Employment	2		2		2		1		1			1	1			1	2		1			14	
Worker's Compensation			1					1					3								1	6	
Total	3	7	11	5	6	3	5	1	1	3	2	3	6	5	4	5	4		17	9	5	105	
Family																							
Child Support	2		1	1		1				1		3		1	1		2			1	2	16	
Dissolution				1		1	2	2		2	1	1			1	3			1			16	
Family - Other	4	6	9	3	2	2	1	3	1	1	7	2	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	11	8	79	
Guardianship of Minors		1	2		2		2	3				1	1	1		1				2	1	17	
Parenting / Custody	7	4	7	7	3	4	1	5		6	3	4	8	5	5	8	2	4	3	9	4	99	
Wills, Trust and Estate Planning			1		1			2				2	1	1						1		9	
Total	13	11	20	12	8	8	6	15	1	10	11	11	15	11	11	12	7	7	7	24	16	236	
Forensic Mental Health Issues																							
Criminal Justice Issues - Rights	4				34	1		1			3	4		1							4	2	54
Diversion			1		4	3					3	7								1		19	

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Annual Report - July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008
Report by Problem Codes

	ARC	CVRC	ELARC	FNRC	GGRC	HRC	IFC	KRC	LRC	NBRC	NLARC	RCEB	ROCC	RCRC	SARC	SCLARC	SDRC	SGPPC	TCRC	VMRC	WRC	Total	
Incompetent to Stand Trial (IST)	1																					1	
Total	5		1		38	4		1			6	11		1							5	2	74
Health																							
CCS Eligibility	1						1				1						2					3	8
CCS Services			1			2	1	2	2	1	1	1		7	2			1	2				23
Denial of Coverage		2	1		1	3	2	1				1	3		1		8	1	3			1	28
In Home Nursing / Medical Care	1				1	3	1		2	2			1	9			2				2		24
Medi-Cal Eligibility		1	6			4	2	1	2		6	15	3		3	5	12		11			7	78
Medi-Cal Services			5	1	1	4	1	6	2	1	2	5	4	2	4		9				2	4	53
Medi-Cal Share of Cost / Co-Payment	1	1	1								1	8					1	2			2	6	23
Medical Treatment	3	2	4	4	13	1	2	8	1	8		1	11	4	4		2	2	6	13	1	90	
Private Insurance	1	1					2				2	1	2			1	1	2	6	2	1	24	
Total	7	7	18	5	16	17	12	18	9	12	13	32	24	22	16	6	37	8	28	21	23	351	
Housing																							
Housing Discrimination			1	4			1	1		1					3				3	1	1	1	16
Landlord / Tenant	14	2	11	33	9	3	5	18	3	1	10	5	9	6	3	14	5	2	4	10	24	24	191
Ownership of Property				1	1		1	3	1					4	2	2	1			1	1	1	18
Reasonable Accommodations		3	2	5	3	2	1	2	3	2	2		1	5	11	3	1		2	2	3	53	
Section 8	3		5	4	4			2	1	3		1	2		2	4	2	1	8		5	47	
Subsidized Housing				1	2								1	1				1	2			1	9
Zoning / Restrictive Covenants	1		1						1		1										1		5
Total																							
Immigration																							
Citizenship Interview												1											1
Immigration			3				1	3			2	5			5	3	8	4	3	1	2	40	
Total	18	5	23	48	19	5	9	29	9	7	15	12	13	16	26	26	17	8	22	16	37	380	
Income Maintenance																							
Disability Benefits and Work				1								1		1						2		3	8
IEP Development																						1	1
IHSS Eligibility	4	6	7	5		10	12	8	12	2	4	3	3	1	2	4	18	5	6			14	126
IHSS Number of Hours	3	6	19	10	8	14	14	6	6		4	7	4	3	5	18	16	1	23	4	12	183	
IHSS Protective Supervision	2	4	9	4	4	2	13	2	4		2	2	5		4	8	4		1	1	7	78	
IHSS Share of Cost and Other		1	4	1		6	3		2		3	2							1			7	32
Income Maintenance	1	2	2	1	1	1		4	1	2			1	1	1		2	2	3	2	8	35	
Other Program Eligibility			2	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	3	7	2			1	1		3	2	4	35	
SSA Benefits, Child Benefits (SSDI)	1	4	12	5		1	1	5	1	3	13		4	1	2		2		11	4	5	73	
SSI - Other	4	4	17	9	9	3	4	6	3	4	5	2	6	5	6	7	6	2	8	9	22	141	
SSI Eligibility	6	9	19	3	7	8	8	17	4	7	13	26	9	8	3	11	23	4	24	10	21	240	
SSI Overpayment	1	2	14	6	13	1	14	8	6	1	7	7	3	5	5	9	11	8	8	13	15	157	
Total	22	38	105	46	44	48	70	58	39	18	41	71	35	28	27	58	85	22	90	45	119	1109	
Juvenile Dependency																							
Juvenile Dependency	2	1	2				1	1					2				2						11
Total	2	1	2				1	1					2				2						11
Legal Representation																							
Civil (General)	5	5	2	4	3	3	4	6		5	3		2	2	2	3	2	1	8			9	69
Criminal (General) - Rights		3		1		1		1			3		3	4	1	2				6			25
Personal Injury	1	3		4	1	2				1	5	3	3	2	1	3			6	7	1	5	49
Public Defender		1		2	1	1	3	1		2										2			13
Total	6	12	2	11	5	7	7	8	1	12	9	3	7	7	4	8	2	7	23	1	14	156	
Licensing																							
Community Care Facilities	1	1					1			2			1										7
Program Accreditation / Certification																				1			1

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Annual Report - July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008
Report by Problem Codes

	ARC	CVRC	ELARC	FNRC	GGRC	HRC	IFC	KRC	LRC	NBRC	NLARC	RCEB	RCOC	RCRC	SARC	SCLARC	SDRC	SGPPC	TCRC	VMRC	WRC	Total
Total	1	1					1			2			1						2			8
Neglect																						
FTP Admission to Institution																			1			1
FTP Dietary Needs															1							1
FTP Medical Treatment					5								1									6
FTP Personal Care					1	1							1		1		2					6
FTP Personal Safety (Conditions in Institutions)					1																	1
FTP Personal Safety (Staff to Client Abuse)					1												3					4
Other Neglect	1		1	1	1							1							2		1	8
Total	1		1	1	9	1						1	2		2	5			3		1	27
Placement																						
Board and Care Conditions	3		1							1		2	2		1		4				9	23
Board and Care Evictions	3					2	1			2		1	1	1	1				1	1	1	14
Childrens' Group Homes			1		1	1		3			1					2	1		2	3		15
FTP Community Residential Placement	1	1	1				1	5		1	1	4			1		5			7	2	30
FTP Community Services				1	1																	2
Return to Community from Institution	10		1	4	1	4		2		2	3		3	1	1		4		1	2		39
Supported and Transitional Housing	1	1			1			3			1		2		2			1	3		1	16
Unit or Institution Transfers	2	5		1		1								1	1			1			2	14
Total	20	7	4	6	4	8	2	13		6	6	7	8	3	7	2	14	2	7	22	5	153
Privacy/Personal Autonomy																						
Personal Autonomy	4	3	8	1	25	1	4	4	1	17	5	11	2	5	5	2	6		11	17	2	134
Recovery of Personal Property					2						1			2								3
Rights of / Denial of Personal Possessions					2					3									1	1		7
Rights of / Denial of Privacy - Association	2	4			4	1	5		1	2	2	3	4	2	2	1	2		1	1	1	37
Rights of / Denial of Privacy - Religion					1		1				1				1							4
Rights of / Denial of Privacy - Search and Seizure					1																	1
Rights of / Denial of Privacy - Sexuality			1		1						2	2		2			1				1	10
Rights of / Denial of Privacy - Telephone		1				1		3		2					1	1			2			11
Rights of / Denial of Recreation				1	3			1									1					6
WIC §5325.1 Rights	4							1												42		47
Total	10	8	9	2	37	3	10	9	2	24	11	16	6	11	9	4	10		15	62	2	260
Records																						
Access	2						2			3	1		2		1		3		1			15
Breach of Confidentiality				2								3	1				2					8
Denial of Access			1			1				1		1			2		3					9
Total	2		1	2			3			4	1	4	3		3		8		1			32
Regional Center Services																						
Assessment of Needs	16	5	9			17	23	1	1	11	1	11	2	3	8	31	1		16	5	3	164
Community Living Arrangements	6		2	6		4	6	5		6	7	3	3			5		2	11	2	5	73
Coordination with County Mental Health		1								1											1	3
Crisis Prevention Services									1	1		1	6	1	2				3			15
Day Training and Activity	4	6	16	1	4	17	3	3	2	16	2	5	3	2	1	13	2	1	2	7	2	112
Eligibility for Regional Center services	17	60	17	22	29	15	85	31	23	28	6	26	45	4	26	59	34	36	36	26	23	648
Family Support Services	5	5	7	3	3	23	4	1	6	26	1	10	13	7	6	9	2	6	8	15	23	183
Hearing Procedures	3	4	6	2	2	4	13		4	22		11	14		2		1	15	19	1	13	136
IPP Development	10	20	5	15		8	9	2	7	10	8	1	7	1	1	12	3	22	29	2	4	176
IPP Implementation	1	8		6	1	5	5	1	6	4	7	1	1			2	3	1	16	5	1	74
Lanterman Act - Case Management	23	8	2	2	1		22	4	1	5	6	9	2			11	3	6	3	2	2	112
Lanterman Act - DDS Policies / Procedures	7	1	2		2	1	13	1	3	14		2				4	5		2		3	60
Lanterman Act - Regional Center	16	4	1		2		7	4	5	5	13	10			1		3	1	8	2	2	84
Licensed Residential Services	2	3		1		6	2									1	2					19

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
 Annual Report - July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008
 Report by Problem Codes

	ARC	CVRC	ELARC	FNRC	GGRC	HRC	IFC	KRC	LRC	NBRC	NLARC	RCEB	RCOC	RCRC	SARC	SCLARC	SDRC	SGPPFC	TCRC	VMRC	WRC	Total
Prevention Services		1	2	1		1		1		1			2		2	7	2		2	2		24
Regional Center Services - Other	34	62	15	9	15	34	7	29	24	9	19		38	3	11	7	22	41	20	21	35	455
Supported Living	7	3	4		6	5	1	3		2	2	4	10		2	6	8		5	10	8	86
Total	151	191	88	68	65	140	200	86	83	161	72	94	147	21	62	167	91	131	180	101	125	2424
Right to Culturally Appropriate Services																						
Right to Culturally Appropriate Services	2										2									3		7
Total	2									2									3			7
Right to Refuse Treatment																						
Involuntary Medication												1			1				1	1		4
Other Involuntary Treatment														1							1	2
Total												1		1	1				1	1	1	6
Vocational Rehabilitation Services																						
Vocational Rehabilitation					1			1			1				1							4
Total					1			1			1				1							4
Grand Total	360	423	510	316	443	388	480	432	266	403	266	416	355	203	448	452	389	361	618	454	505	8488

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Annual Report - July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008
Report by Service Level

	ARC	CVRC	ELARC	FNRC	GGRC	HRC	IRC	KRC	LRC	NBRC	NLARC	RCEB	RCOC	RCRC	SARC	SCLARC	SDRC	SGPRC	TCRC	VMRC	WRC	Total
0 - Pending	3	56	1		1		1	2				9	3		4	1	97		2	5		185
1 - Information/Referral	93	69	50	57	134	115	75	90	39	68	30	26	57	34	72	80	23	70	60	119	142	1503
2 - Rights Information/Consultation (RC/Generic)	53	139	235	112	151	183	254	166	54	175	105	151	88	103	154	183	127	276	341	201	203	3454
3 - Rights Information/Consultation (Other)	17	20	85	51	24	6	16	60	70	87	26	76	25	32	120	48	90	7	193	98	16	1167
4 - Abuse/Neglect Investigation	5	5		2	5		2	2		1			2		1		3			2		30
5 - Special Education Compliance Complaint			3	1			2	8	1	2		4		2	1	2	5			4	9	44
6 - IEP	2	18	31	19	14	4	2	16	4	1	2	2	9	2	17	6	21		1	1	1	173
7 - IPP/IDT	2	6		2	1	4	3	2		4	2		2		1	4		3	2	2	2	42
8 - W&I 4731	4	1				2	2	1		5	1	1	2			2	2				2	25
9 - Technical Assistance	27	6	55	11	23	21	1	21	14	17	5	23	51	4	3		6	5	4	7	11	315
10 - Evaluation and Assessment	11	21	19	24	21	4	17	3	3	26	9	1	45	2	17	13	7		3	3	7	256
11 - Informal Regional Center / Provider Problem Resolution	98	43	9	13	22	25	50	27	19	10	50	57	36	3	8	55	1		2	4	35	567
12 - Informal Generic Service Agency Problem Resolution	32	34	13	17	47	15	50	20	47	4	19	62	28	6	51	57	3		6	5	55	571
13 - Case Settlement Prior to Informal Meeting, Mediation or Hearing			3			2			1	2			1				1			1	2	13
14 - Direct Representation in RC "Voluntary Informal Meeting"	1	1	1			1		1	2	1	2	4	2	3	1	1			1		2	24
15 - Direct Representation in Mediation / RC Fair Hearing	1	2	2	1		1	1		10			1	4	5	1	1				2	5	37
16 - Direct Representation in an Appeal for Generic Services	9	1	3	3		5	4	12	2		5	2	2	7		1	1		3		12	72
17 - Court Litigation	2	1		3				1									2				1	10
Total	360	423	510	316	443	388	480	432	266	403	266	416	355	203	448	452	389	361	618	454	505	8488

ADVOCACY REPORT

OFFICE OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS ADVOCACY

Spring 2008

BENEFITS

SSI Payments for Child Reinstated.

The parent of a 7-year-old with a diagnosis of autism contacted OCRA after the parent's request to have Supplemental Social Security (SSI) reinstated for J.J. were dismissed by the Social Security Administration (SSA). The parent received a written notice in mid-2007, that his child's SSI was being terminated due to the family having excess resources and a second family car reportedly worth \$5,000. The father had previously provided the county with receipts documenting the family's monthly expenses, proof that the car was worth less than \$500 and a sales receipt that the car had already been sold. The Social Security worker refused to accept the paperwork, stating it was too late to reinstate the payments and that the father must place all paperwork in chronological order with a written explanation before SSA would accept the documents. OCRA agreed to write a letter to the SSA, help the parent organize the documents and coached the parent on what to present at a new meeting with the SSA supervisor. The demand letter explained that the child was still within the one-year period to have the SSI reinstated and alleged that the SSA did not comply with regulations by failing to assist the family to obtain the information. At a new meeting with the parent, the SSA notified the parent that his child's SSI payments would be reinstated, including retroactive payments from mid-2007. Tim Poe, CRA, Kern Regional Center.

G. C. Gets Needed IHSS.

G.C. had been receiving In-Home Support Services (IHSS) for the maximum of 283 hours per month with his mother as his provider for many years. She was recently told that she could not be his provider or he would lose his protective supervision, which was the bulk of his hours. Ms. C. contacted OCRA to see if the county was correct.

OCRA determined that G.C. needed to utilize two different waiver programs. The first, the Home Based Community Services Waiver, entitled him to Medi-Cal and IHSS. The second, the Independence Plus Waiver, entitled him to protective supervision through a parent provider. The county had failed to put him on the second waiver, which became available in 2004.

The CRA wrote a lengthy opinion letter regarding both waiver programs. G.C.'s mother then submitted this to the appeals worker for the county prior to hearing and the issue was resolved without the need for a hearing. G.C. has his 283 hours of IHSS back and the family received retroactive payments for the time G.C. was without protective supervision. Katie Hornberger, CRA, Harbor Regional Center.

