



**2012 NYSILC Needs
Assessment Report**

2012 NYSILC Needs Assessment Report

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	ii
Introduction.....	ii
Executive Summary of Findings	iv
Purpose of the Needs Assessment Study	1
Methodology:	2
Background Data about New Yorkers with a Disability.....	3
Findings	5
Question # 1: ...What geographic areas are most in need of Independent Living services?.....	5
Question # 2: What unserved / underserved ethnic, minority and disability communities are most in need of IL services?	11
Question #3: What are the most important unmet service needs for New Yorkers with disabilities who live, or wish to live, independently?	14
Question #4: What are the most important needs that the SILC should address to strengthen New York’s independent living network?.....	17
Comparison with results from NYAIL needs assessment 2008.....	19
Conclusions and Recommendations	21
Appendices.....	23
Appendix I: List of the NYSILC Needs Assessment Committee (NAC) members.....	24
Appendix II: Tables and charts with additional statistical data that relates to the tables for questions 1 and 2 above	25
Appendix III: Tables and charts from the consumer survey that provides a respondent profile. Total number of respondents = 578.	30
Appendix IV: Tables and charts from the Center and Consumer surveys that provide additional data for some of the questions.	32
Appendix V: Copies of the two surveys used in the study.....	34

Acknowledgements

The NYS Independent Living Council (NYSILC) would like to express its appreciation for the dedicated group that formed the Needs Assessment Committee (NAC). The NAC members spent six months wrestling with what questions to ask to identify the critical needs in New York for Independent Living (IL). They reviewed reports, searched for helpful data, and responded to numerous email questions. A full list of NAC members can be found in Appendix I.

NYSILC would also like to thank the California SILC and the NY Association for Independent Living (NYAIL) for their excellent needs assessments. Their respective studies in 2010 and 2008 helped to shape this assessment.

Introduction

The New York State Independent Living Council (NYSILC) is a not-for-profit, non-governmental, consumer controlled state council. It is composed of 24 appointees from around the state, a majority of whom have disabilities. They represent diverse backgrounds and needs across the state. NYSILC is responsible for the development, implementation and monitoring of the three-year Statewide Plan for Independent Living (SPIL). The council is jointly responsible for the SPIL with its state plan partners: New York State Education Department/Office of Adult Continuing and Career Educational Services - Vocational Rehabilitation (ACCES-VR), and the Office of Children and Family Services/Commission for the Blind and Visually Handicapped (CBVH).

Independent Living means controlling and directing your own life, taking risks, and being allowed to succeed and fail on your own terms. Statewide Independent Living Councils (SILCs), established under Title VII of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, provide support to the Statewide IL network of 39 centers (plus satellite locations) in addition to their primary SPIL duties. Some specific examples include, but are not limited to: conducting surveys and reports, promoting media awareness about IL and disability related issues, young adult leadership training sponsorships, general support of technical assistance and training, and direction around disability policy issues (voting access, emergency preparedness, outreach to underserved populations).

NYSILC conducts a public input process as part of the development of the three-year State Plan for Independent Living (SPIL). It is guided by a

formulation packet with a facilitation outline posing critical questions designed to solicit feedback from the public at various venues.

To improve the SPIL formulation, NYSILC decided to conduct a needs assessment to help focus on the critical questions. NYSILC hired Alan Krieger, a consultant with Krieger Solutions LLC, to facilitate this process, and established a committee of Council members and stakeholders to lead the process. (See Appendix I for list of the Needs Assessment Committee (NAC) members). Alan Krieger has extensive experience working with non-profit and public sector agencies. He is a former executive director of a statewide organization and is also working with NYSILC to strengthen its evaluation process for the three year state plan. For more information about Alan Krieger, visit his website, www.KriegerSolutions.com.

For more information about this needs assessment, please contact:

Brad Williams, Executive Director:

Tel: 518 427-1060, Voice and TDD; Toll Free 1 (877) 397-4126

Email: bradw@nysilc.org

Fax: 518 427-1139

or send regular mail to:

New York State Independent Living Council, Inc.

