

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.