OCRA Saves Client's IHSS Hours.

R.M.D., a 10-year-old girl, received notice from the county that her IHSS hours would end because her mother no longer worked. OCRA agreed to help and contacted R.M.D.'s IHSS worker explaining that the client's mother is a farm laborer who only works seasonal jobs and that OCRA would appeal the county's action. OCRA received a call a week later that the client's 200 IHSS hours per month would continue. Arthur Lipscomb, CRA, Ernestine Moreno, Assistant CRA, Kay Spencer, Assistant CRA, Central Valley Regional Center.

OCRA Victorious After Appeals Council Remand.

After the administrative law judge (ALJ) decided that L.C. was not eligible for SSI because, in part, she was "faking" her disability, OCRA appealed the decision to the Social Security Appeals Council. The Appeals Council said the ALJ did not consider all of the evidence and sent the case back to the same judge for rehearing. OCRA represented at the rehearing, where L.C. received a favorable decision that restored her SSI and other disability benefits, including retroactive benefits. Ibrahim Saab, CRA, Ada Hamer, Assistant CRA, North Los Angeles County Regional Center.

IHSS Reinstated Hours.

D.S. requires protective supervision and significant personal support services in feeding, daily living skills, and hygiene. IHSS reduced his monthly support hours based on an incorrect assessment.

OCRA assisted with the appeal including a review of the relevant documents. During this evaluation process, OCRA discovered the error. OCRA contacted IHSS and advocated for reinstatement of the hours based on the correct information. IHSS reviewed the assessment and reinstated the original hours. Filomena Alomar, Assistant CRA, Valley Mountain Regional Center.

Young Children Approved for Institutional Deeming Medi-Cal/DDS Waiver Services.

A.T., D.F., and A.B. are ineligible for needs-based Medi-Cal, yet are much in need of the health care and other benefits Medi-Cal can bring. The children have private health insurance but co-payments and therapies for their autism are a financial strain for their families. Their parents greatly need respite. After hearing about Institutional Deeming Medi-Cal, each family requested it of their case managers, but got discouraging responses. One child was denied. Case managers for the two others reported that children as young as they – three and eight years old – probably would not be eligible. The parents contacted OCRA.

OCRA provided the parents with relevant pages from the state’s Manual of Criteria for Medi-Cal Authorization that deal with eligibility in order to get Institutional Deeming Medi-Cal. These rules show that a child whose autism makes communication and social interaction difficult could meet the eligibility requirements for an ICF-DDH. OCRA elicited information about behavioral concerns of the children’s parents and explained how they fit within the ICF-DDH eligibility definition. With OCRA’s guidance, the parents had their children’s CDERs updated. The parents then asked the case managers to process the requests for Institutional Deeming Medi-Cal/DDS Waiver services. Each child was found eligible. Marsha Siegel, CRA, Regional Center of the East Bay.

Family Obtains Maximum IHSS Hours.

H.E. is a medically fragile 3-year-old who lives with his parents. Private insurance pays for 40 hours of nursing per week. Because of a shortage of nurses, there are no nurses available to work at night and the mother is

required to stay up all night to care for her son's medical needs. H.E.'s mother applied for IHSS in June, 2007. IHSS is supposed to determine need within 30 days. The family did not have a response in December, 2007, when it requested help from OCRA. OCRA requested a hearing on behalf of the family. Two weeks later, the maximum of 283 hours per month were awarded for paramedical care. Jackie Coleman, CRA, Jacqueline Gallegos, Assistant CRA, Alta Regional Center.

U.V. Is Awarded 283 IHSS Hours.

U.V. is a 14- year-old whose mother called OCRA and said that the county had reduced his IHSS hours from 215 to 95 hours. U.V.'s mother explained that U.V.'s needs had increased, he was growing bigger, and his behavior had recently become worse. OCRA opened the case for investigation and assessment, reviewed the relevant records, and attended U.V.'s evaluation. At the evaluation, the IHSS social worker claimed that U.V. was not entitled to 283 hours because "he lived with his mother who was at home during the day."

OCRA wrote an opinion letter which U.V.'s mother took to her fair hearing. OCRA stated that under the Department of Social Service's (DSS) regulations, since U.V.'s mother was unable to work because she could not find someone to care for U.V., he was entitled to have a relative provide all of the services. After reading this opinion letter, the ALJ granted 283 hours. Bernadette Bautista, CRA, Wendy Dumlao, CRA, Alba Gomez, Assistant CRA, San Diego Regional Center.

A.H. Obtained Protective Supervision.

The mother of A.H. a 23-year-old diagnosed with MR contacted OCRA regarding an IHSS denial of protective supervision. The mother had filed for hearing and requested assistance. OCRA was able to successfully negotiate with the county representative for protective supervision and obtained \$14,742 in retroactive payment. Jacqueline Miller, CRA, Cynthia Solomon, Assistant CRA. Regional Center of Orange County.

Social Security Disability Insurance Overpayment Waived.

K.M. was assessed a \$12,000 Social Security overpayment due to the addition of another family member to the benefits paid on her father's earnings record. Although the SSA added the family member to the

benefits, it failed to properly reduce K.M.'s benefit so the maximum family benefit was not exceeded.

K.M.'s father contacted OCRA. After reviewing the notices that had been issued, assistance was provided with a waiver request. The SSA approved the request, relieving K.M. of responsibility for the overpayment. Doug Harris, CRA, Redwood Coast Regional Center.

OCRA Gets Client Maximum IHSS Hours.

C.D.'s mother called OCRA when the county denied C.D. protective supervision hours. The evidence clearly supported the need for protective supervision. C.D.'s physician and psychologist had confirmed that C.D.'s level of functioning was well below her chronological age. In addition, C.D.'s mother had a list of dangerous situations that C.D. had put herself in when nobody was watching. C.D.'s job coaches also agreed that C.D. needed 24-hour supervision.

OCRA appealed the county's denial and provided C.D. with direct representation at hearing. OCRA argued protective supervision was needed as well as more hours in other personal services categories. As a result, the ALJ ordered that C.D. receive the maximum 283 hours. This included protective supervision as well as hours in other categories. The ALJ also ordered retroactive hours from October, 2007, to the present. Bernadette Bautista, CRA, Wendy Dumlao, CRA, Alba Gomez, Assistant CRA, San Diego Regional Center.

IHSS Protective Supervision Termination Reversed on Appeal.

S.N. is an adult who lives with his mother. He was receiving 283 hours of IHSS until a reassessment meeting where the social worker decided that S.N. was no longer severely disabled and only entitled to 195 hours of IHSS. OCRA was able to show at hearing that S.N. did qualify as severely disabled due to moderate to severe mental retardation, ambulation and balancing difficulties, and choking difficulties. S.N.'s 283 hours were reinstated retroactively. Lorie Atamian, Assistant CRA, Far Northern Regional Center.

S.P. Wins the Protective Supervision Hours He Needs.

S.P. is a 40-year-old man with mental retardation and cerebral palsy who uses a wheelchair, walker, and hand-rails in his home. He lives with his family who is monolingual Korean speaking. The county had denied protective supervision because the worker erroneously believed he was unable to walk. Although the worker had been S.P.'s worker for more than 4 years, he had never stayed at the home long enough to observe S.P. use his walker or his hand-rails, nor did she ever explain protective supervision to the family.

OCRA represented S.P. at an IHSS mediation, a new pilot project in Los Angeles to avoid the time and cost of hearings. The family agreed to a reassessment at the family home with the county worker and nurse.

OCRA attended the reassessment and submitted a position statement outlining the need for protective supervision and increased service hours. Following the reassessment, S.P. was awarded protective supervision at the severely impaired rate. The amount will be retroactive and S.P. will receive \$17,829 in retroactive benefits awarded from the time he began his appeal. Katie Meyer, CRA, Westside Regional Center.

SSI Reinstated.

S.M. is a regional center consumer who has moderate mental retardation and a psychiatric disability. S.M. had received SSI without interruption since she was a small child and has never worked. She had many different addresses and representative payees, which caused some confusion over time. When S.M. called OCRA in September of 2007, her SSI was suddenly stopped with no notice of action and she received an overpayment notice for \$24,000 from the SSA. Shortly after that, her apartment building was foreclosed upon, forcing S.M. to stay in hotels. After OCRA and the local SSA supervisor did extensive research into why her SSI was stopped, it became evident that there were many issues. First, a disability cessation was done because S.M.'s representative payee failed to provide any ongoing proof of disability. Someone, however, had requested payment continuation and appealed the cessation in 2004. Between 2004 and 2007, two very small overpayments occurred.

In August of 2007, the hearing for the disability cessation occurred. S.M. was unrepresented by counsel. The ALJ issued a written decision on the two small overpayments that occurred, although S.M. did not file for hearing regarding any overpayment. The ALJ did not issue a decision on disability cessation, which was the only hearing S.M. had requested in 2004. Despite there being no decision on disability cessation, SSA suddenly stopped the SSI payments and assessed the large overpayment.

By submitting a new psychological evaluation, OCRA was able to get S.M. returned to payment status, stop SSA from collecting the overpayment, and filed for hearing to finally prove S.M.'s disability had not ceased. Katie Meyer, CRA, Westside Regional Center

O.R. Receives Assistive Technology.

O.R. is diagnosed with mental retardation and is also deaf. O.R. lives in an adult residential facility whose care provider is fluent in American Sign Language. Initially OCRA was contacted by O.R.'s ex-foster parent to investigate whether O.R. wished to live in his current placement. After OCRA met with O.R., it was determined he was content with the placement. However, during that meeting, OCRA realized that O.R. did not have a communication device that would allow him to communicate with people in the community who are not deaf or do not know how to sign. The Assistant CRA turned her efforts into getting O.R. an appropriate communication device. An IPP was scheduled to discuss assistive technology (AT) services. There were no previous communication goals as part of O.R.'s IPP. The regional center added communication as a goal and assisted O.R. in finding a generic resource that would provide O.R. with an AT device. O.R. will receive a telephone for the deaf from California Telephone Access free of charge and will now be able to communicate with friends, family and advocacy offices. Veronica Cervantes, CRA, Beatriz A. Reyes, Assistant CRA, Inland Regional Center.

CONSUMER FINANCES

OCRA Investigation Results in Debt Forgiveness.

J.R. opened several credit cards in his name at the request of his sister who lives in Arizona. His sister then used the cards, leaving J.R. with

approximately \$4,000 in debt. Despite repeated attempts by J.T. and his supported living agency to have his sister pay the debts, she refused. The sister also threatened J.R. on the phone. J.R. and his service provider contacted OCRA to assist him in resolving this issue.

OCRA met with J.R. and suggested that he file a police report. J.R. was initially reluctant to do this but after meeting with J.R. several times to discuss his options, he ended up filing the report. OCRA then wrote letters to the collection agencies, explaining the situation and asking that the debts be forgiven. One debt was forgiven but J.R. continued to receive letters about the other debt.

A meeting was arranged with J.R., the regional center, the supported living agency, and the police detective who was working the case. The detective told OCRA that J.R.'s sister had been involved in credit card fraud and was being investigated by the police in Arizona. OCRA wrote another letter to the collection agency and the detective also called the agency. They agreed to send the debt to their fraud department and discontinue any attempts for payment from J.R. Katy Lusson, CRA, Amanda St. James, Assistant CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

DISCRIMINATION

Bus Company Agrees to Add a Bus to Route and Provides Sensitivity Training to All Staff.

OCRA filed a federal complaint against the local public bus company on behalf of two adult consumers who ambulate by wheelchair. The consumers tried previously to resolve their problems with the bus company by telephoning the customer service department, complaining to the bus drivers and addressing their problems at public community meetings. The allegations of discrimination based on a disability included the refusal of the bus company to provide alternative transportation on the route frequented by regional center consumers. Riders often had to wait over one hour for the bus due to the occupancy of the two bus spaces designated for riders in wheelchairs. In addition, the complaint alleged that the bus staff did not treat consumers with dignity, often referring to them as "wheelchairs." The Program Operations director of the bus company contacted OCRA to discuss the complaint. Following discussions with OCRA, the bus company agreed

to take corrective actions to address the allegations. The consumers and the CRA later met with the operations director. The bus company agreed to add another bus to the route, resulting in a pick up every half-hour and provide extensive training to all bus staff on respectful communications with and about passengers who use wheelchairs. The bus company also agreed to the consumers' request to address their concerns at an upcoming company staff training. At this training, the operations director and the consumers will review the current plan of corrective action and determine if there is a need for additional improvements. Tim Poe, CRA, Kern Regional Center.

J.E. Continues Working in a Harassment Free Workplace.

J.E., a regional center consumer with developmental disabilities, reported that his co-workers were harassing him at work. J.E. had held the same job for 30 years. OCRA agreed to assist J.E. by requesting a meeting with J.E., his employer, family, and regional center service coordinator. OCRA's investigation determined that the co-workers were teasing J.E. about his disability.

A written request was made to the employer requiring that the co-workers immediately stop the harassment and that the employer provide reasonable accommodations for J.E. so that he would be able to perform his job free from harassment. The co-workers were counseled by the employer, J.E.'s work shift was changed and one of the co-workers was transferred to another work site. Katherine Mottarella, CRA, Tri-Counties Regional Center.

HOUSING

Habitability Issues of Rental Housing Corrected.

M.G. and N.G. are mother and minor daughter who are both regional center consumers. A family friend contacted OCRA and related that numerous complaints about repairs and maintenance of M.G. and N.G.'s apartment to the managers had gone unaddressed for months.

OCRA provided assistance in drafting a list of repairs in writing and coached the caller on presenting these demands to the manager. The management agreed to an inspection of the property. This resulted in a

commitment to begin repairs and repainting within 10 days to correct the complaints. Doug Harris, CRA, Redwood Coast Regional Center.

Section 8 Reinstatement and Extension.

S.H. is a young woman who has lived in a nursing home for many years. OCRA and the Area Board worked for several years to get her out of the nursing home and into the community with supported living services. S.H. had been living in the community successfully for two years when she received a Section 8 voucher. The regional center vendorized an agency to assist S.H. in her search for an accessible apartment. S.H. requires 24-hour care. She uses a power wheelchair and a Hoyer Lift.

After several months, S.H. had not found an accessible apartment. OCRA received a call on a Friday afternoon that S.H.'s Section 8 voucher was going to expire at 5:00 PM that day. On Monday morning, OCRA contacted the Section 8 worker who was assigned to the case. This worker had told S.H., her regional center social worker, and the agency assisting S.H. in her housing search, that the voucher could not be extended, as she had already been granted one extension.

The worker said that if OCRA wrote a letter and sent documentation, she would approach her supervisor about a second extension. OCRA contacted the Area Board and the Congressional legislative aide in S.H.'s district. OCRA secured letters from the Area Board, the regional center, and the supported living staff. OCRA also wrote a letter on S.H.'s behalf. The congressional aide called the Section 8 worker.

OCRA put together all of the letters and got them to the Section 8 worker within two days. Several days later, OCRA was notified that the Section 8 voucher had been reinstated and that it had been extended for two months. OCRA has continued to contact the parties assisting S.H. in her search to assure that S.H. has accessible housing within the time allowed. Katy Lusson, CRA, Amanda St. James, Assistant CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

PERSONAL AUTONOMY

L.W. Obtains Supported Living

L.W. is a 22-year-old with a diagnosis of autism, referred to OCRA by Adult Protective Supervision due to emotional abuse by his mother and aunt with whom L.W. resides. L.W. was never allowed to contact his father, favorite aunt or grandmother and he was losing hope that his wishes would ever be heard. L.W. informed OCRA that his mother and aunt had threatened that if he tried to seek assistance, he would be placed in an institution. L.W. expressed his dream to have his own apartment and go to school to help others.

