

Imagine!  
Quality Assurance Housing Survey  
Project Findings: April 22, 2024, through June 7, 2024

**Overview:**

Beginning on April 22, 2024, Imagine! conducted a quality assurance survey that obtained information regarding both client specific statistics and opinion-based criterion on the subjects of personal housing goals, and funding needs/distribution in the areas of current and future habitation. The client sample identified to participate in the survey consisted of individuals that are actively or have received the following voucher(s), waiver(s), or other documented financial housing assistance:

- Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher
- Colorado Medicaid
- DD (Developmental Disabilities) Waiver
- EBD (Elderly, Blind and Disabled) Waiver
- BI (Brain Injury Waiver)
- SLS (Supported Living Services) Waiver
- CHRP (Children’s Habilitative Residential Program)
- CES (Children’s Extensive Support)
- CHCBS (Children’s Home and Community Based Services)
- CMHS (Community Mental Health Supports)
- CLLI (Children with Life Limiting Illness)
- CIH (Complementary Integrative Health) Waiver
- Other Medicaid Waiver (Please specify)
- Family Support Services Program
- Autism Spectrum Disorder Program
- Social Security Disability Insurance (SSDI)
- Supplemental Security Income (SSI)
- Financial Assistance from family/friends

**Survey Content:**

A twelve variable questionnaire was previously authored by Imagine! staff before the commencement of the official project. Preceding distribution of questionnaire, its contents was transferred to Survey Monkey formatting

before circulating in English and Spanish languages. During seven weeks, the survey was conducted over telephone and email correspondence. Both methods were utilized to obtain and record survey subject matter.

Willing participants had the opportunity to respond to survey questions identifying their personal demographics; care provider or self-advocate, age, current living arrangements, funding assistance, and if parent/caregiver/guardian is currently over 65 years of age. Also, documentation of future goals including ideal habitation, obstacles with obtaining ideal habitation, description of barriers/issues in relation to domicile specifications per client need, supports necessary to be successful with independent living. Sub-situational variables were ranked from 'Most Important,' 'Neutral' and 'Least Important,' in congruency to ideal housing situations. Additionally, open-ended comment boxes provided opportunities to address any other concerns regarding living goals and/or issues.

### **Sample Aggregation:**

The housing survey sample involved one thousand, one hundred and thirty-one (1131) potential participants. The mode accumulative client contact information was provided primarily by case management. Client name, email address and telephone numbers were generated and gathered in spreadsheet form for communication and documentation purposes. Survey Monkey analytics collector was utilized to record relevant data in mean, mode, and median statistical measurements. The emailed option for the survey had a return completion date of June 7, 2024.

### **Survey Strategy Implementation:**

The housing survey was conducted by Gina Manchego, Quality Assurance Specialist. Ms. Manchego has twenty-five years of accumulative experience in human services, special education, advocacy, direct care, senior care, vocational and administrative work with the Developmentally Disabled population of Colorado. During the length of the survey, she conducted the following methodologies:

Telephone correspondence was first implemented on April 22, 2024. An average of approximately one hundred calls were made daily, live call

participants were encouraged to give their time to the telephone survey. During live call surveys, Ms. Manchego read the survey aloud to participants, elaborated and gave examples if necessary. Ms. Manchego also noted any pertinent concerns individuals needed emergency assistance with. Those issues were relayed to Jenna Corder, Director of Client Relations. If a telephone opportunity was declined, then an email version of the survey was sent per participant request. Most live call participants opted for an emailed survey; this trend remained consistent throughout the entirety of the project.

For survey calls that went directly to voicemail, a message was left with the reason for the call, along with a contact number for Ms. Manchego. Voicemail calls were noted on the spreadsheet for second, then third round call backs. After three failed attempts to reach live call participants, the email version of the survey was distributed utilizing file email addresses (if available) for the survey sample individuals.

There was a total of fifty-nine Spanish speakers/readers on the survey list. Those individuals were distributed a Spanish version of the same housing survey along with a translated introduction letter describing the contents of the survey and due date for completion.

### **Survey Sample Statistics:**

Surveys distributed through phone call and email were attempted to all one thousand, one hundred and thirty-one (1131) participants. During the survey there were twenty (20) wrong numbers, one hundred and seventeen (117) no email contact available, one hundred and eleven (111) disconnected phone numbers and one hundred and sixty-five (165) that declined the opportunity to participate in the housing survey in any capacity. The total number of participants tallied at three hundred and thirteen (313,) with a twenty-seven (27) percent accumulative survey completion average.

## **Survey Assessment Results:**

The following data correlated was from accumulated mean numeric percentages from combined housing surveys. Total Surveys documents the number of completed survey answers per question, any discrepancy is a result of survey questions that were not answered by choice of participants.