111 Washington Avenue, Suite 101

Albany, NY 12210

Executive Summary of Findings

This needs assessment was designed to collect input on four research questions to help guide the development of the next three-year State Plan for Independent Living (SPIL). The key findings for each question are outlined below. A more complete discussion follows in the main body of this report.

- 1) Based on what we know (existing data), the following needs were identified:
 - There are a high number of veterans with disabilities in New York (232,805) with a high incidence of disability (25.1%) compared to the general population and people with disabilities (11%).
 - The poverty rate for New Yorkers with disabilities ages 18-64 is 28.6% - more than twice the rate for persons without disabilities in the State.
 - The employment rate for New Yorkers with disabilities ages 18-64 is 31.2% - a 40.8% gap compared to persons without disabilities in the State.
 - When types of disabilities among New Yorkers are compared to employment and poverty rates, people with mental health disabilities have low employment (25.3%) and high poverty (35.7%) rates.

- 2) Utilizing an analysis of penetration rates and inundation indexes, and their relative rankings, the top ten counties with the greatest need for Independent Living (IL) services:
 - Livingston
 - Bronx
 - Queens
 - New York
 - Suffolk
 - Wyoming
 - Kings
 - Yates
 - Orleans
 - Ontario.

- 3) The following information was revealed related to underserved populations:
 - In a comparison of center service and ACS/Census data on a percentage basis, the IL network needs to improve its outreach and ability to serve Hispanic/Latinos and Asians with disabilities.
 - In addition, the center survey asked what groups were underserved. The top six identified were:
 - Male veterans with disabilities
 - Female veterans with disabilities
 - Rural residents with disabilities

- Homeless individuals with disabilities
- Young adults with disabilities
- Immigrants with disabilities.

It should be mentioned that some of these underserved target populations have been identified going into their second consecutive State Plan. As a result, they should be prioritized. They include: veterans with disabilities, Hispanics and Asians with disabilities, homeless individuals with disabilities, and young adults with disabilities.

The institutionalized population in New York State was extremely difficult to identify. The effort to do so was documented. The following is recommended:

- The IL center network should make an effort to utilize the data to plan local strategies and target impact to transition as many of the 220,277 individuals to the “most integrated setting” per Olmstead.
- Direct system change to make all state agencies post institutionalized data publically like OMH for better planning and tracking of the institutional bias.

4) Based on a survey with almost 600 respondents, consumers identified the following as their most challenging issues:

- Finances/paying bills
- Transportation
- Employment.

When asked what services they need most to live independently, the following were identified:

- Transportation
- Advocacy
- Medical/health issues.

5) Based on a survey of Center directors, with more than two-thirds of the network responding, centers indicated that the following were barriers to expanding or starting new services:

- Lack of financial services
- Lack of transportation to consumers
- Additional space/infrastructure
- Increased awareness about ILC.

Consumers responded when asked what could be done to make it easier for them to access services at their local center:

- Improved transportation
- Increased outreach:
 - Home visits

- Increase advertising related to center services
- Closer satellite facilities
- Increased on-line resources.

NYSILC Needs Assessment Report

Purpose of the Needs Assessment Study

As part of the formulation of the three-year State Plan for Independent Living (SPIL), NYSILC conducts a public input process for the plan development. This process includes development of a packet with a facilitation outline posing critical questions designed to solicit feedback from the public, at various venues and through written comments.

This needs assessment study was undertaken to improve the SPIL formulation in time for the start of the process toward the development of the 2014-2016 three-year state plan. NYSILC established a committee of Council members to lead this process. (See Appendix I for list of the Needs Assessment Committee (NAC) members).

The committee conducted a review of other statewide needs assessments, including one conducted in 2008 by NY Association for Independent Living (NYAIL) and one conducted by the California SILC entitled: Needs Assessment for People with Disabilities. The committee recommended that NYSILC focus its needs assessment on the four questions that formed the basis of the California SILC's approach (including their analysis of "penetration rates" and "inundation indexes"). The committee also recommended adapting some of the questions from the NYAIL survey to do a four-year comparison on these questions.