OCRA represented L.W. at a planning team meeting at the regional center with L.W., his mother, and aunt, to create a plan for L.W. to obtain his apartment. Despite his mother's reluctance, it was agreed that L.W. would obtain supported living, deposit and first months rent, and continued rental assistance until he was eligible for Section 8. Both the mother and aunt were reluctant to let L.W. achieve his dream, and kept making excuses for postponing his move. OCRC had to remove several obstacles placed by L.S.'s mother. Two months later, OCRA received a call from L.W. expressing his happiness and gratitude for his new apartment and staff. Jacqueline Miller, CRA, Cynthia P. Salomón, Assistant CRA, Regional Center of Orange County.

A.R. Gets a Dog.

A.R. wanted to have a small companion animal. A.R.'s apartment lease requires her to have an amendment to her lease in order to have a pet. A.R. was told by her landlord that she could not have a pet because she lived on the second floor. A.R.'s service coordinator contacted OCRA to ask for assistance. OCRA sent the landlord a letter requesting that A.R. be allowed to have a small companion pet in her apartment as an accommodation under federal and state fair housing laws. A.R.'s psychiatrist wrote a letter of support indicating that A.R. could benefit from having a small animal. A.R.'s landlord agreed. Margie Oppel, Temporary CRA, Katherine Mottarella, CRA, Tri-Counties Regional Center.

J.E. Exercises His Right to Vote.

J.E. is 53-years-old and diagnosed with mental retardation, cerebral palsy, and an impulse control disorder. J.E. is an accomplished artist and has many ceramic and painted artworks on display. J.E. has attended the Allen Short Center in Stockton for years. After participating in the OCRA voting rights training at the day program, J.E. decided that he would like to vote for the first time in his adult life. J.E. understood the election process and provided education for his peers during the training.

OCRA assisted J.E. by helping him complete his California voter registration form by the deadline of January 22, 2008. OCRA personally delivered the completed forms to the local registrar's office in San Joaquin County so that J.E. would have the opportunity to vote during the California Primary Election on February 5th. Leinani Neves, CRA, Philomena Alomar, Assistant CRA, Valley Mountain Regional Center.

REGIONAL CENTER

J.M. Keeps Respite.

J.M.'s mother, a Spanish-speaker, is taking English classes at night so she can help J.M. with his school work. Because J.M.'s father's self-employment required that he work at night, the mother needed respite care for J.M. so she could continue to go to school. Although the regional center temporarily funded the respite care, after several months the family received notice that the respite would end. J.M.'s mother appealed and called OCRA, which provided technical assistance in preparing the mother to self-advocate at the hearing. OCRA prepared opening and closing statements and helped with the factual argument and questions for witnesses. J.M.'s mother went to hearing and prevailed. She continues to attend English classes as J.M. continues to receive respite. Matt Pope, CRA, Lucy Garcia, Assistant CRA, Eastern Los Angeles Regional Center.

Restoration of Behavioral Services and New Services Provided for E.A.

E.A. lives at home with both parents and three siblings. E.A. and his family are Spanish speaking. As a result of termination of a contract between a vendor and Far Northern, needed in-home behavioral services were

terminated without notice to the family. No replacement services were provided. After several months of being told no new vendor had been located to provide behavioral services, E.A.'s parents contracted OCRA for assistance. Following intervention with the service coordinator, a "temporary" behaviorist, and a translator were provided. At a subsequent IPP meeting, it was agreed that the temporary behaviorist would be hired permanently. Additional services of more translation hours and 51 hours of respite care per quarter were also confirmed and included in an IPP addendum. Another positive outcome of the IPP was that the good working relationship between E.A. and family and the service coordinator was maintained. Andy Holcombe, CRA, Lorie Atamian, Assistant CRA, Far Northern Regional Center, Jacqueline Gallegos, Interpreter.

J. D. Gets the Day Program of His Choice.

J.D. had been attending the same day program for many years. He was bored with the activities and longed for a new program. One day, J.D. refused to go back due to his dislike of the program.

J.D. and his family consulted with the regional center to find a new day program. The regional center then offered a variety of programs that were all substantially similar to the program J.D. had just left. Many were quite a distance from his home. They all proved unsatisfactory. The family then found a program J.D. wanted to attend. It offered reading classes, a skill J.D. was trying to improve at home, and a specialized classroom to work on independent living skills. J.D. requested the program from the regional center and it was denied.

His family then called OCRA and the CRA agreed to prepare them for the hearing. The CRA assisted the family by building evidence packets including a chart of the services offered at each suggested program, subpoenaing witnesses and developing testimony. The ALJ found that placing J.D. in the program would support the Lanterman Act's objective of respecting the choices of the consumer and his family and that the program has the ability to provide quality services that will meet claimant's current needs. Katie Hornberger, CRA, Harbor Regional Center.

Family Not Responsible for Funding Respite Hours.

K.P.'s mother is a monolingual Spanish-speaker. She signed an English version of an IPP and was given verbal assurance from the regional center service coordinator that all services were to stay the same. The mother was not made aware that the respite hours were scheduled to expire.

Caring for K.P. involves a high level of care. The respite hours are crucial to keeping him in his home. Mother received an invoice from the respite agency for over \$1000. The family had unintentionally used unauthorized respite hours and the regional center was refusing to pay since the IPP indicated the purchase had expired.

OCRA reviewed the documents and met with both the provider and the regional center. OCRA explained that the situation was clearly not the fault of the family. Both agencies came to an agreement regarding the hours. The regional center did not require the family to pay for the service. Yulahlia Hernandez, CRA, Trina Saldana, Assistant CRA, North Bay Regional Center.

Regional Center Provides Gap Funding for Mental Health Services.

The mother of E.P. called OCRA stating that their family moved from Alameda County to Santa Clara County. Her 21-year-old son was receiving mental health services in Alameda County but since the family's move to the new regional center, the mother was paying for the mental health services because E.P.'s Medi-Cal eligibility had not transferred to Santa Clara County. The new regional center claimed that the mother had not exhausted her resources and refused to pay for mental health services. OCRA called the service coordinator and requested that the regional center pay for mental health services until Medi-Cal was transferred. The regional center immediately agreed to provide mental health services. Rita DeFilippis, CRA, San Andreas Regional Center.

RIGHTS IN THE COMMUNITY

Court Orders District Attorney to follow the Law.

The Public Defender called OCRA for help with a juvenile who had been placed at Porterville Developmental Center. When OCRA investigated, it learned that the court had allowed N.M. to be placed at Porterville without proper legal steps. Neither N.M. nor his attorney was given notice of the court process that would put N.M. in Porterville. The court also allowed the Porterville placement to be completed in court by someone who is not an attorney. OCRA went to court and asked a different judge to reverse the Porterville placement and to order the District Attorney to follow the law. The judge agreed. N.M. is now being reassessed. Bernadette Bautista, CRA, Wendy Dumlao, CRA, Alba Gomez, Assistant CRA, San Diego Regional Center.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Private Tutoring Continues.

Once S.C. completed 6th grade, her parents decided to enroll her in a private parochial school. Her parents properly noticed the school district at the next IEP meeting and again in writing 2 months before her new placement. The parents also requested the school district continue to fund the 4 hours of private tutoring services that were designated in her current IEP. The school district ignored the parents' request for seven months before sending notice that the district would no longer fund the tutoring. OCRA met with the Director of Special Education and negotiated a settlement with the school district agreeing to fund the tutoring service for the remainder of the current IEP. Arthur Lipscomb, CRA, Ernestine Moreno, Assistant CRA, Kay Spencer, Assistant CRA, Central Valley Regional Center.

Student Obtains Needed Services and Compensatory Hours.

D.V. is a 5-year old boy with autism. He moved to a new school district that acknowledged that it must fully implement his IEP from the previous school but was not doing so. The new district completed its own evaluations, and reduced the amount of occupational therapy (OT), physical therapy (PT) and speech therapy (speech) services. D.V.'s mother is a monolingual Spanish-speaker, so there were language access problems with the district personnel.

An IEP was held to talk about the OT and PT assessments, but the occupational therapist did not appear for the meeting. PT was discontinued completely. The IEP was continued for 2 weeks. The OT offer was not appropriate for D.V.

Because of all the disagreements, the mother and OCRA requested a Dispute Resolution Session with a facilitator present. D.V.'s needs were discussed and an agreement was reached and signed by all parties. The district agreed to fund an independent assessment for PT, a supplementary assessment for OT to address specific issues that were not addressed in the recent assessment, and clinic OT to be provided through a non-public agency, which is a more appropriate environment for D.V.'s therapy. After negotiation, the district also agreed to provide 1/2 hour more per week of OT than was initially offered.

Additionally the district agreed to provide all of the compensatory hours that were not provided during the transition between districts. D.V. will receive 24 hours of compensatory OT, and 16 hours of compensatory speech. Finally, the district offered D.V. a placement to supplement his Head Start placement. Luisa Delgadillo, Assistant CRA, Westside Regional Center.

Student Transferred to Transition Program.

J.F. is a 17-year-old student with significant cognitive and physical impairments. She has been fully included for many years although her parents wanted her to transfer to a transition program. The parents requested this move from the district and had several meetings but J.F. was not moved.

J.F.'s parents called OCRA and asked it to intervene. OCRA called the Director of Special Education for the district and asked for an IEP meeting to discuss placement. A timeline of what had transpired before OCRA became involved was developed.

OCRA accompanied J.F.'s parents to the meeting. The Director of Special Education said that the paperwork had been completed and that the parents would receive a letter regarding J.F.'s transfer to the transition program that the parents had requested. Katy Lusson, CRA, Amanda St. James, Assistant CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

Increase in Mainstream Time for Fourth Grade Student.

V.E.'s mother called requesting assistance in getting more mainstreaming for her daughter. At the last IEP meeting in early March, the mother had requested mainstreaming for all her daughter's classes and resource support for math and reading. She did not want her daughter in a special day class (SDC) and felt that her daughter's low math skills were a direct result of the low expectations of the SDC teacher.

The district's offer that the mother rejected was for SDC for language arts and resource for math, and mainstreaming for the rest of the day without a 1:1 aide. The mother did not want a SDC and requested a 1:1 aide for mainstreaming, and resource for math. Mother informed the school district that she intended to go to due process. OCRA contacted the director of special education. The district then offered resource for math and reading comprehension support for the regular class and mainstreaming for all else, with the agreement that the IEP include a review in 30 days to determine if V.E. needs a 1:1 aide or classroom accommodations to be successful in the regular class. The mother agreed to the proposed IEP. Rita DeFilippis, CRA, San Andreas Regional Center.

Student Receives 42 Hours of Compensatory Speech Services.

J.T. did not receive the speech services that were in his IEP for the previous school year. The speech therapist had been out ill and the district had not hired another speech therapist to cover the caseload. Despite repeated phone calls, letters, and meetings, J.T.'s parents had not been successful in their request to have these hours compensated in the current school year.

OCRA wrote a letter stating the concerns and suggesting that a compliance complaint would follow if the speech hours were not compensated for in a timely manner. OCRA attended a meeting with J.T.'s parents and the school district. The district agreed that J.T. was due 42 hours of compensatory speech and that it would begin providing it and continue to provide it through the extended school year. J.T. is now receiving the compensatory services as agreed. Katy Lusson, CRA, Amanda St. James, Assistant CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

OCRA Prevents School from Discriminating Against Student.

R.J. is in a full inclusion kindergarten class with a 1:1 aide. The school decided to extend the school day for the kindergartners but R.J. was only allowed to stay for the extended part of the day if his mother came to the class. R.J.'s mother requested that the school reconsider its position as it had singled R.J. out from his peers and compromised his performance in class. The school stated that it did not have money for the 1:1 to stay for the extended time and that the extended time was "optional". Therefore, it was not part of the IEP. OCRA investigated the issue with the Office of Civil Rights as a discriminatory act by the school. OCRA represented R.J. at an IEP. The school agreed to the 1:1 aid for the entire day. Yulahlia Hernandez, CRA, Trina Saldana, Assistant CRA, North Bay Regional Center.

Student Mainstreamed.

L.C. is a 5-year-old boy who was mainstreamed in his pre-school program. His parents were told that if they placed L.C. in a SDC, the school would mainstream him into the regular kindergarten class as soon as possible. L.C.'s parents called OCRA because four months had passed and L.C. had not been mainstreamed.

OCRA advised the parents to obtain letters from the pre-school, as well as the other specialists currently working with L.C. OCRA also spoke with the special education director for the district who agreed that L.C. was a good candidate for mainstreaming. L.C.'s parents then notified OCRA that L.C. had begun being mainstreamed several hours each day. Katy Lusson, CRA, Amanda St. James, Assistant CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

Student Receives New Behavioral Assessment Plan and 1:1 Aide.

I.R. is a student with severe cognitive and behavioral impairments. Although she had a current behavioral plan, I.R. was being sent home every day from school because her behaviors could not be managed in the classroom. I.R.'s mother had given up her employment because she had to pick her daughter up from school. Additionally, I.R.'s mother had repeatedly asked for a 1:1 aide but the district had not agreed to this.

OCRA attended a meeting with both the district and the county. The psychologist was also at the meeting. The psychologist said that the behavioral plan was working well. OCRA pointed out that I.R. had to leave school early every day due to her behaviors. The county asked for a new assessment and behavioral plan. The district agreed to provide a 1:1 aide. Additionally, I.R.'s mother was compensated for providing transportation for her daughter. Katy Lusson, CRA, Amanda St. James, Assistant CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

Student Receives Nursing Services and Transportation.

S.L. has significant physical and cognitive impairments. He has a G-tube, a tracheotomy, and needs to be continuously suctioned. The district continued to tell S.L.'s mother that they were searching for a nurse but could not locate one. S.L.'s mother was driving S.L. to school each day with her cousin because he needed to be suctioned during the ride. S.L.'s respite worker was going to school with S.L. to perform the suctioning and to monitor S.L.

OCRA arranged a meeting with the school district and the county. The district's attorney was present at the meeting. The district stated that it had located a nurse who was willing to provide services to S.L. and would also ride the bus with S.L. The district agreed to compensate S.L.'s mother for the transportation she had been providing. They also agreed to pay for the hours S.L.'s respite worker would accompany S.L. to school until the nurse could start. Katy Lusson, CRA, Amanda St. James, Assistant CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

F.R. Gets Less Restrictive Placement.

F.R.'s mother contacted OCRA because she wanted her son in a full-inclusion program. At that time, F.R. was in a general education classroom for most of the school day and spent his last two hours in a SDC with children with more severe disabilities. Although it appeared that F.R. could successfully transition to a fully inclusive program, the special education teacher had developed a strong emotional attachment to F.R., which made the move more difficult. The Assistant CRA attended two IEP meetings which led to the development of a plan to slowly move F.R. from the SDC to full-time placement in the general education class. The plan included weekly meetings with the special education teacher and the general education teacher in order to address any problems that might arise from the

change in placement. The plan also included social skills training and close monitoring of academic progress. Finally, F.R.'s service coordinator became part of the IEP team where she now acts as F.R.'s primary advocate. Matt Pope, CRA, Lucy Garcia, Assistant CRA, Eastern Los Angeles Regional Center.

OCRA Negotiates Settlement with School District.