## **Survey Participant Identifier**

Total Surveys: 307/313

Self-Advocate 114

Care Provider 160

Other 33

## **Age of Person Receiving Services**

Total Surveys: 313/313

Average Age Percentages

16-21: 41.69%

21 and under: 1.98%

22-35 years: 25.08%

36-49 years: 16.02%

50-64 years: 8.85%

65 years +: 6.94%

Prefer not to answer: 0.00%

## **Current Living Arrangements**

Total Surveys: 299/313

Live with parents/family/friend(s)/guardians: 73.87%

Live in a home/apartment with roommate(s): 1.72%

Live alone in a rented apartment: 9.98%

Live in a 24-hour staffed setting/group home: .73%

I am homeless: .23%

I live in a Companion Home Model: .37%

I live in a Host Home Model: 8.87%

## **Funding Assistance Percentages for Housing Supports**

Total Surveys: 297/313

Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher: 14.14%

Colorado Medicaid: 58.63%

DD (Developmental Disabilities) Waiver: 31.08%

EBD (Elderly, Blind, and Disabled) Waiver: 0.73%

Brain Injury Waiver: 0.36%

SLS (Supported Living Services) Waiver: 11.01%

CHRP (Children's Habilitative Residential Program): 0.00%

CES (Children's Extensive Supports): 2.46%

CHCBS (Children's Home and Community Based Services): 0.12%

CMHS (Community Mental Health Supports): 0.12%

CLLI (Children with Life Limiting Illness): 0.00%

CIH (Complementary Integrative Health) Waiver: 0.00%

Other Medicaid Waiver: 0.36%

Family Support Services Program: 12.97%

Autism Spectrum Disorder Program: 14.53%

Supplemental Social Security Disability Insurance (SSDI): 14.32%

Supplemental Insurance Income (SSI): 24.25%

Financial Assistance from family/friends: 4.53%

## **Age of Family Member/Parent/Guardian 65+ (If co-habitation is applicable)**

Total Surveys: 277/313

Age 65+

- Yes: 76
- N/A: 201

## **Desired Supports for Ideal Habitation Scenario Percentages**

Total Surveys: 291/313

Live with parents/family/guardian in their home: 50.54%  
Live in a home or apartment with roommates: 10.14%  
Live alone with someone I could check in with: 4.75%  
Live in a group home with 24-hour staff: 5/64%  
Live in a skilled nursing facility: .25%  
Live in a Companion or Host Home Model: 9.00%  
Live on my own or with caretaker near family: 14.0%  
Live alone: 14.56%

### **Obstacles Regarding Ideal Housing Percentages**

Total Surveys: 249/313

I don't have the skills to live independently: 51/85%  
I don't have enough money: 53.28%  
I worry that I will be lonely: 21.45%  
I can't find an apartment/house: 10.12%  
I worry that I cannot take care of myself: 21.86%  
I am scared people will take advantage of me: 29.10%  
People don't treat me the same: 9.79%  
I don't know who to ask for help: 8.28%  
There is no transportation: 11.75%  
I need housing that meets my physical needs: 18.88%  
(Wheelchair, bathroom accessible, open floor)

An additional two hundred and fourteen (214) participants commented on concerns regarding logistical challenges clients face with current living situations. Those comments are predominantly described as a lack of monetary resources to fund bigger living spaces with accessible laundry facilities on-site, residential funding services that allow more opportunity for physical disabilities management and the lack of choices Section 8 vouchers provide for domicile growth and movement both in Boulder County and in other neighboring counties. Following the main concern of funding, many clients described a lack of necessary skills to live as independently as they would like to. The challenge with forward progress falls short with training opportunities to achieve lasting independence residentially. Finally, there were concerns about living in housing that felt

unsafe due to the location and population of the given neighborhoods was documented.

When clientele and caregivers were asked about any additional housing barriers or issues (physical and otherwise) in the subject of housing and living independently, one hundred and ninety-seven (197) people stated the following: Due to the insufficiency of appropriate housing funding distribution there isn't opportunity to fix broken items in their current homes to help manage present physical barriers. Many clients and caregivers documented such issues as broken showers, broken kitchen appliances, broken beds, lack of wheelchair ramps leading into homes and/or only one working emergency escape route. Lastly, several clients made note that community access was limited because disability accessible transportation was inadequate and hard to schedule. The privation of transportation and an inability to drive hinders many from reaching their current and future goal of independent living.

### **Supports for Independent Living Percentages**

Total Surveys: 260/313

I need 24/7 staff: 36.10%

I need help during the day: 27.50%

I need help during the night: 14.18%

I need occasional help during awake and night hours: 9.70%

I need someone to stop by my home every day for assistance: 7.47%

I need someone to stop by my home every few days for assistance:  
22.91%

I don't need someone coming to my home during the day or week for assistance: 15.43%

One hundred and ninety-four (194) survey takers commented that to achieve optimal independence regarding future housing they would require ongoing training in the following: Money management, paying monthly bills and grocery shopping. Daily living skills training that would address accurate medication administration, food preparation, house cleaning practices, hygiene, and appointment planning/scheduling. Many caregivers stated that for their client/child to be successfully independent, home healthcare funding with consistent, trustworthy staff was a necessity.