The four research questions on which NYSILC decided to focus the needs assessment were:

1. What geographic areas are most in need of IL services?
2. What unserved/underserved ethnic, minority and disability communities are most in need of IL services?
3. What are the most important unmet service needs for New Yorkers with disabilities who live, or wish to live, independently?
4. What are the most important needs that the SILC should address to strengthen New York's independent living network?

Methodology:

The Needs Assessment Committee then reviewed available data to see if some of these questions could be answered. Research questions 1 and 2 were able to be substantially answered by accessing and analyzing existing data, and it was determined that questions 3 and 4 needed to have additional data developed through two surveys – one of consumers and one of Independent Living Center directors. The surveys drew from questions in the 2008 NYAIL survey and while focusing on NYSILC’s research questions 3 and 4 above, it also included a few items relating to the other two research questions.

It should be pointed out that no known public data on the number of people with disabilities who are in institutional settings previously existed within the State. This is the first attempt recognized by the network to capture data about the State’s institutionalized population in any meaningful way. Only the NYS Office of Mental Health maintains their related data publically, online, with the information updated to indicate shifts in the population as people transition in and out of settings. This should be the standard to which all other State agencies are held. Otherwise, NYSILC had to engage in an aggressive effort to FOIA the other State agencies to obtain the necessary data. Specific attempts are mentioned in footnotes of Table 1.5A. NYSILC believes that this information represents a solid start on which to base estimates and planning. However, given the State’s reluctance to release its own information in a public way, there are some issues. The institutionalized population figure could be improved through increased cooperation with State agencies, helping to identify all institutional settings and data sources by county.

The **consumer survey** was an electronic survey for consumers to complete from their home computer via an on-line link, or on a computer in an Independent Living Center. A text based/paper survey was also made available if the on-line survey was not accessible, and many consumers used this option. NYSILC sent information about how to access the survey to all the Independent Living Centers in New York, and to a number of advocacy and service organizations that serve people with disabilities. 578 consumers responded to the survey and their responses are summarized in the report that follows. Many of these consumers are already involved with Independent Living Centers (ILC). Others heard about this from associated stakeholders or advocates and were unfamiliar with ILCs. A demographic breakdown of these consumers is also provided in the report. To increase responses, we provided an incentive – entry in a drawing for a \$50 gift card.

The **Center survey** was also an on-line survey with a text based/paper option available if the on-line version was not accessible. More than two-thirds of all

Independent Living Centers in the state responded (34 out of 50 locations). Their responses are also summarized in the report that follows.

Appendix V (page 34) contains a full copy of the Consumer and Center survey questions.

Background Data about New Yorkers with a Disability

A large number of statistical documents were reviewed to try to assemble a picture of what it means to be a New Yorker with a disability. According to the 2011 Annual Disability Statistics Compendium¹ compiled by the RRTC on Disability Statistics & Demographics, here is what we found:

- **Total population:** There are over 2 million New Yorkers with disabilities living in the community out of a total of more than 19 million residents (11%). This does not account for institutionalized individuals or active military personnel.
- **Veterans:** There are 928,961 civilian veterans age 18 or older living in the community in New York State, and 232,805 (25.1%) of these individuals have a disability - a high incidence of disability compared to the general population.
- **Poverty rate:** The rate for New Yorkers with disabilities ages 18 to 64 living in the community is 28.6%, which is more than twice that of persons in our state without disabilities (12.3%).
- **Employment:** The employment rate for a New Yorker with a disability (ages 18-64) is 31.2% compared to 72% for a person without a disability resulting in a gap of 40.8 percentage points. Full-time, year-round employment for a New Yorker with a disability (ages 18-64) is 18.7% compared to 52.2% for a person without a disability creating a gap of 33.5 percentage points.
- **Income:** Among civilians age 16 or older during the last 12 months, New Yorkers with disabilities earned \$10,903 less on average compared to a person without a disability (\$21,581 versus \$32,484).
- **Education:** For students with disabilities ages 14-21 during the last 12 months, it was reported that they left New York State schools for the following reasons: 52% (15,937) graduated with diplomas, 21% (6,277)