K.A.'s physician and a psychologist reported that K.A. becomes very upset when she is assessed for school. As a result, her mother offered to give the school district recent independent assessment results rather than allow the district to put K.A. through more testing. The district refused and insisted on new testing. OCRA attended an IEP meeting and negotiated an agreement. K.A.'s mother would allow K.A. to be tested for a maximum of two hours, with the district agreeing to follow OCRA's suggestions to be creative in the testing to avoid upsetting K.A. The district also agreed to use some of the independent assessments that the mother provided. Bernadette Bautista, CRA, Wendy Dumlao, CRA, Alba Gomez, Assistant CRA, San Diego Regional Center.

Early Start Child Obtains Appropriate Services.

I.A. is a 3-year-old diagnosed with autism. Under the Early Start Program, I.A. was receiving speech, OT, and an at-home floor time program. During I.A.'s first IEP, the school district offered a county placement and no related services. I.A.'s mother disagreed and requested an in-home ABA program along with OT and speech. The district refused and I.A.'s mother contacted OCRA for assistance. The CRA assisted the mother in drafting and filing a request for a due process hearing. OCRA further advised the mother to request that the regional center fund an ABA assessment. While awaiting mediation and hearing dates, the regional center funded the ABA assessment which recommended at-home ABA and also agreed to co-fund the program. During communications with the regional center, it offered to provide a special education advocate to represent I.A. at the mediation and hearing, which the mother accepted. The mother was given three options for preschool placement. I.A. will now be receiving speech and OT services. In addition, the district agreed to provide compensatory hours of 120 education hours, 28 speech sessions and 28 OT sessions. Veronica Cervantes, CRA, Beatriz A. Reyes, Assistant CRA, Inland Regional Center.

OCRA Prevails At Mediation.

T.L.P.'s mother requested a 1:1 aide so T.L.P., a 12 year-old, could participate in after-school activities, including school dances. The mother also believed that the district had failed to implement all of the recommendations from several independent assessments. When the district refused the mother's requests, she refused to sign the IEP and the district filed for hearing. OCRA agreed to represent at mediation, where the parties reached a settlement: The district agreed it would implement the independent assessment recommendations, notify the mother of after-school activities and provide T.L.P. with a 1:1 aide during school dances and other after-school activities. The district also agreed to modify several goals and to hold monthly meetings where the mother would be presented with progress reports. Arthur Lipscomb, CRA, Ernestine Moreno, Assistant CRA, Kay Spencer, Assistant CRA, Central Valley Regional Center.

OCRA Gets M.K. an Aide on the Bus.

M.K., who finds it hard to travel and acts out when he does travel, was in danger of being suspended from the school bus. OCRA and the parents scheduled an IEP meeting, where everyone agreed on a plan for the bus. M.K. would get rewards for good behavior and would have an aide on the bus with him. Shortly after this meeting, M.K.'s parents called OCRA again to report that when the bus monitor was not on the bus, M.K. would ride alone, making it likely that he would act out again. OCRA called the principal and explained that consistency was necessary for M.K. to progress on his behavior plan and that the school was not doing what the IEP required. A few weeks later, M.K.'s parents reported that a bus monitor was being provided daily as the IEP required. Bernadette Bautista, CRA, Wendy Dumlao, CRA, Alba Gomez, Assistant CRA, San Diego Regional Center.

OCRA Helps Keep Client in School.

E.H., a 17-year-old, was involved in a shoving incident with a teacher. The school held an emergency IEP even though the Spanish-speaking family had told the school it could not attend at the time scheduled. OCRA agreed to represent and the school held another IEP. At the IEP, it was agreed that E.H. would remain at the same school with the same services, which include individual therapy, medication monitoring, case management, group therapy and someone to ride the bus with E.H. The district also agreed not to call

the parents to pick up E.H. when he acts out, to reimburse the family for mileage for transporting E.H. from school and to do a behavior assessment and a behavior plan. Arthur Lipscomb, CRA, Ernestine Moreno, Assistant CRA, Kay Spencer, Assistant CRA, Central Valley Regional Center.

Student Rides Safely on the Bus Again.

C.R. was sexually molested by a student who rides the same school bus. The school district assigned C.R. a bus monitor and, although C.R.'s parents were to be notified if the monitor would not be on the bus for any reason, there were a few occasions where the parents were not notified. When the parents learned of the monitor's absences, they called OCRA, who attended an IEP meeting with C.R.'s parents. A new plan was developed that if C.R.'s monitor could not be on the bus, the bus would re-route and take C.R. to school before the other child was picked up. Bernadette Bautista, CRA, Wendy Dumlao, CRA, Alba Gomez, Assistant CRA, San Diego Regional Center.

OCRA Assists With Filing Compliance Complaint.

C.L.'s parents contacted OCRA for assistance preparing for an IEP meeting. OCRA reviewed the facts of the case including the school district's OT logs which indicated the school's failure to provide OT services as agreed in the IEP. OCRA advised C.L.'s parents on drafting a compliance complaint for the California Department of Education (CDE.) and provided information on requesting services and supports that C.L. needs at the up-coming IEP meeting. Emma Hambright, CRA, Lanterman Regional Center.

District Agrees to Provide Alternative School Transportation.

A.V. is an 11-year old student with autism who rode the school bus two hours every morning to his placement in a county classroom. Parents of A.V. wanted him to remain in his placement. However, they requested a new bus route because the long commute was causing A.V. to be irritable, fatigued and further disrupting his ability to concentrate in the classroom. The parents had requested a change in transportation at previous IEPs, but the school district denied these requests. OCRA agreed to represent the parents at the IEP and send a letter explaining that the commute was denying A.V. a free and appropriate education. The long commute exacerbated many of the deficits related to A.V.'s diagnosis of autism and prevented A.V. from

making further progress towards his socialization, communication and academic goals. At the IEP, the school district agreed to provide a second bus that would pick up A.V. over ninety-minutes later. A.V.'s bus ride was shortened from over two hours to less than forty-five minutes. The parents reported that A.V.'s behaviors and progress at school have improved. Tim Poe, CRA, Kern Regional Center.

Parents File Education Compliance Complaint.

J.H. attends pre-school in a SDC. J. H.'s parent identified ongoing concerns that were affecting J.H. at school including the need for appropriate behavioral support. The IEP team had agreed to a speech and language "screening" with results to be completed by November 15, 2007, an Adaptive P.E. "screening" was to be conducted with results by October 12, 2007, and a behavior support plan was to be developed and implemented by November 8, 2007, when a follow-up IEP was to be held.

OCRA staff requested and reviewed educational records for J.H. and represented him at an IEP meeting on January 30, 2008. During the meeting, a request for a behavioral assessment was made. The IEP team agreed to the assessment and a consent form was signed. In addition, the IEP team agreed to an occupational therapy/sensory integration assessment. An assessment consent form was to be provided to the parent within 15 days. J.H. would also receive 1:1 assistance in the classroom and on the bus. The district failed to meet the timelines for the agreements made at both the November, 2007. and the January, 2008, IEPs. With technical assistance provided by OCRA staff, J.H.'s parent filed a compliance complaint with the CDE. A compliance investigation was opened by CDE on behalf of J.H. confirming each allegation of non-compliance identified by the parent. The school district has arranged to meet with the parent and OCRA staff to resolve all complaint issues and consider a more appropriate placement for J.H. Anastasia Bacigalupo, CRA, Christine Armand, Associate CRA, South Central Los Angeles Regional Center.

C.C. Returns to School.

C.C. a 6-year-old in foster care, moved to a new group home in a new school district. C.C. was denied admission to the new school district because his last IEP placed him in a non-public school and the new district claimed it did not have to serve him because 1) the county welfare department had not

verified that there was an existing program for him in the district prior to his placement, 2) the district did not have any non-public schools in the area. The new district also alleged that it did not have to place C.C. because his child welfare social worker did not inform the new district prior to C.C.'s move. OCRA was contacted by the regional center to assist. OCRA agreed to write a letter to the new school district and advocate on C.C.'s behalf to have him placed in a public school program. After much negotiation, including discussion of joining the district in the juvenile court proceedings, the new district agreed to place C.C. in a home hospital program, then in a partial day in his neighborhood public school SDC, and finally accepted responsibility for him as a district student and held an IEP to formalize his full-day placement in the SDC. The new district also initiated C.C.'s triennial assessment. Margie Oppel, Temporary CRA, Katherine Mottarella, CRA, Tri-Counties Regional Center.

Preschooler Gets Assessment and Behavior Plan.

R.M. has autism. He started preschool in late August, and the regional center promptly sought an assessment by a SELPA expert. More than six months later, the assessment had not been administered. R.M. was being physically restrained at school by untrained personnel. He was isolated on the playground. He returned home from school each day with his diaper not having been changed. He was learning few, if any, words. Aides were arguing about whose turn it was to work with him. R.M.'s parents pulled him out of school and the regional center referred the parents to OCRA.

OCRA contacted attorneys for the school district. R.M. was assessed by an expert in autism. A behavior plan is being developed and R.M. is back in school. Jim Stoepler, CRA, Redwood Coast Regional Center, Eureka.

OUTREACH AND TRAINING

OCRA Conducts a Series of Trainings on IHSS.

OCRA was contacted by the Koch-Young Family Resource Center to provide IHSS trainings to the regional center's Spanish-speaking support groups. During this quarter, staff provided the IHSS trainings for the group De Mi Familiar A Su Familiar, and an IHSS training for the Early Intervention Spanish-speaking support group. Two additional trainings were

scheduled to take place over the next quarter to address parental concerns about up-coming budget changes which may impact the provision of IHSS services. Emma Hambright, CRA, Lanterman Regional Center.

F:\docs\Jeanne\ADVOCACY REPORT.spring08.doc

ADVOCACY REPORT

OFFICE OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS ADVOCACY

Summer 2008

BENEFITS

Nine-Year-Old Wins Protective Supervision.

T.F.'s mother already provides close supervision since T.F. has had several accidents when the mother has been in another room. In addition to T.F.'s lack of safety awareness and poor judgment, he is also nonverbal, so if he did have an accident he is not able to tell his mother or an emergency worker what happened.

T.F. was already receiving 27 hours of personal care service hours through In-Home Support Services (IHSS), which was provided by T.F.'s aunt, but his mother could not work because she needed to care for T.F. at home. T.F.'s mother requested a re-evaluation so the county could assess T.F. for protective supervision. The county declined to conduct a re-evaluation and, instead conducted an annual evaluation two months after her request. Following this evaluation, the county denied protective supervision.

OCRA filed for hearing on behalf of T.F. and the county appeals specialist agreed that T.F. met the criteria for protective supervision. However, she could not get the supervisor at the local office to grant T.F. protective supervision so OCRA had to proceed to hearing. At the hearing, the county appeals specialist and the social worker stipulated that T.F. was entitled to protective supervision in the amount of 195 hours per month. The amount will be retroactive and the provider will change to T.F.'s mother. They will receive \$10,530 in retroactive benefit award from the time they first requested protective supervision. Katie Meyer, CRA, Westside Regional Center.

D.W. Found Eligible for SSI after Three Years.

D.W. received Supplemental Security Income (SSI) for many years as a minor. Upon turning 18, D.W. was found no longer eligible for benefits. At

that time, he was placed in an adult residential facility and he did not have any support to assist him with appealing the denial. D.W.'s Independent Living Skills (ILS) worker assisted D.W. with reapplying for SSI. D.W.'s ILS worker contacted OCRA for assistance with the application process for the SSI benefits. The CRA obtained an independent assessment for D.W. The assessment results supported D.W.'s eligibility for SSI benefits. The CRA submitted the independent evaluation on behalf of D.W. and he was found eligible for SSI dating back to August, 2007. Aimee Delgado, CRA, Marisol Cruz, Assistant CRA, San Gabriel/Pomona Regional Center.

Additional IHSS Hours Obtained.

D.J. is a teenager with multiple disabilities who needs a significant amount of IHSS in order to remain safely in his home. At a recent annual review, the county did not increase the amount of hours, which remained at 83.6 hours per month with no protective supervision, despite the fact that D.J. has needed this supervision for several years.

D.J.'s mother consulted with OCRA and decided to appeal the amount of hours and the denial of protective supervision. A conditional withdrawal was agreed upon with the county, and a reassessment was scheduled. The Assistant CRA was present at the reassessment by the county worker and staff nurse. The Assistant CRA gave the IHSS staff a walking tour of DJ's home, together with an explanation of what behaviors occur in each room as well as what the needs are in each room of the house. The nurse was persuaded by the detailed explanations.

IHSS staff issued a Notice of Action adding protective supervision and bringing the total monthly hours to 278.6, retroactive to December, 2007. The mother was advised that she could appeal, and most likely prevail, for the 4.4 hours that would bring her to the maximum of 283. The mother decided not to appeal and is satisfied with the monthly hours D.J. is now receiving. Katie Hornberger, CRA, Harbor Regional Center, Lucy Garcia, Assistant CRA, Eastern Los Angeles Regional Center.

OCRA Gets Retroactive IHSS for Client.

B.L.'s mother contacted OCRA for assistance in obtaining IHSS hours. The mother disagreed with the county's initial determination and filed for hearing disputing the determination of hours and the denial of protective

supervision. The County's Appeal Unit determined that it would be appropriate to re-assess B.L.'s needs for services including protective supervision. After re-assessment, B.L. was approved for 195 hours per month, including protective supervision, but the county refused to authorize these hours retroactive to the date of application. The CRA contacted the county in an attempt to resolve this matter, but the county refused to pay retroactive benefits stating that B.L. was not eligible for protective supervision effective the date of application. The CRA represented B.L. at hearing and argued that B.L.'s condition and need for hours were the same at the time of initial assessment as they were at re-assessment and that the county had failed to adequately assess B.L. at the initial assessment. The Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) ruled from the bench and agreed that B.L.'s condition had not changed or worsened during the six months between assessments. In addition, the ALJ discussed the conditional withdrawal in which the county agreed to preserve the initial application date, and make any increase in hours effective the date of application. B.L.'s mother, who is the IHSS provider, received a retroactive payment of \$9,500. Veronica Cervantes, CRA, Beatriz A. Reyes, Assistant CRA, Inland Regional Center.

IHSS Service Reduction Successfully Appealed.

B.A. is an 11-year-old consumer whose IHSS services were reduced from the maximum of 283 hours per month to 259 hours. Also, protective supervision even though no change had occurred justifying the reduction. OCRA agreed to represent B.A. and submitted a state hearing request on her behalf contesting both the reduction and improper notice.

OCRA wrote to the county appeals representative requesting that the case be reviewed, benefits reinstated, and proper notice issued so the consumer could appeal in order to have aid remain unchanged pending the hearing. The county responded by issuing a new notice, restoring lost payment for services, and agreeing that the reduction was in error. Doug Harris, CRA, Redwood Coast Regional Center.

L.B. Keeps IHSS after Being Accused of Fraud.

L.B. lives in her own apartment and receives ILS. L.B.'s ILS worker helped her apply for IHSS. When L.B. applied for IHSS, she only told them that she was blind. Neither L.B., nor her ILS worker, told IHSS that L.B. had

developmentally disabilities. The county investigated L.B.'s ILS worker because the worker was working more than 300 hours per month for various clients. During this investigation, a county investigator observed L.B. walking up and down stairs, using the laundromat and walking to the bus stop with no assistance. When L.B. was questioned by the investigator, she appeared to be evasive and she refused to answer questions.

IHSS issued a Notice of Action reducing L.B.'s hours to zero and stating that L.B. had no need for services. The matter was also referred to the District Attorney to investigate the alleged fraud. L.B. asked OCRA for help in keeping her IHSS so that she could safely remain in her own home.

OCRA investigated the matter and represented L.B. at hearing. The ALJ found that L.B. has poor judgment and diminished ability to care for herself, clean her home, cook or shop, and had been taken advantage of by her ILS worker. The ALJ ordered that L.B. keep her IHSS. Jackie Coleman, CRA, Jacqueline Gallegos, Assistant CRA, Alta California Regional Center.

