

Final report on disability housing to the Medfield Affordable Housing Trust

Autism Housing Pathways
Ma



Contents

Roles of the Affordable Housing Trust and Autism Housing Pathways	2
Population Survey Phase	2-3
Focus Groups Phase	3-4
Next steps	4
Appendices:	
Appendix A - Support for ADLs and IADLs by group	5-6
Appendix B - Survey Statistics - Housing Preferences by Group	7
Appendix C - Focus Group 1 Feedback on Housing Preferences	8-9
Appendix D - Focus Group 2 Feedback on Housing Preferences	10-11
Appendix E - Focus Group 3 Feedback on Housing Preferences	12-13
Appendix F - Observations: Combined Housing Model (Constant + Daily Support)	14-15
Appendix G - Observations: Combined Housing Model (Constant + Weekly Support)	16-17
Appendix H - Survey Questions and Responses	18-28

Roles of the Affordable Housing Trust and Autism Housing Pathways

As part of the Medfield Housing Production Plan, the Medfield Affordable Housing Trust (“MAHT”) seeks to determine “an approach it may take to support the creation of supportive special needs congregate housing . . . for adults with intellectual and developmental disabilities (“IDD”) which the Town may do with local funding and technical support, and to consider possible public/private partnerships to foster creating such housing in Medfield.”¹

Autism Housing Pathways was charged with characterizing the population to be served via a survey and with elucidating a set of possible housing models via a series of focus groups with respondents who participated in the survey.

Population Survey Phase

The survey was conducted via SurveyMonkey between late October and late November of 2022. A copy of the survey questions, along with responses from respondents, is in Appendix H. Outreach to potential respondents was via Hometown Weekly, The Patch, Outreach, Pete Peterson’s blog, Student Services, SEPAC, Medfield Housing, the Medfield Inclusion Project, and a variety of human services agencies serving the local area. 70 usable responses were obtained.

- **DEMOGRAPHICS:**

- A brief summary of survey responses is presented here; a more comprehensive presentation of data is in Appendix H, “Survey Questions and Responses”.
 - The average age of individuals identified by the survey is 26.
 - 64% are male and 36% are female.
 - 14% have an intellectual disability (IQ of 70 or below), 47% have a developmental disability (such as autism, cerebral palsy, Prader-Willi syndrome), 39% have both.
 - 87% indicated they have one or more secondary diagnoses; of those answering this question, 60% have an anxiety or panic disorder.
 - Level of support needed:
 - 43% (30 out of 70 survey respondents) need someone present at all times (henceforth called “Group 1”)
 - 23% (16 of 70 survey respondents) need some support daily (henceforth called “Group 2”)
 - 34% (24 of 70 survey respondents) need some support weekly (henceforth called “Group 3”)

¹ Contract between the town of Medfield and Autism Housing Pathways.

- For a detailed compilation of survey results regarding each group’s support needs for Activities of Daily Living (“ADLs”) and Instrumental Activities of Daily Living (“IADLs”), see Appendix A, “Support for ADLs and IADLs by Group”.
- **HOUSING PREFERENCES:**
 - It is important to preface any discussion of housing and funding for it with a review of the Department of Developmental Services (DDS) policy which “limits the capacity of new 24-hour residential service settings licensed or funded by the department to five (5) or fewer individuals”.²

While strictly speaking this policy would only apply to those in Group 1 (needing constant support) as the others do not require 24/7 support, in practice DDS has sometimes refused to allow individuals needing less than 24/7 support to use their support dollars in housing settings with higher numbers of residents. To eliminate the possibility of this occurring, all the housing models discussed by the focus groups were kept to 5 individuals under one roof.
 - The survey respondents were also asked what they would like their housing to look like. Those response results can be found in Appendix B “Survey Statistics: Housing Preferences by Group”.

The overriding preference of the three groups was for a location in town within walking distance of shops.

Importantly, the responses regarding housing preference drove the focus group discussion about alternative housing models which in turn determined estimated costs per resident and defined levels of financial resources available to support those costs, discussed further in the “Observations” Appendices F and G.

Focus Group Phase

Three focus groups were held to dig further into the housing preferences of the three populations.

- People in each group who had shared an email address were invited to a focus group, representing approximately half of those in each group identified in the survey. About half of those invited in each group attended, meaning the focus groups each represented about 25% of the cohort identified in the survey.³
- The participants of each group were asked if they preferred to rent or own. If they preferred to rent, they were asked if they preferred to rent from a service provider that owns the property or from a third party that owns the property. If they preferred to own, they were asked if they preferred a condo association or a limited-equity housing co-operative.
- Also, the group was asked their preference for a time frame for housing. The options were:

² <https://www.mass.gov/doc/ddshcbs-policy-2014-1/download>

³ The numbers should not be assumed to constitute the only people interested in housing options. It more likely reflects the limited calendar options available given the time constraints of the project.

- <2 years
 - 2-5 years
 - 5+ years
 - I'm not interested
- The summaries from each focus group session can be found in their respective appendices, as follows:
 - Group 1 Focus Group - Appendix C
 - Group 2 Focus Group - Appendix D
 - Group 3 Focus Group - Appendix E

Next steps

- With a wealth of data from the survey and focus group sessions on individual support needs and family housing preferences, the next step in the MAHT supported housing initiative is to bring service providers into the conversation. Given the strong impetus of this endeavor to meet the needs of local residents with disabilities, it is important to emphasize that a service provider should be willing to continue the discussion with the families.
- There are a variety of service providers serving the Medfield area who would be capable of undertaking a project like this. Examples include (but are not limited to): the Barry Price Center, Advocates, LifeWorks, and TILL - all of whom are tax-exempt 501(c)(3) organizations.
- An initial step is to share this report with providers and elicit their feedback via an RFI to see what the providers are willing to do operationally and financially to support housing for people with disabilities in Medfield.
- Once it is ascertained there is interest from one or more service agencies, the cleanest approach for the MAHT is to issue a formal RFP.
 - The RFP should stipulate that respondents should be public charities able to meet the **standard for property tax exemption found in G.L. c. 59, § 5, Clause 3 (real and personal property of charitable organizations)** and direct providers to address the following:
 - The populations to be served (including preference for residents of Medfield and surrounding towns)
 - The housing model(s) and the costs and resources available from public and private sources, and
 - The provider's expectations of the MAHT for financial support.