¹ 2011 Annual Disability Statistics Compendium, Rehabilitation Research and Training Center (RRTC) on Disability Statistics and Demographics, www.DisabilityCompendium.org, November 2011. Source is the U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 American Community Survey, and American FactFinder.

received certificates, 26% (7,788) dropped out, and 1% (390) died or aged out.

- **Health:** 89.7% of New Yorkers with disabilities have health insurance coverage (as a result of 59.4% receiving public health care coverage and 30.3% private health care coverage), resulting in 10.3% New Yorkers with disabilities lacking insurance. For New Yorkers with disabilities age 18 or older, 34.3% are considered obese compared to 21.1% for a person without a disability.

This can be compared with findings from the New York State Disability and Employment Status Report 2009 for the New York Makes Work Pay project. The lead for the report was the Employment and Disability Institute at Cornell University². Here are some highlights from that report:

- Employment rates for people with disabilities by race/ethnicity: African Americans/Blacks have the lowest employment rate at 26.4% followed by Hispanics/Latinos at 28.2% (31.2% overall average employment rate for people with disabilities).
- When types of disability are compared to employment and poverty rates, people with mental health disabilities have low employment (25.3%) and high poverty (35.7%) rates (see Table 2.3 for more information).
- Educational attainment (highest level) for New Yorkers with disabilities: 26% have a less than a high school degree and 16% have a bachelor's degree or higher, compared with people without disabilities where 11% have less than a high school degree and 36% have a bachelor's degree or higher.

This data provides a summary of what we knew statewide. We found additional data that filters some of this by ethnicity and types of disabilities to help identify sub-populations most in need of services (see pages 11-12).

What the figures didn't show was:

- *How* this information varies by county and region
- *What* the greatest needs are for services
- *Where* the greatest needs are for services
- *What* the Council can do to strengthen the Independent Living (IL) network to address these gaps

With this information as a back drop and with our four core questions in mind, we conducted a needs assessment study to find out more about issues related to independent living facing people with disabilities in New York State.

² NYS Disability and Employment Status Report 2009 for NY Makes Work Pay, Employment and Disability Institute, Cornell University, www.edi.cornell.edu, 2009. Source is primarily the three-year estimates (2005-2007) from the U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, and non-institutionalized working-age population between 16-64.

Findings

Question # 1: What geographic areas are most in need of Independent Living services?

Summary:

The data that was reviewed was organized by each county in the state and includes:

- The number of consumers currently served by IL Centers
- The total number of people with disabilities in the civilian population
- The total number of people with disabilities who are in institutional settings

Based on the data analysis explained below, the ten counties with the greatest need for Independent Living services are:

1. Livingston	6. Wyoming	These are a mix of rural, urban and suburban counties. The charts below are based on existing data we were able to access. Table 1.1 is a summary of the data, with the remaining tables highlighting key elements of the data. Table 1.7 shows how we reached our conclusion of the ten counties most in need of IL services.
2. Bronx	7. Kings	
3. Queens	8. Yates	
4. New York	9. Orleans	
5. Suffolk	10. Ontario	

Comments from both surveys (Independent Living Center directors and consumers) stated that the needs were greatest in rural areas of each county. There were also several comments from urban counties indicating that minority and low income urban areas in those counties were also underserved. The consumer survey didn't have much variation between rural, urban and suburban respondents in terms of what were their most important needs (see question #3).

Table 1.1 below shows the data we used to analyze relative need for services in each of New York's 62 counties. Numbers in bold indicate the 10 greatest needs in each column.