J.C. Finally Obtains SSI Benefits.

J.C. is a regional center consumer who applied for SSI benefits in March, 2007. The Social Security Administration (SSA) informed J.C. that he was approved but needed to have a representative payee. J.C.'s mother told SSA that she would not be able to do the job and requested that the regional center become representative payee. In October, 2007, J.C. received an SSA Notice of Disapproved Claims indicating that he was not eligible for benefits because SSA had not received information it requested. OCRA advised J.C. to file a Request for Reconsideration. In April, 2008, J.C. received a notice from SSA indicating that his Request for Reconsideration was being denied because the regional center had not provided SSA with the information it requested. OCRA agreed to file a Request for Hearing on J.C.'s behalf. After filing the hearing request, OCRA contacted the SSA District Manager. He looked into the matter and notified OCRA that SSA had now received all of the information requested. It will be issuing J.C.'s SSI. Katherine Mottarella, CRA, Gina Gheno, Assistant CRA, Margie Oppel, Volunteer CRA, Tri-Counties Regional Center.

CONSUMER FINANCES

Creditor Relief.

W.S. is an adult with mild mental retardation who lives independently. Some months ago, W.S. purchased an “as is” used car. Shortly thereafter, breakdowns and repair problems began. With the help of her ILS worker, W.S. first tried to go back to the seller for relief, only to find out that he had gone out of business. The vehicle became non-operational, and the estimated cost of repair exceeded the vehicle’s value, so W.S. stopped payment on a check written for an insurance renewal.

When W.S. received a demand letter from the finance company for the payments that were due, W.S. came to OCRA for help. OCRA sent a rescission of contract letter to the finance company alleging fraud, misrepresentation, and failure of consideration, and offered to return the defective car. Issues of meaningful capacity to contract were also raised. A Fair Debt Collection Practices notice was given prohibiting further contact by the finance company, other than to collect (repossess) the car. Thereafter, the vehicle was reclaimed and the problem was resolved.

Subsequently, a demand letter or “bad check” letter was received by W.S. regarding the stopped payment insurance check. OCRA sent out another Fair Debt Collection Practices notice regarding the “bad check,” in addition to raising defenses to alleged liability and civil penalties. Both the finance company and the check collection agency have ceased collection from W.S. Andy Holcombe, CRA, Lorie Atamian, Assistant CRA, Far Northern Regional Center.

CRIMINAL LAW

Judge Waives Jaywalking Ticket.

C.S.’s care provider called OCRA on C.S.’s behalf and reported that C.S. received a ticket for jaywalking. OCRA wrote a letter to the Superior Court Presiding Judge and requested a diversion program. As a result, the Presiding Judge assigned the regional center to provide training on street signs and traffic law and dismissed the ticket. Wendy Dumlao, CRA, Bernadette Bautista, CRA, Alba Gomez, Assistant CRA, San Diego Regional Center.

Consumer Gets Some Immediate Peace of Mind.

G.R. received a citation to appear in court. There were two Penal Code sections cited. G.R. has no prior record but was quite worried that he might go to jail. OCRA carefully outlined the arraignment process, the importance of G.R.'s lack of a criminal record, prosecutorial discretion, diversion, and the right to counsel and the appointment of counsel. G.R. was grateful and relieved. OCRA then met with the regional center services coordinator who offered to write a letter to the court on G.R.'s behalf. Jim Stoepler, CRA, Redwood Coast, Eureka.

HOUSING

Section 8 Voucher Renewed One Year After Expiration.

R.S. is a 54-year-old man with cognitive, mobility, and visual impairments. He moved from one regional center catchment area immediately after receiving his Section 8 voucher. The voucher was transferred to the new county. The regional center hired a vendorized housing agency to assist R.S. to find suitable housing.

R.S. then had an accident and was in the hospital and a rehabilitation facility for several months. During that time, the housing advocate stopped looking for housing. When R.S. was ready to be released from the rehabilitation facility, his sister called OCRA because his voucher had expired months earlier.

OCRA collected all of the documentation, including a declaration from the housing advocate outlining what had happened. OCRA assisted R.S. and his sister in contacting their congressional representative and spoke to the benefits specialist who then arranged a meeting with Public Housing. Public Housing agreed to reinstate the voucher in order to allow R.S. to seek accessible housing. Katy Lusson, CRA, Amanda St. James, Assistant CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

Family Keeps 3-Bedroom Apartment.

T.M. is 15, has autism and lives with his mother and 3-year-old sister. T.M.'s 18-year-old sister moved out of the apartment and Section 8 Housing

determined that the family was no longer entitled to a voucher for a 3-bedroom home. T.M.'s mother requested that the family keep its 3-bedroom unit as a reasonable accommodation. Because of his disability, T.M. needs his own bedroom. Section 8 denied the request and said that T.M.'s mother could share a bedroom with her daughter or sleep in the living room. T.M.'s mother requested assistance from OCRA.

OCRA provided technical assistance and researched the subsidy standards for Section 8 Housing in Sacramento County, which state that heads of households are to be assigned their own bedroom. T.M.'s mother presented this information to Section 8 and it then was determined that the family could keep its 3-bedroom apartment. Jackie Coleman, CRA, Elizabeth Kennedy, Temporary Assistant CRA, Alta California Regional Center.

PERSONAL AUTONOMY

Consumer Moves from Developmental Center to Community.

C.C. is a young man who had been residing at Porterville Developmental Center (PDC) for seven years. OCRA worked with C.C.'s mother to have C.C. re-evaluated and to have the Public Defender and the regional center work toward his return to the community. During the last year of C.C.'s stay at PDC, he began to be physically victimized by other residents. He was placed in a room close to the staff station but OCRA and the mother felt that C.C. was still in danger.

OCRA continued to facilitate conference calls between PDC, C.C.'s mother, and the regional center. OCRA continued to advocate for community placement and checked routinely on the progress every week to see that the regional center had sent out packets and was actively seeking community placement.

C.C. recently moved to a new group home in the community. The residence has trained staff and a high staff to resident ratio, which will offer C.C. the level of support he needs. The home is near his family home. Katy Lusson, CRA, Amanda St. James, Assistant CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

Gym Allows Family to Continue Membership.

P.B. is an 11-year-old with autism. He lives with his grandparents who are also his legal guardians. P.B. and his grandparents have a family membership at the local sports club. When it came time to renew its gym membership, the family was told by the gym owner that the family would no longer be accepted as members. Other members had been complaining about P.B.'s behavior in the pool and locker room. The gym owner said that people had stopped taking the aerobics class because of P.B.'s behavior and the gym owners were afraid of losing members because of P.B.

P.B.'s family contacted OCRA for assistance. The Assistant CRA contacted the gym owners who claimed that P.B. had no impulse control and was not being adequately supervised by his grandmother, who was not allowed in the men's locker room. The Assistant CRA negotiated with the gym owner to allow a male ILS worker to accompany P.B. to the gym and more closely supervise him. P.B.'s gym membership was reinstated. Lorie Atamian, Assistant CRA, Far Northern Regional Center.

D.C. Allowed to See Dying Father in Hospital.

D.C. has mental retardation and cerebral palsy. D.C. was removed from the family home by the county and conserved. D.C.'s father was in the hospital dying from cancer. D.C.'s father requested to see his daughter. The public guardian refused to take D.C. to the hospital because they "did not want to deal with her crying." OCRA informed the public guardian that they were violating D.C.'s rights and had to let her see her father. The public guardian let D.C. go to the hospital to see her father. Arthur Lipscomb, CRA, Ernestine Moreno, Assistant CRA, Kay Spencer, Assistant CRA, Central Valley Regional Center.

Signature Validated to Qualify for IRS Stimulus Payment.

Based on his Social Security income, J.P. qualified for the IRS Stimulus package for the 2007 tax year. However, due to J.P.'s severe developmental delays, his IPP team questioned whether J.P. could legally sign or consent on the IRS 1040 form necessary to file to receive the stimulus payment. OCRA determined that since J.P. is not conserved and no judge has ordered him incompetent, J.P. is presumed to be mentally competent under California law. Moreover, since he could mark an "X", his signature would be valid

with two witnesses under the California Civil Code. OCRA assisted the consumer in filing the necessary 1040 forms and confirmed that two witnesses observed the marking in accordance with the law. J.P. successfully filed the form and received his stimulus payment. OCRA directly assisted four other consumers in this signature process for the purpose of obtaining their IRS stimulus payment. Leinani Neves, CRA, Filomena Alomar, Assistant CRA, Valley Mountain Regional Center.

REGIONAL CENTER

Regional Center Agrees to “Stay Put.”

C.S. is a 2-year-old with moderate speech delays and apraxia. She was receiving speech services through the regional center as part of her early intervention services for a period of six months. A recently submitted assessment from the speech service provider, however, showed that C.S. had been making significant gains. Based on this assessment, the regional center determined that C.S. was no longer eligible for services. C.S.’s family contacted OCRA.

OCRA assisted the family in filing an appeal to challenge the denial of early intervention services and requesting a “Stay-Put” on the speech services. The regional center agreed to the “Stay-Put.” Before the informal meeting, the family was contacted and informed that the regional center would extend C.S.’s eligibility for early intervention services and the speech until her third birthday. Katy Lusson, CRA, Amanda St. James, Assistant CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

OCRA Secures Client’s Right to a Fair Hearing.

A.B. requested a hearing to contest the decrease of the rate of his 1:1 support person at his group home. The regional center filed a motion to dismiss stating that the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) was not the proper forum for the case to be heard. The regional center argued the rate reduction was not a denial from the perspective of the client, but a vendor rate issue which could be addressed as an “administrative grievance” between the vendor and the regional center.

OCRA successfully argued the claim could appropriately be heard by OAH since the result of the rate decrease could force A.B. to move to a more restrictive environment. The ALJ ruled in favor of A.B., stating that if the matter was not heard at a fair hearing, it would “narrow the scope of consumer appeals authorized by statute.” Yulahlia Hernandez, CRA, Trina Saldana, Assistant CRA, North Bay Regional Center.

OCRA Secures Necessary Services for Early Start Child.

J.G.’s mother, who is a monolingual Spanish-speaker, contacted OCRA and reported that the regional center was not providing services prescribed by J.G.’s doctor. J.G. was to receive eight hours of LVN nursing per day and physical and occupational therapy. J.G.’s parent reported that prior to J.G.’s discharge from the hospital, the service coordinator had promised to have the nursing in place. The nursing services were never initiated. The CRA was also informed that physical therapy still had not been provided even though the regional center had authorized the service. J.G.’s parent requested that the physical therapy be provided in the home since transporting the child was difficult. The parent also requested that she retain the 85 hours of respite she was receiving from the regional center.

OCRA contacted the regional center supervisor to discuss the services requested by the parent. OCRA's involvement included communicating the parent's wishes to the regional center supervisor as well as numerous conference calls between the parent, OCRA and regional center representatives. Ultimately, the regional center agreed to implement the recommendations made by J.G.’s physician. Ibrahim Saab, CRA, Ada Hamer, Assistant CRA, North Los Angeles County Regional Center.

ILS for Teenager Living at Home.

L.T. is a 14-year-old boy who lives with his parents and attends a special day high school class. His mother has terminal cancer and has been quite concerned because L.T. does not have any independent living skills. OCRA asked the regional center to provide L.T. with an ILS trainer while his mother was still alive. OCRA argued that although L.T. was still a teenager and not yet ready to move into his own living space, he would be living in a changed environment without his mother and would need ILS skills in order to successfully remain at home. The regional center found that there was no age limit on ILS training and approved the service for L.T.,

beginning immediately. Katy Lusson, CRA, Amanda St. James, Assistant ACRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Police Use Handcuffs – District Found Out of Compliance.

G.M. is a sixth grade middle school special education student with autism. G.M. was in his P.E. class doing sit-ups and singing while exercising. His teacher told him to leave class. G.M. kept asking why and refused to leave. A campus police officer was summoned to the classroom to assist the teacher in getting G.M. to leave. The officer asked G.M. to leave class and G.M. refused. The officer handcuffed G.M. in front of his class and escorted him to the office.

OCRA filed a compliance complaint alleging failure of the district to implement G.M.'s behavior plan, illegal use of discipline measures which cause pain or trauma, and illegal use of excessive force. After investigation, the California Department of Education (CDE) found the district out of compliance on all allegations and directed the district to convene an IEP meeting, offer compensatory services to address the loss of educational benefit during the two-day suspension of G.M., document the offer in the IEP, and send a copy of the IEP to CDE. Additionally, the district was told to submit evidence that it conducted an in-service training on behavioral interventions. Rita Defilippis, CRA, San Andreas Regional Center.

Student Receives Transportation Services from School.

C.T. is a 4-year-old boy with autism who attends a district pre-school special education program. C.T. and his family live in a small district that does not have a contract for a school bus. C.T. was being driven to school by his parents but they both changed jobs and could no longer transport C.T. The district claimed that C.T. did not need transportation because of his disability, but for parental convenience.

The parents called OCRA and asked for assistance. OCRA called the district and began negotiations with the district through its attorney. The district agreed to pay for C.T.'s private tutor to drive C.T. to school for the rest of the school year.

Next, there was a meeting about summer session and the following school year. OCRA alleged that the district had a policy of not transporting special education students unless the student either lived out of district or had mobility problems. The district denied the allegations and said that if a child needed the service due to his disability, the district found alternative means of transportation for the family (taxi services, reimbursement). Although the district claimed that C.T. did not need the service due to his disability, the district agreed to pay for C.T.'s transportation as a showing of good faith.

C.T.'s family will transport him in the morning and will arrange to have someone else transport him in the afternoon. Alternate arrangements were agreed to if the parents could not transport C.T. The district finally agreed that transportation is a related service required by law. Katy Lusson, CRA, Golden Gate Regional Center.

Appropriate School Services Needed.

J.Z. was receiving Early Start services due to his developmental delays and medical conditions. Due to J.Z.'s surgery, his Individualized Education Plan (IEP) with the school district had to be rescheduled to a date after his third birthday. The school district conducted its assessments, then contacted J.Z.'s mother to let her know that the district would only be offering J.Z. speech therapy, and not the other services which J.Z. was currently receiving from the regional center. The regional center had informed Mrs. Z. that J.Z.'s therapies would be discontinued at the end of the month, even though his IEP was not scheduled until the beginning of the next month.

Mrs. Z. contacted OCRA for assistance in obtaining continued services for J.Z. She was concerned that if J.Z.'s services were discontinued, he would regress as well as lose his placement with the providers, as there were long wait lists. OCRA informed Mrs. Z. about J.Z.'s rights and the regional center's responsibility to ensure that there is service continuity. Mrs. Z.'s requests for continuation of the services were then denied twice by the service coordinator. OCRA advised Mrs. Z. about how to make her written request. Upon contacting the Service Coordinator the third time, the regional center agreed to continue services. J.Z. will now continue to receive services for an additional six months, while Mrs. Z. handles the issues with the school district. Debby Doitch, Interim CRA, Guadalupe Marquez, Assistant CRA, Lanterman Regional Center.

I.M. Receives Appropriate Placement.

I.M. is a regional center consumer with developmental disabilities who is deaf and has cerebral palsy. His current junior high school placement was not able to provide an appropriate program. I.M. was denied admission to the California School for the Deaf in Riverside because it could not accommodate his needs. The local school district told I.M. there were no other public school options available to him. OCRA agreed to represent I.M. at his IEP. meetings to assist him in finding an appropriate educational program. After researching the public school options available and working with the SELPA Director, I.M. and his mother agreed to visit a public school program about 60 miles from his home that had a hard of hearing program.. An IEP. meeting was subsequently held placing I.M. in this placement for this fall. Katherine Mottarella, CRA, Gina Gheno, Assistant CRA, Margie Oppel, Volunteer CRA, Tri-Counties Regional Center.