Appendix A

Support for ADLs and IADLs by Group

Support for Activities of Daily Living (ADLs)

- Group 1 (those needing constant support)
 - A majority need prompting with dressing, bathing/showering, other hygiene
 - 47% need prompting with toileting
- Group 2 (those needing some support daily)
 - 6.25% need prompting with toileting, bathing/showering
 - 12.5% need prompting with dressing, other hygiene
- Group 3 (those needing some support weekly)
 - 25% need reminders for bathing/showering
 - 46% need reminders for other hygiene
 - 17% need reminders for eating and dressing (4% need verbal or gesture prompts)

Support for Instrumental Activities of Daily Living (IADLs)⁴

- Group 1 (those needing constant support)
 - A majority need all IADLs to be done for them
 - A majority need help with appointments, transitions, choices, medication, money, paperwork, positive behavioral supports, premack principle (“first this, then that”), schedules, structuring their day, and visual supports.
- Group 2 (those needing some support daily)
 - A majority either need help throughout the process or for the activity to be done for them for the following activities: food prep/cleanup, shopping, and finances
 - Only 12.5% were independent with housekeeping, laundry, or medications
 - 100% need help with appointment and money management
 - A majority need help with transitions, choices, medication, paperwork, structuring their day
- Group 3 (those needing some support weekly)

⁴ IADLs comprise food prep/cleanup, shopping, housekeeping, laundry, medication, and finances.

- A majority either need help to ensure quality or help throughout the process for the following activities: food prep/cleanup, shopping, housekeeping, and finances
- A majority were independent with laundry and medications
- 100% need help with money management
- A majority need help with appointments and paperwork

Appendix B

Survey Statistics: Housing Preferences by Group

QUESTION: What would you like your housing to look like?

- Group 1 (those needing constant support)
 - 63% expressed a desire to live with multiple unrelated people; 16.7% preferred either living with a caregiver or living with family
 - 60% want their own bathroom
 - 29% preferred a group home controlled by a vendor with a state contract and 25% preferred a group home controlled by families
 - 29% preferred licensed congregate care for people with intensive medical/behavioral needs, while 21% preferred inclusive small footprint units
 - The most important design features for this group were fenced in yard, sound insulation of bedrooms, and a sidewalk; over half also indicated a need for construction that can stand up to wear and tear
 - 90% preferred a location in a town in walking distance of shops, but a majority would accept a suburb
- Group 2 (those needing some support daily)
 - 75% expressed a desire to either live with a housemate who shares expenses or live with a housemate who receives a stipend for living with them
 - Over 50% want their own bathroom
 - Equal percentages preferred a group home controlled by a vendor with a state contract, a private group home, or a group home controlled by families
 - A slightly larger percentage preferred individual apartments to shared living in a single-family home (38% vs. 31%)
 - The most important design features for this group were sound insulation of bedrooms, fenced in yard, and a sidewalk
 - Over 90% preferred a location in a town in walking distance of shops, but a majority would accept a suburb
- Group 3 (those needing some support weekly)
 - 56% expressed a desire to either live with a housemate who shares expenses and 26% would like to live alone
 - 35% want their own bathroom and 35% want their own apartment
 - 30% want a privately-owned home or condo and 20% want a rental unit
 - 70% want individual apartments or condos in the community
 - The most important design feature for this group was sound insulation of bedrooms
 - 80% preferred a location in a town in walking distance of shops, but a majority would accept a suburb

Appendix C

FOCUS GROUP 1 FEEDBACK ON HOUSING PREFERENCES

Group 1 (those needing constant support)

The focus group addressing individuals who need constant support took place on January 24th. Nine families participated in the focus group (30% of the 30 respondents surveyed needing this level of support). The group represented 56% of the 16 survey respondents who both expressed a need for this level of support and shared their contact information. All focus group participants were a family member or legal guardian of the person with a disability (0% of survey respondents for those needing this level of support were the individuals themselves). In the survey, 50% of Group 1 respondents could only afford to pay \$1,000/month or less, but over 30% could pay \$2,000+/month. Almost 40% could only afford to put down \$15,000 or less, but almost 40% could pay \$35,000 or more.

Group 1 Housing models

The group was asked to consider two housing models (described below). For each model, they were asked to discuss the pros, the cons, and what they would change. The models discussed were ones able to serve both people who are “Priority 1” for residential support from the Department of Developmental Services and people who are not. This characteristic would maximize the potential pool of residents, while allowing people to stay in their home if their status changed.

Model 1: Three-bedroom apartment

- A caregiver who receives a stipend shares an apartment with two individuals who participate in the MassHealth Adult Foster Care program, or in the DDS Shared Living program, or one in each.
- Any individuals participating in the MassHealth Adult Foster Care program may also have additional DDS individual support hours.
- This model might need to be combined with another model on another floor for people needing some daily support. If so, it might be possible for the individuals in the three-bedroom apartment to have their own bathrooms.

Model 2: Duplex

- A duplex comprising two apartments, each with two residents, plus a live-in caregiver.
- Residents in each apartment would participate in the MassHealth Adult Foster Care program, or in the DDS Shared Living program, or one in each.
- Any individuals participating in the MassHealth Adult Foster Care program may also have additional DDS individual support hours.

Group 1 Outcome

71% (five families) of the constant support group voting (one family missed this one poll) preferred a three-bedroom apartment (one bedroom of which is for a caregiver). This model could be combined with the chosen model for daily support, located on either the first or second floor. It could equally as well be combined with two one-bedroom apartments for those needing weekly support. A slim majority (56%, or five of nine families voting) preferred to rent. If residents rent, 78% (seven of nine families voting) preferred that a service provider own the property. (This property control structure is the same as that preferred by the daily support group.) 44% (four families) preferred a time frame of less than two years, 44% (four families) preferred 2-5 years, and 11% (one family) preferred 5+ years.