Housing close to family would be important, and more respite availability for those clients that don't have the skill set or medical capabilities for independence would be imperative. Also, it was reported that most survey participants feel that more supports in the area of mental/primary healthcare services specializing in the Developmentally Disabled population, more peer social activities, and more vocational/job training opportunities would be beneficial for consistent independent habitation. Conclusively, a small sample of clients/caregivers suggested that a service collaborator which specializes in the transition to independent living would make the process ideal.

**Most Important/Neutral/Least Important variables in an Ideal Housing Scenario (Mean Averages)**

Total Surveys: 292/313

Ideal Housing Variables	Most Important	Neutral	Least Important
To live in a safe neighborhood	91.58%	7.68%	.73%
To be near a bus stop	32.72%	48.23%	19.05%
To be in walking distance to retail/restaurants/leisure activities	56.27%	30.37%	13.35%
In walking distance from grocery stores	49.66%	34.76%	15.58%
In areas where you can eat with other people	37.16%	48.35%	14.48%
In a community space with on-site community activity	49.46%	20.45%	29.99%
To be close to spiritual opportunities	23.00%	42.18%	34.81%
To be close to recreational activities	48.33%	31.49%	19.83%
To have staff to help me with things like: Getting dressed, cleaning, or cooking	56.31%	25.75%	17.93%
To be close to on-site job training/job opportunities	41.41%	30.43%	27.47%
To have access to assistive technology needed to participate in daily activities	46.75%	26.18%	27.06%
To have access to special lighting	18.29%	30.59%	51.11%
To be near parks and green areas	47.80%	40.13%	12.07%

Ideal Housing Variables	Most Important	Neutral	Least Important
To be near farm animals, agriculture and/or gardens	24.62%	44.11%	31.26%
To have social opportunities with others	68.15%	18.99%	12.85%
To be close to friends and family	87.97%	6.61%	5.41%
To be near my doctors/medical/therapy appointments	66.81%	22.82%	10.36%

**Observations and Recommendations**

Generally, during live calls, the survey participants were willing to candidly disclose their opinions regarding housing and funding distribution. Overall, they are satisfied with the options accessible to them for habitation in congruence with the waiver(s) and voucher(s) available for utilization. The common thread among survey takers was gratitude for the staff that helps facilitate the obtainment of housing services. Additionally, those clients requiring assistance with daily living tasks resoundingly expressed appreciation for direct care workers that aid in more independent living.

There was a percentage of individuals who indicated that because of the rise in the cost of living, were concerned that the amount offered through waiver(s), and voucher(s) did not reflect the standard daily living financial expense fluctuation. Some participants voiced worry about ‘making ends meet,’ since housing prices have gone up so expeditiously. It was also expressed that the Section 8 Voucher was quite limiting in the ways of accessibility and physical location, therefore it made the prospects of relocation difficult, even when necessary or urgent.

Upon reviewing the results of the Spanish language surveys, it was evident that many in this sub-cohort of clientele have crucial housing needs that are falling through the cracks in conjunction with implementation of service waiver(s,) voucher(s) and necessary funding. A percentage of respondents described housing situations that put their daily health, safety, and wellbeing at risk. The added variable of the language barrier is making it more difficult for this portion of individuals receiving services to

communicate housing issues that are immediate in nature. A deeper assessment of housing standards must be reviewed for this sub-set of people receiving housing services. Ms. Manchego's recommendation would be an additional layer of quality assurance practices to ensure the Spanish (and other non-English) speakers have due opportunity to express their concerns with effective assistance from a translator/service specialist.

Finally, the most concerning trend identified during this project was the topic of transition for clients currently being cared for by aging parents. The issue came up over and over again, when senior caregivers described insufficient future support for their adult children requiring arrangements after parental/guardian/caregiver passing. Consequently, most aging parents/guardian/caregivers expressed concern for those clients that will be moved into the system for residential care. Senior caregivers lack knowledge about the process of obtaining ongoing services. They also vocalized there are not any incumbent resources to bridge the transitional gap for this sub-sample of clientele. It was extremely clear that the situation requires action sooner than later, since the rigors of client care are increasingly more difficult to facilitate with aging parents/guardians/caregivers that oversee all aspects of physical, behavioral, and medical care. Ms. Manchego's recommendation at the completion of this specific survey is the suggestion of a liaison that would be a specialist in parent/guardian/caregiver transitional support for their adult children. An advocate whose primary focus revolves around resource coordination and paperwork assistance. An employee representative who is available to parents/guardians/caregivers that require aid in the navigation of transition of their (client(s)) children receiving services through Boulder County and Imagine!

All information, both statistical and opinion based for this closed survey can be reviewed through Survey Monkey. Necessary verification of survey correspondence during this contracted project can be retrieved through Zoom call logs, sent email receipts and spreadsheet denotations.