Alternate Dispute Resolution Resolves Matter.

R.P. has been attending a fully inclusive setting but her father has recently been concerned about her struggles with the 4th grade material. R.B. has headaches and doctors have not been able to determine the cause. Her father has attended recent IEPs asking that the district provide a 1:1 aide for part of the day and provide accommodations for testing. These requests, as well as others, were denied. At her father's request, the CRA attended a follow up Alternate Dispute Resolution meeting to discuss the requests. The district was receptive and agreed to provide an "independent facilitator" (a 1:1 aide) for the part of the day that was most difficult for R.P. She was also given an increase in speech services and the district agreed to provide accommodations for testing. The district also agreed that the school nurse would cooperate with R.P.'s doctor in attempting to determine the cause of R.P.'s headaches. Matthew M. Pope, CRA, Eastern Los Angeles Regional Center.

Compensatory Education after Age 22.

R.M. had been receiving the services of a full time one-to-one aide who was proficient in American Sign Language (ASL). However, in February, 2008, the aide was no longer working with R.M, though the IEP required it. His mother was concerned that, because R.M. was turning 22 and would be out

of special education in September, 2008, any compensatory time would be terminated at the age of 22. R.M.'s mother requested that the CRA assist her in researching the law on this matter. The CRA researched the law and obtained a recent OAH decision that provided compensatory time after the special education student turned 22. R.M.'s mother used the law and advice from the CRA to obtain the compensatory time and have special education provided for a few months after R.M. turned 22. Matthew M. Pope, CRA, Eastern Los Angeles Regional Center.

OCRA Representation Leads to Additional Services and Supports at School and Home.

J.H. is a 5-year-old with autism and limited expressive language development. His parents were referred to OCRA for assistance by J.H.'s service coordinator.

OCRA staff represented J.H. at several IEPs. J.H. received a functional behavior assessment, speech and language assessment, and a sensory integration assessment. J.H. had not been assessed nor did he receive designated instructional services prior to OCRA intervention. He now has a comprehensive behavior support plan in place, with data collection required and bi-weekly monitoring by a district psychologist. J.H. has a temporary support assistant during school hours. His support assistant receives behavior training through a non-public agency to help him work with J.H. J.H. receives 1:1 speech services twice a week and group speech once a week for 30 minutes.

OCRA staff also represented J.H. at his annual IPP with the regional center. J.H. was assessed for in-home behavior services. He and his parents have begun to receive in-home behavior training. Anastasia Bacigalupo, CRA, Christine Armand, Associate CRA, South Central Los Angeles Regional Center.

OCRA Representation Provides Much Needed Change of Placement and Overdue Assessments.

J.W. is an 11-year-old girl with autism and moderate-severe intellectual disabilities. J.W. attends school with a special day class (SDC) placement.

OCRA represented J.W. at IEP meetings because of the school's failure to provide adequate assessments and educational services. OCRA requested assessments in several areas. The assessment reports were reviewed in all educational areas and specific academic, self-help, and behavior goals were established for J.W. His parent made a request for a non-public school placement for J.W. and the district denied the request. However, at subsequent meetings, with the education needs of J.W. now documented, the district was unable to identify an appropriate placement to meet J.W.'s needs. During a June, 2008, IEP meeting, the IEP team agreed to return J.W. to the local district for placement, as J.W. had been in a county placement. The local district could not identify a placement and offered a non-public school with expertise in applied behavior analysis and discrete trail training teaching methodology for J.W. J.W. has new goals to support progress in cognitive level academics, communication, and self-help. Anastasia Bacigalupo, CRA, Christine Armand, Associate CRA, South Central Los Angeles Regional Center.

School District Creates New Program for G.C.

G.C. has a history of behaviors at school that have resulted in a number of suspensions and a referral for expulsion. His parent agreed to an alternative placement in a continuation high school adjoining juvenile hall. G.C. was beginning to follow the behaviors of other students in the program and was being suspended from the high school. He was not making educational progress. The special education services at this site were inadequate and G.C.'s current IEP was not being implemented. At this point, the client's mother called OCRA for assistance.

OCRA represented G.C. at an emergency IEP meeting. The school district agreed to a new assessment and intensive services during the assessment period. G.C. had a modified school week and school day and received 1:1 instruction from the resource specialist for the entire day. G.C. began to enjoy school and to make academic progress. The IEP team met to review the new assessment and to consider placement. OCRA represented at the IEP. The district offered a new SDC that is being created for G.C. and other students with behaviors who require both special education services and an alternative placement in a protected setting. Arthur Lipscomb, CRA, Ernestine Moreno, Assistant CRA, Kay Spencer, Assistant CRA, Central Valley Regional Center.

S.B. Gets Curb to Curb Transportation.

S.B. is a young girl who has cerebral palsy. S.B.'s mother called OCRA because S.B.'s current IEP provided "curb to curb" transportation with an air conditioned vehicle, due to S.B.'s physical disability and severe asthma. However, the school district failed to provide the transportation. OCRA attended an IEP and argued that the district's excuse that it "could not find the transportation" was not acceptable. As a result, the school district contracted with another district to provide the required transportation. Wendy Dumlao, CRA, Bernadette Bautista, CRA, Alba Gomez, Assistant CRA, San Diego Regional Center.

D.K. Gets a Qualified ASL Teacher.

D.K. is a young man who has cerebral palsy and auditory issues. D.K.'s mother called because D.K. was not making progress in the ASL goals in his IEP. OCRA discovered that the classroom aide who was assigned to work on the ASL goals was improperly trained. OCRA attended an IEP and explained the issue to the school district. As a result, the school district agreed to properly train the aide. Wendy Dumlao, CRA., Bernadette Bautista, CRA, Alba Gomez, Assistant CRA, San Diego Regional Center.

OCRA Prevents NPS Placement.

U.V. is 14-year-old middle school special education student. He had been fully included in regular classes for many years. The district filed for due process to force U.V. into a SDC due to low academic performance. U.V. did well for six months in the new placement. Because the district felt that U.V. was too dependent on his aide of five years, a new aide was assigned. U.V. began acting out with serious behaviors, including inappropriate sexual behaviors, physical aggression, and emotional outbursts. U.V. was repeatedly suspended.

OCRA was contacted and requested a behavioral assessment and plan. Before it could be implemented, the district placed U.V. on home instruction and only offered a non-public school (NPS) for students with mental health challenges. OCRA prepared a request for due process and mediation for failure of the district to implement the behavior plan in the current setting.

OCRA negotiated with the district's attorney over several days. The district settled before filing. They offered placement in a SDC with a 1:1 aide and implementation of the behavior plan by a trained behaviorist. The district also agreed to fund an evaluation to determine appropriate educational supports and services. The family accepted the settlement proposals in their entirety. Rita Defilippis, CRA, San Andreas Regional Center.

Behavior Intervention Techniques Are Altered To Be Less Invasive.

M.H. is a 5th grade student who often became frustrated due to her inability to adequately communicate her needs. Her frustration often led to aggressive behaviors in the classroom and on the school bus. As a result, prone restraint methods were being used with her at least twice each week in class, and she was strapped into a restrictive and uncomfortable harness to ride the school bus every day.

Although the district maintained that its interventions were reducing the number of M.H.'s aggressive incidents, OCRA's review of the records revealed that target behaviors had been increasing. The Associate CRA advocated at a total of three IEP meetings. These advocacy efforts resulted in increased intervention from the district's behaviorist from one hour per month to one hour per week, increased speech therapy services from two to four sessions weekly, discontinued use of the school bus harness, which was replaced by a combination of bus driver training, preferential seating, and, when necessary, the use of a safety device known as a "buckle guard," an agreement to immediately stop the use of prone restraint, and to use (for emergencies only) a less invasive technique known as "C.I.P.," which allows the student to remain in a seated position, with no risk of asphyxiation. Celeste Palmer, Associate CRA, Regional Center of the East Bay.

Full Inclusion for First Grade Student.

M.G. was placed in a SDC class and mainstreamed very successfully in regular kindergarten for 3 days a week for one hour. The parents contacted OCRA because they wanted their son fully included with supports and services next year and retained in kindergarten because he is at kindergarten level in his social skills.

OCRA attended two IEP meetings. At the first meeting, OCRA communicated the parents' desired placement to the team. The team did not

recommend retention due to M.G.'s average academic skills. OCRA suggested that M.G. be mainstreamed every day for 1.5 hours a day, the same time every day until the next meeting. The team agreed.

At the second IEP meeting, due to the success of M.G. and in the spirit of compromise, the district agreed to a K-1 combination class for M.G. with an experienced teacher, a 1:1 aide trained in applied behavior analysis techniques, and a social skills class after school. This setting allows M.G. to socialize with 10 kinders in the morning and 10 first graders in the afternoon. This gives him both the social skill practice he needs and the academic and more challenging work in the afternoon in a small, more structured setting. Rita Defilippis, CRA, San Andreas Regional Center.

Compensatory Speech Therapy Services Provided.

D.B. had not received speech services in accordance with his IEP for the past three months. The district's last speech therapist resigned and the district failed to hire another speech therapist to provide speech services. Despite D.B.'s parents' advocacy and advocacy from the regional center case manager, the district had not hired a new speech therapist to provide necessary speech therapy each week.

OCRA assisted the case manager by writing a confirming letter stating the parents concerns and suggested compensatory services would be necessary when a new speech therapist was hired. The district confirmed within days that it had hired a speech therapist and D.B. started receiving speech services. The district also agreed to provide speech services through the extended school year. Leinani Neves, CRA, Valley Mountain Regional Center.

Child Receives Special Education Services and Compensatory Hours.

A.C. moved into a new district but the district told A.C.'s mother to keep driving him to the old school in the former district because the new district did not have a place for him. The former school only had substitute teachers available and A.C. had started acting out due to the lack of a steady teacher. OCRA helped A.C.'s mother file a compliance complaint against both districts. A.C. will receive 34 compensatory hours of tutoring from the old district for its not having a teacher in class. A.C. also started attending school in his own district while it completed its own assessments for

placement and services. After doing its evaluations, the new district wanted to reduce A.C.'s services.

OCRA represented A.C. at two IEP meetings. At one meeting, the occupational therapy (OT) report suggested a reduction of OT services, but after discussion and advocacy, the team agreed to leave the hours the same. The speech therapist proposed not only a reduction of hours but also for speech to be provided in group only. After discussion and advocacy, the team agreed to keep the individual therapy time but reduced the group therapy time. A.C. will also receive APE, behavior intervention, and placement in a SDC with an aide. Luisa Delgadillo, Assistant CRA, Westside Regional Center.

OUTREACH AND TRAINING

Celebración de Familias Excepcionales – Spanish Language Conference in the San Joaquin Valley

In Kern County, OCRA assisted with planning the second annual Celebración de Familias Excepcionales, a Spanish language conference modeled after the Los Angeles Fiesta Educativa, held on May 10, 2008, at the Holiday Inn in Bakersfield, CA. Over 320 people attended the conference from all over the San Joaquin Valley. Counties represented included Kern, Inyo, Mono, Tulare, Kings, Fresno, Monterey, San Benito, Madera, Merced, Mariposa and Stanislaus. Kern Regional Center and Central Valley Regional Center collaborated along with other agencies in sponsoring and planning the very successful conference.

The first keynote speaker was Clinical Neuropsychologist, Dr. Jose Fuentes who has previously been keynote speaker for Fiesta Educativa. He frequently serves in a consulting capacity to various school districts, educational systems, and agencies in order to enhance educational benefit as well as the level of educational support required for students with varying disabilities. The second keynote speaker was Dr. Anthony Montreal, who supervises eight divisions of the CDE. His associate, Tapita Cortez-Alcala, CDE Director of Legislation was also a guest speaker.

In addition, this year the conference had five pull-out sessions. PAI Multicultural Affairs Advocate, Carmen Varela, facilitated the IEP session.

Other sessions included: Self-Esteem, Social Security, Mental Health and Behavior Problems. Celebración de Familias Excepcionales was honored to have Dolores Huerta, President of the Dolores Huerta Foundation deliver the welcoming address. Valerie Geary, Associate Clients' Rights Advocate, KRC

Parents Practice the IPP Process in Napa.

'Parents Can' and OCRA provided a training to monolingual Spanish speaking families regarding clients' rights and the Individual Program Plan (IPP) process. The first part of the training included a presentation regarding the Lanterman Act. The second part of the training included the application of the law demonstrated in a mock IPP meeting. Parents participated in the mock IPP which included the barriers of language and translation which often occur when families speak a different language than the service coordinator.

Families learned of the right to have the IPP document translated into an accessible language, before signing the legal document. Families were excited about learning clients' rights and how to advocate for their children. Yulahlia Hernandez, CRA, Trina Saldana, Assistant CRA, North Bay Regional Center.

OCRA Provides Voting Rights Training.

OCRA provided voting rights training at an independent living center in Napa, for consumers who were interested in learning about their rights to vote. Consumers were interested in different voting options such as absentee ballots or voting at a polling place. They also had various concerns regarding poll workers denying the clients' right to vote or to have assistance in voting. The training was successful and OCRA was invited to provide another training regarding issues on the ballot, using the Easy Voter Guide. Yulahlia Hernandez, CRA, Trina Saldana, Assistant CRA, North Bay Regional Center.

OCRA Conducts Presentations for Monolingual Spanish-Speaking Parents.

The Assistant CRA for San Diego, Alba Gomez, has been busy doing outreach to Spanish-speaking parents and consumers. On April 24, 2008

Alba Gomez conducted a Spanish presentation to 20 parents of the support group at the Harold Ballard Center in San Diego. The presentation contained basics on “SSI Programs.” On May 22, Ms. Gomez conducted a second presentation on basics of the “Medi-Cal Programs.” Then, on April 19, 2008, Alba Gomez hosted a table at the Fiesta Educativa, 2008, conference in San Diego. Alba Gomez, Assistant CRA, San Diego Regional Center.

Spanish Speaking Parents Learn about Special Education and Other Issues.

On June 13, 2008, Lisa Navarro and Gail Gresham traveled to Watsonville to meet with parents and children with whom OCRA has worked for many years. The agenda for the training was on IEP’s. The evening turned out to be much more than just a basic training. Parents asked questions regarding issues about regional center and Medi-Cal.

While the children created beautiful art with supplies provided by OCRA, the parents participated in meaningful discussions about a variety of topics—other than special education. Lisa Navarro, Bilingual Assistant CRA, Gail Gresham, Supervising CRA, San Andreas Regional Center.

OFFICE OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS ADVOCACY
Protection & Advocacy, Inc.

MEMORANDUM

Date: September 3, 2008

To: Jeanne Molineaux, Director

From: Lisa Navarro, Northern California Outreach Coordinator
Anastasia Bacigalupo, Southern California Outreach
Coordinator

Re: **Annual OCRA Outreach Report**
July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008.

OVERVIEW

On June 30, 2008, staff OCRA completed the first year of their current two-year outreach plans. OCRA staff met its commitment to developing on-going relationships within their communities, increasing community contacts and the strength of individual office relationships with members of their communities.

OCRA staff obtained new accomplishments in this first year of the two-year plan, 2007-2009. The outreach training conducted at the end of the previous two-year period, 2005-2007, served to assist in a successful first year of the current two-year period. The OCRA outreach committee and the OCRA Supervising CRA's continue to encourage staff to seek out opportunities to educate consumers, their families and community leaders. The outreach training to OCRA staff in June, 2007, focused on preparing for different types of outreaches in the community including preparation and planning for accommodation needs, the development of outreach boxes, and accessible materials.