Appendix D

FOCUS GROUP 2 FEEDBACK ON HOUSING PREFERENCES

Group 2 (those needing some support daily)

The focus group addressing individuals who need some support daily took place on December 21st. There were four participants in the focus group (25% of the 16 respondents surveyed needing this level of support). The group represented 50% of the eight respondents who both expressed a need for this level of support and shared their contact information. All focus group participants were a family member or legal guardian of the person with a disability (0% of survey respondents for those needing this level of support were the individuals themselves). In the survey, over 50% of Group 2 respondents could only afford to pay \$1,000/month or less, but over 20% could pay \$1,500+/month. Over 50% could only afford a down payment \$10,000 or less, but over 35% could pay \$20,000 or more.

Group 2 Housing models

The group was asked to consider two housing models (described below). For each model, they were asked to discuss the pros, the cons, and what they would change.

Model 1: “Cass” housing model with modifications

- The model was pioneered in Indiana.
- It combines three independent living suites in a single-family home that also has a shared full kitchen, dining room, and living room. Each suite has a bedroom, bath, sitting area, and “food prep” area.
- There is an attached accessory apartment for a “steward”, who functions as a safe neighbor. This person would receive free rent but would also need to be paid a stipend to bring their compensation up enough to cover 40 hours a week of being on call overnight.
- Individuals use their own support hours/budgets through DDS or MassHealth.
- This model might need to be combined with another model on another floor for people needing a different level of service.

Model 2: Small multi-unit building

- The building comprises 6 studio apartments.
- One apartment is for a “safe neighbor” who receives free rent and a stipend to be on call 40 hours a week overnight.
- 3 apartments are for people needing daily support.
- Two additional apartments are for people needing only weekly support.
- Individuals use their own support hours/budgets through DDS or MassHealth.

Group 2 Outcome

75% (three families) preferred the modified Cass model, comprising three independent living suites (bed/bath/sitting/food prep area) in a single-family home that share a full kitchen, living room and dining room. There is an attached accessory apartment for a “steward”. Another floor would comprise a living option (to be determined in the other focus groups) either for people who need 24/7 support or for people who need weekly support. 25% preferred the small multi-unit of studio apartments.

75% (three families) would prefer to rent. 75% (three families) would prefer that a service provider owns the property.

75% (three families) said housing would ideally be available within 2 years; 25% (one family) preferred 2-5 years.

CAVEAT: Please note that this group represented four families. A change by one family would swing the balance to a 50/50 split between the two housing models. Families said that while they would currently prefer renting from a service provider, they are still open to options for families owning the property. **They would like to be included in discussions with service providers to flesh out the details of what would be created.**

Appendix E

FOCUS GROUP 3 FEEDBACK ON HOUSING PREFERENCES

Group 3 (those needing some support weekly)

The focus group addressing individuals who need some support weekly took place on January 19th. There were six participants in the focus group (25% of the 24 respondents surveyed needing this level of support). Participants represented 46% of the Group 3 survey respondents who shared their email. All focus group participants were a family member or legal guardian of the person with a disability (10% of survey respondents for those needing this level of support were the individuals themselves). In the survey, 85% of Group 3 respondents could only afford to pay \$1,000/month or less for rent and services. 50% could afford a down payment of \$10,000 or less, but 30% could pay \$20,000 or more.

Group 3 Housing models

The group was asked to consider three housing models (described below). For each model, they were asked to discuss the pros, the cons, and what they would change.

Model 1: One-bedroom apartments (paired with “Cass” housing for people needing daily support)

- The model comprises two one-bedroom apartments (alternatively, it could comprise one two-bedroom apartment).
- A different floor would provide housing for people needing daily support, combining three independent living suites in a single-family home that also has a shared full kitchen, dining room, and living room. Each suite has a bedroom, bath, sitting area, and “food prep” area.
- There is an attached accessory apartment for a “steward”, who functions as a safe neighbor. This person would receive free rent but would also need to be paid a stipend to bring their compensation up enough to cover 40 hours a week of being on call overnight. This person is primarily to serve those needing daily support but could also provide some assistance to those needing weekly support.
- Individuals use their own support hours/budgets through DDS or MassHealth.
- Apartments would be combined with the Cass model due to the possibility that the amount of money potentially available through the Medfield Affordable Housing Trust might require combining the apartments with another model for people needing a different level of service.

Model 2: Small multi-unit building

- 2 apartments in a building comprising 6 studio apartments

- One apartment is for a “safe neighbor” who receives free rent and a stipend to be on call overnight 40 hours per week.
- 3 additional apartments are for people needing daily support
- Individuals use their own support hours/budgets through DDS or MassHealth.

Model 3: Townhouses

- 2 two-bedroom townhouses in a row
- A third townhouse would be occupied by a caregiver providing Shared Living to someone needing constant support
- Individuals use their own support hours/budgets through DDS or MassHealth.

Group 3 Outcome

The weekly support group split completely evenly among 3 housing models presented. When asked to make a backup choice, they split completely evenly on that, as well. However, 83% (five families) gravitated to a variation they brainstormed on one of the models. That variation comprised 6 studio apartments, with one occupied by a “safe neighbor” and the others **all** occupied by those needing weekly support. The challenge is that that model is not one combined with units serving individuals with other support needs -- which in part is why they chose it. If it turns out the Medfield Affordable Housing Trust only has funds to create two housing options, it is problematic to have one of them only serving people with a single level of need. The remaining option could provide housing for the other two levels of need (daily support and constant support) -- but reduces the number of those served needing constant support to only two people. Given that the constant support group is the largest single group, that is problematic. However, based on the original poll results, it is likely that a model that combining people needing weekly support with those needing a different level of support would still pick up people. Based on the overall discussion, this is particularly likely if the combination model allowed residents to have a one-bedroom apartment, rather than a studio.

67% (four families) of the weekly support group preferred to have the families own the property. If they own, 83% (five families) prefer a condo association.

67% (four families) were interested in a time frame of 2-5 years, 17% (one family) preferred less than two years, and 17% (one family) was not interested in the model brainstormed.