Over the course of the plan year, OCRA continued its focus on the development of on-going relationships with traditionally underserved communities of color, providing trainings to communities on a variety of

subjects including the following: Special Education Rights, IEP Development, IPP Development, Regional Center Fair Hearing Process, Medi-Cal, Social Security, In Home Supportive Services, Alternatives to Conservatorships, and Denial of Rights. OCRA also conducted numerous client-centered outreaches, training consumers on financial abuse, voting rights, and clients' rights.

Of the 22 offices statewide, 19 offices have targeted the Latino community through their outreach plans, 2 offices have targeted the Native American Community (Redwood Coast Ukiah/Eureka and Far Northern), and 1 office has targeted the African American Community (South Central Los Angeles).

In the last year, staff has worked hard to implement the new plans. With the hiring of new CRAs in Far Northern, San Andreas, Central Valley and East Bay, OCRA staff has worked on the development of individual outreach skills. Also, new Assistant CRAs were hired with the start of the new two-year plan year. In particular, the CRA at North Bay and Golden Gate mentored their newly hired Assistant CRAs in conducting substantive trainings to Spanish-speaking families. Both Assistant CRAs are now able to conduct trainings on their own.

Moreover, the Westside Regional Center CRA has been so successful in the development of the Assistant CRA's training skills, that it revised their outreach plan. The new plan encourages the Assistant CRA to take the lead in providing additional substantive trainings.

Over the past year, OCRA has provided more than 300 outreach activities statewide including participation with groups that develop activities statewide. A prime example is Fiesta Educativa which holds educational resource fairs to meet the varied needs of Latino communities from Sacramento, Butte, Glenn, Tehama, Colusa, Shasta, Yuba, Sutter, Placer, Nevada, Sierra, El Dorado, Santa Cruz, Monterey, Santa Clara, San Diego, Alameda County (now Congreso Familiar), Los Angeles, Orange County, Kern, and the San Gabriel Valley. With the upcoming elections in the fall, OCRA staff continues to distribute voter materials to consumers and their families.

Below is a sample of some of the outreach activities by OCRA staff over the past year. This list represents a sample of the work by staff to creatively

reach out and meet the training needs of consumers, family members, support groups, vendors, and other providers statewide.

HIGHLIGHTS OF STATEWIDE OUTREACH ACTIVITIES

7/2/07, WRC, “Work and Your Benefits” consumer training at the Peer Mentor/Life Coach Agency.

7/20/07, FNRC, Northern California Advocacy Training Session 4 on Assistive Technology, Voting, TBI, and Advocacy Skills, Feather Falls Casino, for the Native American community.

10/1/07, GGRC, Social Security trainings in Spanish and Cantonese.

10/6/07, NLARC, “Key to Success” self-advocacy training on clients’ rights under the Lanterman Act, 2nd annual Self Advocacy Relationships Conference.

10/20/07, TCRC, Special Education Parent Leadership training, Latino families.

10/16/07 and 10/23/07, ACRC, Regional Center/ IPP Development training and Special Education Rights training, Sacramento County Adoptions, UC Davis Care Center.

10/27/07, SARC, question and answer on SARC Services, Respite, and Special Education.

10/29/07, RCOC, Public Benefits training, Orange County Fiesta Educativa.

10/30/07, SCLARC, Regional Center Eligibility training, staff of the Los Angeles Child Guidance Clinic.

11/2/07, KRC, Vendor booth at “Get Acquainted Luncheon” for Latino families.

11/2/07 and 11/16/07, ELARC, Alternatives to Conservatorship training for Latino families.

11/19/07, IRC, Lanterman Act and the IPP Process training to Grupo Mariposa, a Spanish-speaking parent support group.

11/26/07, SG/PRC, Parent Advocacy Workshop and Basic Special Education training for Baldwin Park HeadStart.

12/1/07, RCRC, Special Education training for the Mendocino County Special Education Parent Support Group, in Fort Bragg.

12/3/07, HRC, "What is OCRA?" Also, "Basic Program Entitlements for People with Disabilities," training at Cal. State Long Beach graduate class for speech pathologists.

12/5/07, VMRC, "Your Rights to Language Services," Special Education training at Walton School in Stockton.

12/11/07 and 12/14/07, LRC, "Clients' Rights" trainings for school and residential staff at Villa Esperanza.

01/09/08, SG/PRC, Special Education, PACT (Parents and Children Together), a Spanish-speaking support group.

01/10/08, WRC, Legal Clinic, to "Padres de Angelitos Especiales," a Spanish-speaking parent support group.

02/21/08, KRC, Clients' Rights, Adult Residential Vendors.

03/21/08, NLARC, Intake Clinic, Cultivar and Crecer, a Spanish-speaking parent support group.

03/22/08, HRC, Special Education, the Japanese Parents Association of Children with Challenges.

04/02/08, IRC, Regional Center Fair Hearings and 4731 complaints, Amigos Unidos, a Spanish-speaking parent support group.

04/12/08, SCLARC, African American parents at the Special Needs Network conference "Tools for Transformation."

05/10/08, TCRC, Spanish-speaking parents of the Rainbow Family Resource Center on In Home Supportive Services.

05/22/08, SDRC, Spanish-speaking parent support group, EFRC at the Harold Ballard Center about Medi-Cal Programs.

04/11/08, RCEB, Special Education Rights and Responsibilities training to parent support group, "Madres Con Angeles Especiales."

05/09/08, RCOC, Rights Under the Lanterman Act to Spanish-speaking parents, consumers and family members.

04/08/08, RCEB, self-advocacy training regarding "You Have Rights! No Abuse!" to CP Center Women's Group.

5/09/08, VMRC, "Early Start Services" training for Spanish-speaking parents support group in Modesto.

06/19/08, TCRC, Alternatives to Conservatorship training to Spanish-speaking parents.

04/11/08, VMRC, participated at a booth at Choices Conference in Stockton.

04/21/08, FNRC, Clients' Rights to consumer advocates at "We Care A Lot."

05/16/08, CVRC, table at the "Friday Nights Fiesta," by Fresno Barrios Unidos.

06/27/08, CVRC, "What is OCRA" training to Spanish-speaking parents at Exceptional Parents.

05/28/08, ACRC, "16 Advocacy Tips Regarding Regional Center Services," to Spanish-speaking parents with the grupo Apoyo de Padres.

05/22/08, GGRC, SSI Clinic, to Spanish speaking parents with Support for Families.

6/24/08, GGRC, "Supporting People to Live Independent Lives," GGRC staff and service providers.

04/19/08, NBRC, “The IPP process and Lanterman,” to Spanish-speaking parents with Parents Can.

05/01/08, RCRC, “What is OCRA,” to the Arak Tribe in Del Norte County.

Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy
Annual Report - July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008
Report by Service Level

	ARC	CVRC	ELARC	FNRC	GGRC	HRC	IRC	KRC	LRC	NBRC	NLARC	RCEB	RCOC	RCRC	SARC	SCLARC	SDRC	SGPRC	TCRC	VMRC	WRC	Total
0 - Pending	3	56	1		1		1	2			9	3		4	1		97		2	5		185
1 - Information/Referral	93	69	50	57	134	115	75	90	39	68	30	26	57	34	72	80	23	70	60	119	142	1503
2 - Rights Information/Consultation (RC/Generic)	53	139	235	112	151	183	254	166	54	175	105	151	88	103	154	183	127	276	341	201	203	3454
3 - Rights Information/Consultation (Other)	17	20	85	51	24	6	16	60	70	87	26	76	25	32	120	48	90	7	193	98	16	1167
4 - Abuse/Neglect Investigation	5	5		2	5		2	2		1			2		1		3			2		30
5 - Special Education Compliance Complaint			3	1			2	8	1	2		4		2	1	2	5			4	9	44
6 - IEP	2	18	31	19	14	4	2	16	4	1	2	2	9	2	17	6	21		1	1	1	173
7 - IPP/IDT	2	6		2	1	4	3	2		4	2		2		1	4		3	2	2	2	42
8 - W&I 4731	4	1				2	2	1		5	1	1	2			2	2				2	25
9 - Technical Assistance	27	6	55	11	23	21	1	21	14	17	5	23	51	4	3		6	5	4	7	11	315
10 - Evaluation and Assessment	11	21	19	24	21	4	17	3	3	26	9	1	45	2	17	13	7		3	3	7	256
11 - Informal Regional Center / Provider Problem Resolution	98	43	9	13	22	25	50	27	19	10	50	57	36	3	8	55	1		2	4	35	567
12 - Informal Generic Service Agency Problem Resolution	32	34	13	17	47	15	50	20	47	4	19	62	28	6	51	57	3		6	5	55	571
13 - Case Settlement Prior to Informal Meeting, Mediation or Hearing			3			2			1	2			1				1			1	2	13
14 - Direct Representation in RC "Voluntary Informal Meeting"	1	1	1			1		1	2	1	2	4	2	3	1	1			1		2	24
15 - Direct Representation in Mediation / RC Fair Hearing	1	2	2	1		1	1		10		1	4	5	1	1					2	5	37
16 - Direct Representation in an Appeal for Generic Services	9	1	3	3		5	4	12	2		5	2	2	7		1	1		3		12	72
17 - Court Litigation	2	1		3				1									2				1	10
Total	360	423	510	316	443	388	480	432	266	403	266	416	355	203	448	452	389	361	618	454	505	8488

MEMORANDUMS OF UNDERSTANDING

REGIONAL CENTER	STATUS OF MOU
Alta	Previous MOU dated 4/02. Met 9/17/07. MOU needs final signature.
Central Valley	MOU dated 12/19/06.
East Los Angeles	MOU dated 10/17/06.
Far Northern	MOU dated 11/17/06.
Golden Gate	MOU dated 3/07.
Harbor	Previous MOU dated 4/02. MOU needs final signatures.
Inland	MOU dated 4/10/07.
Kern	MOU dated 5/2007.
Lanternman	Previous MOU adopted 8/17/07.
North Bay	MOU dated 5/30/07.
North Los Angeles	MOU dated 10/06.
Redwood Coast	Previous MOU dated 10/01. Need to schedule meeting.
Regional Center of East Bay	Previous MOU dated 4/02. Need to schedule meeting.
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
Protection & Advocacy, Inc.
100 Howe Avenue, Ste. 240N
Sacramento, CA 95825
Phone (916) 575-1615/Fax (916) 575-1623/TTY (916) 575-1624

Memo

To: OCRA Advisory Committee
From: Jeanne Molineaux, Director
Date: July 21, 2008
Re: Consumer Satisfaction Surveys – July 1, 2007, through
June 30, 2008

Attached are the results of the current Consumer Satisfaction Survey. The surveys were sent out for the period of July 1, 2007, through June 30, 2008. Every fourth closed case was randomly selected from OCRA's computer intake system to receive a survey, which included a self-addressed stamped envelope.

Nine hundred and twenty-one surveys were mailed out. Two hundred and seventy-nine people returned the surveys. This represents a 30 percent return rate. The results were excellent. Of those responding to the questions, 97 percent of the respondents who answered the questions felt they were treated well by the staff, 96 percent understood the information they were provided, 95 percent believed their CRA listened to them, 95 percent would ask for help from the Clients' Rights Advocate again, 90 percent were helped by the CRA, and 85 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.	264	7	8
2. My call was returned within two (2) days	229	39	11
3. I could understand the information I got.	258	11	10
4. My Clients' Rights Advocate listened to me.	258	13	8
5. I was helped with my question/problem by my Clients' Rights Advocate.	247	26	6
6. I would ask for help from the Clients' Rights Advocate again.	251	15	13

Comments: ¹

- I could completely understand the information I got. Jacqueline Miller, Esq. is Super-Duper!
- Leinani has always been very pleasant to work with and helpful, she's great!
- I do not know. I had asked for your help, but you didn't respond. I would like your help in a Civil Right's case, where I'm the plaintiff. I was beaten so bad, that I now need surgery on my back and neck...If you could please send me a "Legal" Law Dictionary, I have no money and I could sure use one. I thank you for your time, please respond. God Bless you, (ALL).
- It seems that PAI does not accept many cases when referred by RC staff.
- To whom it may concern: My son _____ was born _____....I reported this to _____ and _____....I'm so tired of nothing being done about this, I need your help here and no one seems to want to help!
- I did receive a call back on the 1st & 2nd items, the third items I got a call back but not a follow up call. The service is needed. They need more

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.

staff so they can respond quicker and not get overwhelmed. Marketing about their services should be provided to all clients of the infant program. Advocacy need to have a larger role . Parents need to feel empowered to change the xxxx regional center determines how and to whom they grant services.....The xxxx xxxx is too big to be served by one regional center, this needs to be on somebody's agenda so that many more can be opened up to serve the diverse needs of a very large community.

- At this time it does not seem like I need your services. School District seems like trying to work with us. We will be having an IEP meeting in May. I will keep in touch or give you guys a call if we need to move forward with your services. Thank you so much.
- Thank you for your help!
- I am scheduled for my son's full assessment!
- I am so grateful for all the help. I know it was a lot of time to spend and mentor me with my case. And I Won! But I know this will not be the last time I will be needing your services. Thank you so much for your help.
- Very efficient and knowledgeable. Helps much. Thank you.
- Me ayudo mucho, estoy muy agradecida y por ella tengo mi niña a qui conmigo. (It helped me very much, I am very grateful and because of that I have my daughter here with me.)
- "Un comentario" no es necesario que el centro regional solo reinvierte si esta escrito en IPP esto no es verdad. ("One comment" it is not necessary that the regional center only reinvest if it is written in the IPP this is not true.)
- Katie Hornberger is great! She is knowledge, approachable, & friendly. Can't recommend her enough!
- I was told this office would be really anxious to help but I felt they weren't really that interested – kind of like if I wanted to do this fine but they weren't going to be too helpful.
- I understand the matter I had contacted CRA for wasn't typical for OCRA to work on, but it took over 2 months for me to get a response back. I called/e-mailed 11/16/07 & heard back on 1/18/08 after 3 f/ups.
- Mi defensora "Leinani" trabajo muy completa, rápida y efectivamente con mi caso. Gracias a ella pudimos arreglar las dificultades por las que estábamos pasando en cuanto a la silla de ruedas se refiere y también en cuanto a nuestro servicio. (My advocate "Lieinani" was very efficient,

complete, and effective in my case. Thanks to her we were able to fix the problems we were encountering regarding the wheelchair and also regarding our services.)

- Kathy supplied materials to help me & be prepared for sch. mtg.
- After this yr. my son has one year of public school left. He has been included since kindergarten, however to this day I still couldn't manage without help from Katie. She is always my guide and keeps me going – we are so grateful for her help and advice – one more year and graduation!! ☺
- -No me volvieron a llamar y lo único que me dijeron era que si mi hijo tenia síndrome de down/autismo. (They didn't call me back and the only thing they asked me was if my son had down syndrome/autism.)
- K. Lusson was very helpful again, as she was several years ago (she helped resolve a very difficult problem at that time.)
- Thank you!
- It is fantastic that P&A helps w/legal matters. Thanx
- Thank you
- Thank you very much. Thank God for organizations like yours that do a lot for us.
- Todo muy bien. Buen servicio! (Good service! Everthing was very good.)
- Great, Great, Great! Matt Pope is not only a great asset to RC but he cares!
- Thanks for the great work!
- I have twins - 1 has autism. They are in kindergarten. Both have been attending daycare at ___ in ___ for 2 years. ___ denied my son kindergarten on a inter-district transfer but accepted his twin. I filed for a hearing & lost. ...Because of ___ emergency leave, I can't re-file or appeal. My choice now is to move into the district (I am about 1 block away!).
- They were very helpful! They gave me very helpful information, and I got my son a one to one para-educator! Thank you so much!!!
- Very informative! Very helpful to prepare for IEP.
- I started not to mail this survey back. I don't expect to get the needed assistance that I need to resolve an issue. I was sent info. on Attorney's from the Bar Assoc. The Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy, Protection & Advocacy was much too busy to investigate my concerns. Thank you!