APPENDIX F

OBSERVATIONS:

COMBINED HOUSING MODEL FOR RESIDENTS NEEDING CONSTANT AND DAILY SUPPORT LEVELS

The expressed focus group preferences of both Group 1 and Group 2 would be met by a structure combining the “Cass” model for those needing daily supports on one floor, with a three-bedroom apartment for a caregiver and two individuals requiring constant support on another floor. An accessory unit could house a steward acting as a friendly neighbor for those needing some daily support, who would receive free rent and a stipend to be on call overnight 40 hours a week. Both groups seem to prefer a rental model but would like to be involved in discussions with the provider who would own the property.

Seven of the thirteen families participating in the Group 1 and Group 2 focus groups preferred a time frame of two years or less, so it would make sense to move ahead on this model first.

Since the HUD Fair Market Rent for Medfield is approximately \$2,200/month (\$2,198) for a one-bedroom apartment, minimum wage is \$15/hours, and a full-time (40 hours/week) employee is 2,080 hours per year, the *minimum* stipend for the steward would need to be \$400/month as a service fee divided among the three residents in the “Cass” model.⁵ That might be privately paid by families or come out of an individual’s DDS budget. Again, additional services would need to be covered by individuals’ DDS and/or MassHealth service hours.

Assuming a structure size of 5,000 square feet and construction costs of \$350/square foot, gives a total construction cost of \$1.75M. Assuming site preparation of \$200K brings the total project cost to \$1.95M.⁶ If land and \$500,000 were to be provided by Medfield, this would reduce the amount needed to be covered by a mortgage.

At least two additional questions need to be considered that can affect the total cost:

- What additional capital might a service provider be able to bring to the table from, for example, the One Stop process? (DEFINE ‘One Stop’)
- If the structure is owned by a non-profit, would it be subject to property tax?

Assuming:

- No additional capital to reduce the amount needed to be mortgaged

⁵ This and all calculations going forward are good faith estimates. Autism Housing Pathways, Inc., its employees, agents, and directors are not liable for any claims and causes of action arising from errors or omissions by such parties; in using information provided, the user hereby releases and waives all claims of action against Autism Housing Pathways, Inc., its employees, agents, and directors. For a complete legal disclaimer, go to http://autismhousingpathways.net/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/Legal_disclaimer_general.pdf.

⁶ Middle of the road estimate, calculated using figures at <https://www.fixr.com/costs/land-clearing-and-building-site-preparation>.

- No property tax charged to a non-profit owner⁷
- Property insurance of \$7,000 per year
- 6.7% interest

yields a total monthly payment of \$ 9,939.86 or about \$1657 per resident (excluding the steward, but including the caregiver for those receiving 24/7 support).⁸ For individuals who would need to rely on a Section 8 voucher to pay their rent, the issuing housing authority would need to agree to cover rent at 110% of the HUD Fair Market Rent for a Single Room Occupancy (SRO) unit (which is 75% of the rate for a studio); the 110% rate is fairly common practice. (There is a chance that the three-bedroom apartment would need to be constructed with suites, in the same way as the “Cass” unit, for a housing authority to agree to using the SRO rate.)

⁷ A property tax rate of \$17.42/\$1,000 of assessed valuation would increase the costs by about \$470/person. This would put the model out of reach of someone with a Section 8 voucher unless 1) the issuing housing authority agreed to a one-bedroom Fair Market Rent, which is unlikely, or 2) the developer brought in additional capital .

⁸ Calculated at <https://www.mortgagecalculator.org/> on February 11, 2023.

APPENDIX G

OBSERVATIONS:

COMBINED HOUSING MODEL FOR RESIDENTS NEEDING CONSTANT AND WEEKLY SUPPORT LEVELS

The Group 3 focus group was clear that they preferred a model only comprising residents needing weekly support. They also preferred to own the property. This approach raises issues of both equity and practicality, however. The model that 83% supported would house five individuals requiring weekly support. If the Medfield Affordable Housing Trust were only able to move forward on two models, this would result in housing only two individuals needing constant support, despite that being the largest group represented in both the survey and the focus groups. On a practical basis, the group requiring weekly support has the least financial capacity of all three groups. Property tax would take the rental cost to an amount where a resident could not cover the monthly charge with a Section 8 voucher and none of the families in the focus group have the capacity to put down a sufficient down payment for an ownership model.⁹

Members of the focus group were contacted for a vote on one of two alternative models:

- A one-bedroom apartment in a building comprising three one-bedroom apartments for people needing weekly support on one floor and (on a different floor) one three-bedroom apartment housing a caregiver with two people needing constant support.
- A suite comprising a bedroom, bath, small sitting area, and food prep area, sharing a common living room, kitchen, and dining area with two other residents. A different floor comprises one three-bedroom apartment housing a caregiver with two people needing constant support.

Either model would create an equitable arrangement where, across two projects, four residents needing constant support, three needing daily support, and three needing weekly support are housed.

Three members of the weekly support group responded that they would opt for the first option, indicating sufficient demand.

Assuming a structure size of 4,000 square feet and construction costs of \$350/square foot, gives a total construction cost of \$1.4M. Assuming site preparation of \$135K brings the total project cost to \$1.535M.¹⁰ If land and \$500,000 were to be provided by Medfield, this would reduce the amount needed to be covered by a mortgage. At least two additional questions need to be considered that can affect the total cost:

⁹ Based on total development costs for small units in a suburban/rural area in the Department of Housing and Community Development's 2022-2023 Qualified Allocation Plan <https://www.mass.gov/doc/2022-2023-gap/download>.

¹⁰ Middle of the road estimate, calculated using figures at <https://www.fixr.com/costs/land-clearing-and-building-site-preparation>.

- What additional capital might a service provider be able to bring to the table from, for example, the One Stop process?
- If the structure is owned by a non-profit, would it be subject to property tax?

Assuming:

- No additional capital to reduce the amount needed to be mortgaged
- No property tax charged to a non-profit owner¹¹
- Property insurance of \$7,000 per year
- 6.7% interest

yields a total monthly payment of \$7,261.96 or about \$1,210 per resident (including the caregiver for those receiving 24/7 support).¹² A one-bedroom Section 8 voucher would cover the costs for a resident of a one-bedroom apartment. For residents of the three-bedroom apartment who would need to rely on a Section 8 voucher to pay their rent, the issuing housing authority would need to agree to cover rent at 110% of the HUD Fair Market Rent for a bedroom in a shared three-bedroom unit (which is one-third of the rate for a three-bedroom unit); the 110% rate is fairly common practice.

¹¹ A property tax rate of \$17.42/\$1,000 of assessed valuation would increase the costs to about \$1,580/person. For individuals who would need to rely on a Section 8 voucher to pay their rent, the issuing housing authority would need to agree to cover rent at 110% of the HUD Fair Market Rent for a Single Room Occupancy (SRO) unit (which is 75% of the rate for a studio); the 110% rate is fairly common practice. (There is a chance that the three-bedroom apartment would need to be constructed with suites, in the same way as the “Cass” unit, for a housing authority to agree to using the SRO rate.)

¹² Calculated at <https://www.mortgagecalculator.org/> on February 11, 2023.

Appendix H

Survey Questions and Responses




Question 1:

What is the age of the person with a disability as of Oct. 1, 2022?						
Answered	70					
Skipped	0					
Average age	26					
Group 1 average age	27					
Group 2 average age	26					
Group 3 average age	25					

Question 2:

What is the gender of the person with a disability?								
Answer Choices	Responses	Group 1	Group 1	Group 2	Group 2	Group 3	Group 3	
Male	64.29%	45	77%	23	56%	9	54%	13
Female	35.71%	25	23%	7	44%	7	46%	11
Other	0.00%	0						
	Answered	70		30		16		24
	Skipped	0						

Question 3:

The person with a disability has:								
Answer Choices	Responses	Group 1	Group 1	Group 2	Group 2	Group 3	Group 3	
Intellectual disability	14.29% 	10	10%	3	31%	5	8%	2
Developmental disability (such as autism, cerebral palsy, Prader-Willi syndrome, etc.)	47.14% 	33	20%	6	44%	7	83%	20
Both	38.57% 	27	70%	21	25%	4	8%	2
If the person has a developmental disability, what is it?		47				9		16
	Answered	70		30		16		24
	Skipped	0						

Question 4:

What are the person's secondary diagnoses, if any (check all that apply)?								
Answer Choices	Responses	Group 1	Group 1	Group 2	Group 2	Group 3	Group 3	
Anxiety or panic disorder	60.66% 37	50%	12	64%	9	73%	16	
Allergies (food)	11.48% 7	8%	2	21%	3	9%	2	
Allergies (environmental)	11.48% 7	8%	2	29%	4	5%	1	
Bipolar disorder	4.92% 3	0%	0	7%	1	9%	2	
Depression	16.39% 10	8%	2	21%	3	23%	5	
Dysautonomia	0.00% 0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	
Gastro-intestinal (G/I) issues	18.03% 11	25%	6	29%	4	5%	1	
Learning disabilities	47.54% 29	54%	13	43%	6	45%	10	
Mitochondrial disease or dysfunction	0.00% 0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	
Obsessive/Compulsive disorder (OCD)	27.87% 17	33%	8	21%	3	27%	6	
Seizure disorder	16.39% 10	33%	8	7%	1	5%	1	
Sensory processing disorder	13.11% 8	21%	5	14%	2	5%	1	
Sleep disorder	13.11% 8	21%	5	21%	3	0%	0	
Other	11.48% 7	13%	3	21%	3	5%	1	
	Answered	61		24		14		22
	Skipped	9		6		2		2

Question 5:

If you answered "other" to question 4, please specify.								
		Group 1	Group 2	Group 3				
Answered	8					3	3	2
Skipped	62					27	13	22

Question 6:

In your opinion, which of the following best describes the level of residential supports the person needs to live outside the family home (check one)?								
Answer Choices	Responses	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3				
The person is able to live independently, but need or would benefit from periodic monitoring and/or assistance with activities like money management, shopping, home repairs, and cleaning at least once a week.	34.29% 24	0	0	24				
The person is able to be left alone for up to 6 hours, but need monitoring and/or assistance with self-care at least once a day.	20.00% 14	0	14	0				
The person needs someone present at all times.	37.14% 26	26	0	0				
The person needs more support than any of the other choices.	4.29% 3	3	0	0				
Other	4.29% 3	1	2	0				
	Answered	70	30	16		24		
	Skipped	0	0	0		0		

Question 7:

If you answered "other" to question 7, please specify.				
	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	
Answered	3	1	2	0
Skipped	67	29	14	24

Question 8:

All respondents

How much assistance does the person need with the following “activities of daily living”?											
	none		reminder		verbal and/or gesture prompt		physical prompt	this must be done for the person			Total
Dressing	52.86%	37	18.57%	13	15.71%	11	8.57%	6	4.29%	3	70
Toileting	65.71%	46	12.86%	9	11.43%	8	2.86%	2	7.14%	5	70
Bathing/showering	38.57%	27	28.57%	20	5.71%	4	14.29%	10	12.86%	9	70
Other hygiene	28.57%	20	35.71%	25	14.29%	10	8.57%	6	12.86%	9	70
Eating	61.43%	43	27.14%	19	8.57%	6	1.43%	1	1.43%	1	70
									Answered		70
									Skipped		0

Group 1

How much assistance does the person need with the following "activities of daily living"?													
	none		reminder		verbal and/or gesture prompt		physical prompt		this must be done for the person			Total	
Dressing	20%	6	23%	7	27%	8	20%	6	10%		3	30	
Toileting	27%	8	27%	8	23%	7	7%	2	17%		5	30	
Bathing/showering	10%	3	17%	5	10%	3	33%	10	30%		9	30	
Other hygiene	7%	2	20%	6	27%	8	20%	6	27%		8	30	
Eating	37%	11	40%	12	17%	5	3%	1	3%		1	30	

Group 2

How much assistance does the person need with the following "activities of daily living"?													
	none		reminder		verbal and/or gesture prompt		physical prompt		this must be done for the person		Total		
Dressing	87.50%	14	0.00%	0	12.50%	2	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0	16	
Toileting	87.50%	14	6.25%	1	6.25%	1	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0	16	
Bathing/showering	37.50%	6	56.25%	9	6.25%	1	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0	16	
Other hygiene	31.25%	5	50.00%	8	12.50%	2	0.00%	0	6.25%	1	0	16	
Eating	81.25%	13	18.75%	3	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0	16	