- I don't recall talking to anybody in the Office of Clients' Rights Advocacy.
- Conflict of interest from close relationship and personal relationships between regional center's executives and _____.
- Como puedo recibir ayuda legal en la junta de IEP en persona. (How can receive legal assistance in person at IEP.)
- Esta persona que le pedí ayuda tuvo muy bonito modo para tratarme y ayudarme...yo la recomendó con mucho gusto porque yo estoy muy contenta con este servicio muchas, muchas gracias. (The person whom I have solicited assistance from treated me well and helped me...I am very pleased and would greatly recommend them because I am very happy with this service, thank you very much.)
- With Mr. Matthew Pope's great assistance, parents have learned and keep learning the most effective and productive Client's rights information along the advocacy path. We could not say thank you enough. Greatly recommended Mr. Pope's hard work!
- He was completely sympathetic, he listened & educated me in a very sincere & caring manner.
- Treatment went absolutely great.
- Por aproximadamente 4 años recibo In Home Support Services 249hrs por mes...Mi hija es autista y su comportamiento es severo, no habla y depende completamente de mí. Tiene 12 años. Muchas gracias por su ayuda. (I have been receiving In Home Support Services 249 hrs per month for approximately 4 years now...My daughter is autistic and her behavior is severe. She doesn't speak and she is completely dependant on me. She is 12 years old. Thank you so much for your help.)
- It took 2 calls for my call to be returned.
- Would you ask for help from the Clients' Rights Advocate again? Depends – for regional center matters, definitely. School district unsure... Seems OCRA/PAI needs some coordinators to help schedule follow up meetings for school district dispute resolution.
- Deberian de tener gente mas comprensiva trabajando para el centro regional en diversos condados del estado de California y responder llamadas dentro de 48 horas sobre todo en el condado de _____ y _____. Gracias. (You should have people who are more understanding working for the regional center in the diverse counties in the state of California and return phone calls within 48 hours, especially in the _____ and _____ county. Thank you.)

- Katy is very knowledgeable, professional & helpful.
- Katie Hornberger contacts me w/up to date info. and offers sharp & focused perceptions.
- We won our case with consultation!
- Thank you for having this service available.
- I normally do not bother filling the questionnaires but I really wanted everyone in charge to know how pleasant she was...was extremely cheerful and very helpful. She was always very understanding.
- Srita. Beatriz fue muy amable conmigo cuando yo necesite hablar con ella. Gracias. (Ms. Beatriz was very pleasant with me when I needed to talk to her. Thank you.)
- Valerie is so knowledgeable & compassionate!
- The service we got was outstanding – Thank you so much.
- Person I spoke with was not experienced in what I needed to know.
- I just wish that an Attorney/Advocate could have gone with me to the hearing - - hearing went well – still waiting for decision.
- I was told Arthur Lipscomb in San Jose will be leaving the San Jose office, who will replace him as an attorney?
- Estoy muy contenta con su ayuda. (I am very happy with your help.)
- I'm having difficulty in arriving at deciding first and second sisters to be ___ conservators...I did get the information on conservatorship sent to me and I must digest it soon and make arrangements with an attorney, to get things underway. Thank you.
- I would absolutely ask for help from the Clients' Rights Advocate again!
- Excellent help, professional feedback, great attitude, got everything resolved.
- La señorita era muy amable y me ayudo mucho. Que bueno que esta trabajando con ustedes y que puede hablar mi idioma! (The young lady was very pleasant and she helped me a lot. I'm glad she is working for you guys and she speaks my language!)
- Kathy Mottarella is wonderful!
- A great service.
- CRA did excellent job.
- My name is ____, and I want to thank Filomena Alomar from the office in Stockton for the help she has given me. I also appreciate it. Thanks again.

- Me siento comoda hablando el mismo idioma con la persona de recepcion y su información es clara concisa y precisa. Gracias. (I feel comfortable speaking the same language as the receptionist and her information is clear and precise. Thank you.)
- Is very happy with the services she received at the Westside office and she won't hesitate to call them if she needs further assistance.
- Everything went well. Thanks.
- The staff was great! Really cared about my child! Wonderful people to work with! I refer other parents to their office.
- This is being filled out by the client's mother.
- Friendly and knowledgeable. Thank you!
- My call was returned within the two (2) days, but was not home, I called again & got no response. Not sure if I would ask for help from the Clients ' Rights Advocate again.
- I always get prompt easy-to-understand advice from Kathy M!!! Thank you!
- Most of the time my call was returned within two (2) days. Very knowledgeable and provided additional info that a parent would not know to ask but need to know. The CRA has provided information that has made me a better advocate for my child.
- No help. Their suggestion was in direct opposition to what should have been done since RC was payee. The CRA office serving ---- was of very little help.
- Very helpful.
- I Feel Brigitte Ammons is Great! She totally understood my situation and has helped me in so many ways. I refer people having problems with their districts to PAI all the time.
- You guys are awesome! I could not have dealt with my son's needs without you Bernadette. Thank you so much!
- I have asked for help to represent us at hearing on 2 occasions with lost of time/notice but unfortunately, ---- couldn't represent or help us in court. I think there is lack of staff available.
- Su personal es muy profesional. Siempre me ayudan a resolver mis problemas y a entender mis necesidades educacionalmente, abogando por los derechos de mi hija. (Your personnel is very professional. They always help solve my problems and they understand my educational needs, advocating for my daughter's rights.) Good Job!!!
- Great resource of information and help to families.

- Anastasia and Christine are two of the most knowledgeable, energetic and committed professionals that I know! They are always ready to help and very informative. They love their jobs! and helping people. They are a joy to talk with. They are two very professional people. I love them!
- Not sure, she keeps telling me that she is busy. I was not helped to the extent that she either gave me the info and come represent my son.
- Keep up the good work! Christine Armand is great!
- Se necesita mas abogacía para los clientes, una sola persona, para un centro regional es muy poco. (You need to provide more Advocacy to clients, one person, for one regional center is too little.)
- Doug Harris is very knowledgeable. He has been a great help to me personally as I am also a consumer of RCRC he has helped us get the appropriate services for our son from both RCRC & the school system as well educating me so that I was better equipped to help RCRC consumers.
- Just would like to comment that everything was really explained very well, very very helpful, also explained on issues. I had very well and again very helpful. Just makes a big difference when you know you're being listened to, and feel good how I was explained and treated overall. Thank you.
- I greatly appreciate your services and the information that was provided was invaluable. Thank you!
- Very helpful. The school is trying to do everything we requested. The parents were so happy ---- mom said she feels like she won the lottery!
- No help whatsoever! Certainly not an advocate.
- Gracias por su servicio. Quede muy a gusto con su ayuda he información que me dieron. (Thank you for your service. I was very pleased with your help and information you provided.)
- Katie Hornberger is fantastic! She was invaluable helping me prepare for a hearing (which I won!)
- It would be helpful to have someone attend the IEP mtg.
- The service/assistance I received was very professional.
- My call was returned within two (2) days most of the time but not always, maybe gone out of the office?
- Mrs. Katie Casada-Hornberger is an outstanding person who helps with much diligence & care.
- Katie is awesome! Thanks

- I saw a case manager for GGRC and found our Clients' Rights Advocate to always be informative and helpful.
- Yulahlia Hernandez is very helpful!
- I could understand the information I got sometimes. I was helped with my question/problem by my Clients Rights Advocate sometimes. I sent a letter and no one answered or called. I have not received any respite for the last year...
- Thank you for being there!!!
- I'm really happy that I found out about your services. Thank you very much.
- My son's CRA (Matthew Pope) was fantastic! He helped my son so much. We had no idea how to handle our situation and Matt guided us through. I am sure that there is NO way we would have made it through without Matthew Pope! He is our hero and an Angel! Families that have disabled members seem to be walking in the dark throughout most of their life. There is no one there to blaze a trail for you. Everything is a day by day trial and error approach. Matt has helped us during several of these times and his help has made all the difference!
- He went out of his way to help me and I am grateful for his assistance and am no longer in fear of losing my hearing.
- No tengo palabras para agradecerles por toda la ayuda que le han brindado a mi hijo gracias a ustedes ----- esta recibiendo todos los servicios que el Distrito Escolar le habían negado. (I don't have enough words to thank you for all the help you have provided my son. Thanks to you my son ---- is receiving all the services that the school District was denying him.)
- They need more information by both rights. Both services.
- I have asked for their help several times and never got valuable help. I will never waste my time with this again. Most people don't bother with them and I won't either anymore.
- Can't remember if my call was returned within two (2) days.
- Thank you for all you have done for my son. Thanks for the book Jacqueline.

F:\DOCS\MANUELLA\Word Docs\SURVEYS\Quarterly Reports\Client Satisfaction Survey Annual Report 4th Quarter_July 1, 2007 - June 30, 2008_7-21-08.doc

OCRA ADVISORY COMMITTEE
(2008)

Advisory Committee Members:

Diana Nelson	(Ventura)
Marylou Perez	(Bakersfield)
Dan Owen	(Bishop)
Cristine Walters	(Redwood City)
Ted Cottini	(Oroville)
Spencer McClay	(Grass Valley)
Portia Lemmons	(Berkeley)
Board Liaison	

OCRA ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Wednesday, May 14, 2008 and Thursday, May 15, 2008
The Best Western Sutter House
1100 H Street
Sacramento, California 95814
12:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

MINUTES

In Attendance:

Dan Owen	Ted Cottini
Alice Ximenez	Evelyn Abouhassan
Diana Nelson	Catherine Blakemore (by phone)
Sujatha Branch (by phone)	Andrew Holcombe
Portia Lemmons	Christine Walters
Jeanne Molineaux	Christina McMillen
Lakia Murray	

1. Approval of Minutes of 11/2/07.
2. Sujatha Branch gave update on Capitol People First. The trial date has been set for March 9.
3. Andy Holcombe gave report on FNRC office
4. Dan Owen gave report on Respectability Conference
5. Evelyn Abouhassan gave report on current legislation and briefing for Capital Action Day.
6. Catherine Blakemore gave updates on PAI, open houses, PAI new name and logo etc.
7. Jeanne Molineaux gave updates OCRA Semi-Annual Report and Budget.
8. Committee meeting dates were changed and set up as follows:
 - Friday, August 15 changed to Friday, August 22, 2008 – Videoteleconference
 - Friday, November 21, 2008 – Videoteleconference
9. It was agreed that Marylou Perez and Dan Owen will continue as Co-Chairs of the committee.

On May 15, 2008, members of the committee attended Capital Action Day along with staff members from the legislative unit or volunteer staff members from OCRA.

**OFFICE OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS ADVOCACY
ANNUAL REPORT
JULY 1, 2007 – JUNE 30, 2008**

TITLE 17 REPORT

TITLE 17 LETTER	COMPLAINT (INITIALS)	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	STATUS	OUTCOME
5/30/08	E.B.	Right to prompt medical treatment.	Closed	Allegations not Supported
7/15/08	E.J.	Right to prompt medical treatment. Proper payment of personal and incidental monies. Right to keep and be allowed to spend a reasonable amount of his own money. Improper case management.	Closed	Allegations not Supported

**OFFICE OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS ADVOCACY ANNUAL REPORT
(July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008)**

DENIAL OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS

Regional Center	Good Cause	Right(s) Denied	Date Denial Began	Date of Review	Date of Restoration
CVRC08-01	I, O	T	6/25/08	6/25/08	Ongoing review
GGRC07-01	O	V	7/12/07	7/25/07	7/25/07
HRC07-01	I, O	T	10/10/07	11/15/07	
HRC07-01	I, O	T	10/10/07	12/14/07	11/27/07
HRC07-02	I	V, T	12/12/07	1/11/08	Ongoing review
HRC07-02	I	V, T	12/12/07	4/7/08	Ongoing review
HRC07-02	I	V, T	12/12/07	5/1/08	Ongoing review
HRC07-02	I	V, T	12/12/07	6/1/08	Ongoing review
HRC07-02	I	V, T	12/12/07	7/3/08	Denial terminated
KRC07-01	O, D	P, T	8/21/07	9/20/07	9/24/07
KRC07-02	O	T	9/24/07	10/24/07	Client waived right and will contact CRA if he changes his mind.
NBRC0801	I, O, D	P	5/6/08	5/6/08	5/9/08
RCRC92-015	I	P	4/16/92	9/1/03	Ongoing review
RCRC92-015	I	P	4/16/92	7/30/05	Ongoing review
RCRC92-015	I	P	4/16/92	8/30/05	Ongoing review
RCRC92-015	I	P	4/16/92	9/27/05	Ongoing review
RCRC92-015	I	P	4/16/92	10/31/05	Ongoing review
RCRC92-015	I	P	4/16/92	11/21/05	Ongoing review
RCRC92-015	I	P	4/16/92	12/21/05	Ongoing review
RCRC92-015	I	P	4/16/92	1/20/06	Ongoing review
RCRC92-015	I	P	4/16/92	2/20/06	Ongoing review
RCRC92-015	I	P	4/16/92	3/20/06	Ongoing review
RCRC92-015	I	P	4/16/92	4/20/06	Consumer deceased 7/07
SARC07-01	I, O	T	9/17/07	10/11/07	Ongoing review
SARC07-01	I, O	T	9/17/07	10/12/07	Restored 10/12/07
SARC0801	I	M	6/27/08	6/27/08	Client voluntarily waived right in writing.

Clients' Rights:

- M** To keep and be allowed to spend one's own *money* for personal and incidental needs.
- V** To see *visitors* each day.
- C** To keep and wear one's own *clothes*.
- T** To have reasonable access to *telephones*, both to make and receive confidential calls, and to have calls made for one upon request.
- L** To mail and receive unopened correspondence and to have ready access to *letter* writing materials, including sufficient postage.
- P** To keep and use one's own personal *possessions*, including toilet articles.
- S** To have access to individual *storage* space for one's private use.

OFFICE OF CLIENTS' RIGHTS ADVOCACY
 ANNUAL REPORT
 JULY 1, 2007 – JUNE 30, 2008

CONSUMER GRIEVANCES WITH CONTRACTOR

DATE OF RESOLUTION LETTER	COMPLAINT (INITIALS)	NATURE OF COMPLAINT	STATUS	OUTCOME
11/26/07	K.C.	Allegations of unauthorized actions by OCRA	Closed	Partially upheld OCRA actions
1/7/08	D.W.	Failure to provide advocacy in RC matter	Closed	Upheld OCRA actions
5/20/08	A.T.	Failure to provide advocacy in RC matter		Upheld OCRA actions
6/29/08	A.T.	2 nd level – Failure to provide advocacy in RC matter		Upheld OCRA actions
7/17/08	A.T.	3 rd level – Failure to provide advocacy in RC matter		Referred to DDS
6/13/08	C.G.	Failure to represent in RC matter	Closed	Offer to determine staff availability after 8/15/08

**OCRA Attorney's Fees
Fiscal Year
July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008**

Date:	From:	Subject:	Case #:	Amount:
December 2007	Los Angeles County Office of Education	Special Education	428697	\$12,500.00
February 2008	Los Angeles County Office of Education	Special Education	719295	\$ 2,500.00
April 2008	Whittier Unified School District	Special Education	870656	\$ 2,000.00
	Total For FY 2007 - 08			<u>\$17,000.00</u>