Group 3

How much assistance does the person need with the following "activities of daily living"?													
	none		reminder		verbal and/or gesture prompt		physical prompt		this must be done for the person		Total		
Dressing	79.17%	19	16.67%	4	4.17%	1	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	24		
Toileting	100.00%	24	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	24		
Bathing/showering	75.00%	18	25.00%	6	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	24		
Other hygiene	54.17%	13	45.83%	11	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	24		
Eating	79.17%	19	16.67%	4	4.17%	1	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	24		

Question 9:

All respondents

How much assistance does the person need with the following "instrumental activities of daily living"?										
	none		some help to ensure quality		help available throughout the process		this must be done for the person			
										Total
Food prep/cleanup	7.25%	5	31.88%	22	36.23%	25	24.64%	17		69
Shopping	8.70%	6	33.33%	23	34.78%	24	23.19%	16		69
Housekeeping	5.80%	4	37.68%	26	30.43%	21	26.09%	18		69
Laundry	24.64%	17	26.09%	18	24.64%	17	24.64%	17		69
Medications	21.74%	15	27.54%	19	14.49%	10	36.23%	25		69
Finances	0.00%	0	13.04%	9	21.74%	15	65.22%	45		69
								Answered		69
								Skipped		1

Group 1

How much assistance does the person need with the following "instrumental activities of daily living"?										
	none		some help to ensure quality		help available throughout the process		this must be done for the person			
										Total
Food prep/cleanup	3.33%	1	6.67%	2	40.00%	12	50.00%	15		30
Shopping	0.00%	0	3.33%	1	46.67%	14	50.00%	15		30
Housekeeping	0.00%	0	10.00%	3	40.00%	12	50.00%	15		30
Laundry	3.33%	1	10.00%	3	33.33%	10	53.33%	16		30
Medications	0.00%	0	10.00%	3	13.33%	4	76.67%	23		30
Finances	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	3.33%	1	96.67%	29		30

Group 2

How much assistance does the person need with the following "instrumental activities of daily living"?									
	none		some help to ensure quality		help available throughout the process		this must be done for the person		Total
Food prep/cleanup	6.25%	1	25.00%	4	56.25%	9	12.50%	2	16
Shopping	0.00%	0	50.00%	8	50.00%	8	0.00%	0	16
Housekeeping	12.50%	2	56.25%	9	18.75%	3	12.50%	2	16
Laundry	12.50%	2	56.25%	9	31.25%	5	0.00%	0	16
Medications	12.50%	2	43.75%	7	31.25%	5	12.50%	2	16
Finances	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	18.75%	3	81.25%	13	16

Group 3

How much assistance does the person need with the following "instrumental activities of daily living"?									
	none		some help to ensure quality		help available throughout the process		this must be done for the person		Total
Food prep/cleanup	13.04%	3	69.57%	16	17.39%	4	0.00%	0	23
Shopping	26.09%	6	60.87%	14	8.70%	2	4.35%	1	23
Housekeeping	8.70%	2	60.87%	14	26.09%	6	4.35%	1	23
Laundry	60.87%	14	26.09%	6	8.70%	2	4.35%	1	23
Medications	56.52%	13	39.13%	9	4.35%	1	0.00%	0	23
Finances	0.00%	0	39.13%	9	47.83%	11	13.04%	3	23

Question 10:

The person needs the following supports to be successful (check all that apply):								
Answer Choices	Responses	Group 1	Group 1	Group 2	Group 2	Group 3	Group 3	
appointment management	86.96%	60	90.00%	27	100.00%	16	73.91%	17
assistance with transitions ("In 5 minutes it will be time to...")	50.72%	35	73.33%	22	50.00%	8	21.74%	5
behavior contracts (for example, a token system)	20.29%	14	40.00%	12	6.25%	1	4.35%	1
choices	57.97%	40	80.00%	24	50.00%	8	34.78%	8
communication system (PECS, iTouch, communication book, etc.)	18.84%	13	40.00%	12	6.25%	1	0.00%	0
data collection	18.84%	13	23.33%	7	18.75%	3	13.04%	3
Gluten-free/Casein-free (GFCF) or other diet	11.59%	8	20.00%	6	12.50%	2	0.00%	0
medication management	60.87%	42	80.00%	24	75.00%	12	26.09%	6
money management	92.75%	64	93.33%	28	100.00%	16	86.96%	20
paperwork management	81.16%	56	90.00%	27	93.75%	15	60.87%	14
positive behavioral supports	42.03%	29	63.33%	19	31.25%	5	21.74%	5
premack principle ("First we do this, then we can do that")	31.88%	22	63.33%	19	12.50%	2	4.35%	1
schedules	71.01%	49	83.33%	25	81.25%	13	47.83%	11
sensory diet (deep squeezes, etc.)	14.49%	10	26.67%	8	6.25%	1	4.35%	1
social stories	17.39%	12	30.00%	9	12.50%	2	4.35%	1
structured day	60.87%	42	86.67%	26	50.00%	8	34.78%	8
visual supports	33.33%	23	53.33%	16	25.00%	4	13.04%	3
other	2.90%	2	3.33%	1	0.00%	0	4.35%	1
	Answered	69		30		16		23
	Skipped	1						

Question 11:

If you answered "other" to question 10, please specify.					
Answered	3				
Skipped	67				

Question 12:

The preferred living arrangement would be:								
Answer Choices	Responses	Group 1	Group 1	Group 2	Group 2	Group 3	Group 3	
The person lives alone	10.14%	7	3.33%	1	0.00%	0	26.09%	6
The person lives with their parents and/or siblings	11.59%	8	16.67%	5	12.50%	2	4.35%	1
The person lives with their spouse/partner/children	1.45%	1	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	4.35%	1
The person lives with a housemate who shares expenses	26.09%	18	0.00%	0	31.25%	5	56.52%	13
The person lives with a housemate who receives a stipend for living with them (Shared Living or Adult Foster Care)	18.84%	13	16.67%	5	43.75%	7	4.35%	1
The person lives with multiple unrelated people	31.88%	22	63.33%	19	12.50%	2	4.35%	1
	Answered	69		30		16		23
	Skipped	1						

Question 13:

If you answered "The person lives with multiple unrelated people" to question 12, the total preferred number of people living in the home is:								
Answer Choices	Responses	Group 1	Group 1	Group 2	Group 2	Group 3	Group 3	
4 or less	80.65%	25	76.19%	16	83.33%	5	100.00%	4
5-8	16.13%	5	19.05%	4	16.67%	1	0.00%	0
9+	3.23%	1	4.76%	1	0.00%	0	0.00%	0
	Answered	31		21		6		4
	Skipped	39						

Question 14:

The person would prefer their housemates be (skip if their only preferred housemates are family members):								
Answer Choices	Responses	Group 1	Group 1	Group 2	Group 2	Group 3	Group 3	
People with an intellectual disability	7.55%	4		2		2		0
People with developmental disabilities	7.55%	4		2		0		2
A mix of people with intellectual and developmental disabilities	26.42%	14		6		3		5
People without an intellectual or developmental disability	13.21%	7		2		1		4
A mixture of people with/without intellectual or developmental disability	45.28%	23		11		7		5
	Answered	52		23		13		16
	Skipped	18						

Question 15:

The preferred layout of the housing would be:								
Answer Choices	Responses	Group 1	Group 1	Group 2	Group 2	Group 3	Group 3	
The person has their own bedroom, but shares all other rooms	22.73%	15	33.33%	10	12.50%	2	15.00%	3
The person has their own bedroom and bath/half bath	51.52%	34	60.00%	18	56.25%	9	35.00%	7
The person has their own bedroom, bath/half bath, and some food prep/storage space (single room occupancy)	7.58%	5	6.67%	2	12.50%	2	5.00%	1
The person has their own in-law apartment	3.03%	2	0.00%	0	6.25%	1	5.00%	1
The person has their own apartment	13.64%	9	0.00%	0	12.50%	2	35.00%	7
The person has their own house	1.52%	1	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	5.00%	1
	Answered	66		30		16		20
	Skipped	4				0		4

Question 16:

The preferred housing option would be:								
Answer Choices	Responses	Group 1	Group 1	Group 2	Group 2	Group 3	Group 3	
Privately owned home or condo	21.67%	13	21.43%	6	8.33%	1	30.00%	6
Co-operative housing	5.00%	3	7.14%	2	0.00%	0	5.00%	1
Apartment or other rental unit (please specify):	8.33%	5	0.00%	0	8.33%	1	20.00%	4
Group home owned or leased by the state or a vendor under state contract, property not controlled by families of residents	18.33%	11	28.57%	8	16.67%	2	5.00%	1
Private group home	5.00%	3	3.57%	1	16.67%	2	0.00%	0
Group home where the property is controlled by the families of the residents, regardless of who provides support services	18.33%	11	25.00%	7	16.67%	2	10.00%	2
Public housing	1.67%	1	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	5.00%	1
Private affordable housing (there is a rent subsidy, but it is not run by a government agency)	8.33%	5	3.57%	1	8.33%	1	15.00%	3
Assisted living	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0
Intentional community (co-housing, agricultural community, or other housing organized around a particular principle)	8.33%	5	7.14%	2	8.33%	1	10.00%	2
Other	5.00%	3	3.57%	1	16.67%	2	0.00%	0
	Answered	60		28		12		20
	Skipped	10		2		4		4

Question 17:

If you answered "other" to question 16, please specify.		Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
Answered	4	1	2	1
Skipped	66	29	14	23

Question 18:

In 2016, the Massachusetts Housing Think Tank identified 6 housing models that could collectively meet the needs of many people with disabilities. Please select which one of these models								
Answer Choices	Responses	Group 1	Group 1	Group 2	Group 2	Group 3	Group 3	
Individual apartments or condos in the community, located close enough to one another to permit socialization. A facilitator and a neighbor are both paid to facilitate connections and provide support.	36.07%	22	10.71%	3	38.46%	5	70.00%	14
Shared living in a single family home owned or leased by a family, individual, or a 3rd party not providing the services. It could involve substantially separate space, with a shared kitchen.	16.39%	10	17.86%	5	30.77%	4	5.00%	1
Co-housing in which people with and without disabilities choose to live in community, while having their own living spaces.	11.48%	7	14.29%	4	0.00%	0	15.00%	3
Inclusive, small footprint units, resulting in lower housing costs, with trained management and/or support providers (e.g., micro-units or single room occupancy units).	14.75%	9	21.43%	6	15.38%	2	5.00%	1
Independently.	8.20%	5	7.14%	2	15.38%	2	5.00%	1
Licensed congregate living for people with intensive medical/behavioral needs.	13.11%	8	28.57%	8	0.00%	0	0.00%	0
	Answered	61		28		13		20
	Skipped	9		2		3		4

Question 19:

Design features that would help the person be successful (check all that apply):					
Answer Choices	Responses	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	
Land buffer between the home and the neighbors	32.73% 18	9	4	5	
Sound insulation of bedrooms	65.45% 36	18	7	11	
Floor drains in bathrooms	21.82% 12	8	2	2	
Unbreakable glass	21.82% 12	7	2	3	
Smart home to help with remote support and cueing	30.91% 17	8	4	5	
Construction that can stand up to wear and tear	38.18% 21	15	3	3	
Separate pantry, including space for a refrigerator	32.73% 18	8	4	6	
Fenced-in yard or a courtyard	56.36% 31	21	5	5	
Sidewalk	54.55% 30	18	5	7	
Other	14.55% 8	4	1	3	
	Answered 55	27	10	18	
	Skipped 15	3	6	6	

Question 20:

If you answered "other" to question 19, please specify.		Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
Answered	8	4	1	3
Skipped	62	26	15	21

Question 21:

Preferred locations and amenities (check all that you would consider):								
Answer Choices	Responses	Group 1	Group 1	Group 2	Group 2	Group 3	Group 3	
City	19.67% 12	14.29% 4	7.69% 1	35.00% 7				
Town, within walking distance of shops	86.89% 53	89.29% 25	92.31% 12	80.00% 16				
Suburbs	62.30% 38	67.86% 19	61.54% 8	55.00% 11				
Rural	8.20% 5	14.29% 4	7.69% 1	0.00% 0				
On public transit	31.15% 19	21.43% 6	46.15% 6	35.00% 7				
Near bike or walking trails	26.23% 16	28.57% 8	30.77% 4	20.00% 4				
	Answered 61	28	13	20				
	Skipped 9	2	3	4				

Question 22:

How much the person afford to pay out of pocket per month for rent and residential services (including how much their family could assist them to pay on an indefinite basis)?								
Answer Choices	Responses	Group 1	Group 1	Group 2	Group 2	Group 3	Group 3	
Less than \$500	18.03% 11	14.29% 4	23.08% 3	20.00% 4				
\$500 – \$1,000	47.54% 29	35.71% 10	46.15% 6	65.00% 13				
\$1,000 – \$1,500	11.48% 7	10.71% 3	7.69% 1	15.00% 3				
\$1,500 – \$2,000	6.56% 4	7.14% 2	15.38% 2	0.00% 0				
\$2,000 – \$2,500	6.56% 4	14.29% 4	0.00% 0	0.00% 0				
\$2,500 – \$3,000	3.28% 2	7.14% 2	0.00% 0	0.00% 0				
\$3,000 +	6.56% 4	10.71% 3	7.69% 1	0.00% 0				
	Answered 61	28	13	20				
	Skipped 9	2	3	4				

Question 23:

How much of a down payment could the person afford (including how much their family could assist with)?								
Answer Choices	Responses	Group 1	Group 1	Group 2	Group 2	Group 3	Group 3	
Less than \$5,000	29.51% 18	25.00%	7	38.46%	5	30.00%	6	
\$5,000 – \$10,000	13.11% 8	7.14%	2	15.38%	2	20.00%	4	
\$10,000 – \$15,000	8.20% 5	7.14%	2	7.69%	1	10.00%	2	
\$15,000 – \$20,000	8.20% 5	10.71%	3	0.00%	0	10.00%	2	
\$20,000 – \$25,000	9.84% 6	3.57%	1	23.08%	3	10.00%	2	
\$25,000 – \$30,000	3.28% 2	7.14%	2	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	
\$30,000 – \$35,000	1.64% 1	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	5.00%	1	
\$35,000 +	26.23% 16	39.29%	11	15.38%	2	15.00%	3	
	Answered 61		28		13		20	
	Skipped 9		2		3		4	

Question 24:

The person who completed this survey is (select all that apply):								
Answer Choices	Responses	Group 1	Group 1	Group 2	Group 2	Group 3	Group 3	
The person about whom the information was provided	3.33% 2	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	10.00%	2	
A parent of or other relative of the person on whose behalf the survey was completed	90.00% 54	85.19%	23	100.00%	13	90.00%	18	
A legal guardian of the person on whose behalf the survey was completed	23.33% 14	44.44%	12	15.38%	2	0.00%	0	
Staff of an agency serving the person on whose behalf the survey was completed	0.00% 0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	
	Answered 60		27		13		20	
	Skipped 10		3		3		4	

Question 25:

Please use the space below to tell us about any other concerns, interest, needs or resources that you have related to housing.		Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
Answered	14	5	5	4
Skipped	56	25	11	20

Group 1	Both parents are in mid seventies so housing is going to be necessary in near future.
Group 1	I would like DDS group homes in Medfield.
Group 1	Mainly the level of self care she needs assistance with.
Group 1	Need for a sufficiently large number of housemates or community mates to allow for friendship/socialization and an "extended family" to age-in-place with. Also need access to activities on site or close to residence; pandemic closures were devastating, and few options exist in the community for low-functioning autistic adults
Group 1	Our son has a section 8 housing voucher
Group 2	I may want to edit my choice for housing model depending as I learn more about them.
Group 2	Ideally housing and a part time job could be close in proximity
Group 2	On section 8 list
Group 2	Our daughter is very high functioning, verbal and very social. Activities and stimulating conversation are very important to her. My wife has stage 4 breast cancer and is undergoing her third round of chemo. She needs to have access to a nurse to monitor the catatonia.
Group 2	trying to find the right match of people, location and cost
Group 3	Best now would be a 2-3 bedroom apt or condo, each w own bedroom and some support.
Group 3	Housing must allow pets, for emotional support
Group 3	I am excited about the possibility of housing options with built in support for my daughter. She desperately wants her own apartment/condo. Being able to have a pet would be a must for her. Being able to walk to shops/library would be a big plus. I am not able to commit to help at this time (And honestly, probably have limited skills in this area) but would be open to it if things change in my schedule/life situation. Our family's ultimate goal is to own a condo for my daughter and have her use her future section 8 to help pay the mortgage. She has been saving for a down payment.
Group 3	I think there needs to be more availability of housing for high functioning people who need a little support

Question 26:

Would you be interested in working with others to create a housing option for individuals intellectual and/or developmental disabilities?								
Answer Choices	Responses	Group 1	Group 1	Group 2	Group 2	Group 3	Group 3	
Yes (if so, please include your name and email address when you complete question 27)	50.00%	27	54.17%	13	58.33%	7	38.89%	7
No	50.00%	27	45.83%	11	41.67%	5	61.11%	11
	Answered	54		24		12		18
	Skipped	16		6		4		6

Question 27:

The only required information below is your zip code. Please provide additional information if you are interested in being placed on our email list or participating in a focus group.		
Answer Choices	Responses	
Name	55.56%	35
Zip/postal code	98.41%	62
Email address	61.90%	39
	Answered	63
	Skipped	10

City	Count of City
Medfield	7
Sharon	7
Westwood	7
Canton	5
Norwood	4
Walpole	4
Framingham	2
Norfolk	2
Needham	2
Holliston	2
Foxborough	2
Plainville	2
Natick	2
Sherborn	2
Lincoln	1
Dover	1
Dartmouth	1
Taunton	1
Wayland	1
Dedham	1
Cambridge	1
Millis	1
Milton	1
Grand Total	59

Note: Three respondents' zip codes were not recognized by Excel. Two were in Medfield, bringing Medfield's total to 9; the third was in Westwood, bringing Westwood's total to 8, bringing the Grand Total of respondents to 62.