Table 1.1 Service Needs by County (Top Ten Counties for Each Column Highlighted in Bold)

NYS County	(A) ³ CSRs Served by IL Network FY 2010- 2011	(B) ⁴ # Incidence of Disability/ County	(A)/(B) Penetration Rate	(C) ⁵ Total # Institutionalized/ County	(C)/(A) Inundation Index
Albany	760	34,197	2.22%	3,686	4.85
Allegany	165	6,855	2.41%	425	2.58
Bronx	308	183,928	0.17%	17,250	56.01
Broome	877	28,507	3.08%	2,663	3.04
Cattaraugus	649	11,518	5.63%	1,046	1.61
Cayuga	543	9,486	5.72%	1,317	2.43
Chautauqua	430	19,412	2.22%	2,185	5.08
Chemung	264	12,714	2.08%	2,347	8.89
Chenango	256	8,383	3.05%	730	2.85
Clinton	116	11,076	1.05%	1,804	15.55
Columbia	161	7,486	2.15%	1,044	6.48
Cortland	198	5,399	3.67%	528	2.67
Delaware	231	7,525	3.07%	604	2.61
Dutchess	588	35,270	1.67%	5,390	9.17
Erie	1,992	115,455	1.73%	11,507	5.78
Essex	41	5,238	0.78%	718	17.51
Franklin	160	6,101	2.62%	1,734	10.84
Fulton	187	8,314	2.25%	1,030	5.51
Genesee	291	7,844	3.71%	662	2.27
Greene	96	5,737	1.67%	1,215	12.66
Hamilton	10	701 ⁶	1.43%	76	7.60
Herkimer	608	8,859	6.86%	759	1.25
Jefferson	834	14,708	5.67%	1,381	1.66
Kings	706	244,165	0.29%	19,121	27.08
Lewis	163	3,525	4.62%	249	1.53
Livingston	16	7,107	0.23%	1,221	76.31
Madison	242	7,329	3.30%	579	2.39
Monroe	1,721	89,275	1.93%	9,051	5.26
Montgomery	496	8,144	6.09%	986	1.99
Nassau	976	114,837	0.85%	14,437	14.79
New York	381	157,488	0.24%	14,774	38.78
Niagara	578	28,810	2.01%	2,286	3.96

³ Based on ACCES VR data, yearend statewide totals, FY 2010-2011, Statistical Report. Plus 704 Report data for CDR and Tri-Lakes centers.

⁴ US Census Bureau, American FactFinder, Disability Characteristics (S1810), 2008-2010 American Community Survey 3-Year Estimates, New York State by County. Assistance locating the data was provided by the Employment and Disability Institute at Cornell University.

⁵ Based on last column of Table 1.5A Total # Institutionalized Population by County.

⁶ There were no figures given the ACS-census data for the incidence of disability in Hamilton and Schuyler counties. The figures used above were derived from taking the average rate of disability in the 60 available counties (13.04%), multiplied by the total population of the individual county.

NYS County	(A) ³ CSRs Served by IL Network FY 2010- 2011	(B) ⁴ # Incidence of Disability/ County	(A)/(B) Penetration Rate	(C) ⁵ Total # Institutionalized/ County	(C)/(A) Inundation Index
Oneida	2,221	34,114	6.51%	5,986	2.70
Onondaga	1,253	52,720	2.38%	4,765	3.80
Ontario	69	12,863	0.54%	1,097	15.90
Orange	815	41,385	1.97%	3,351	4.11
Orleans	33	5,402	0.61%	967	29.30
Oswego	790	15,843	4.99%	835	1.06
Otsego	261	8,719	2.99%	765	2.93
Putnam	238	8,637	2.76%	711	2.99
Queens	473	209,722	0.23%	20,285	42.89
Rensselaer	354	20,251	1.75%	1,968	5.56
Richmond	894	45,649	1.96%	5,582	6.24
Rockland	441	24,335	1.81%	4,312	9.78
Saratoga	579	20,813	2.78%	1,702	2.94
Schenectady	264	17,636	1.50%	1,859	7.04
Schoharie	65	4,964	1.31%	159	2.45
Schuyler	101	2,440 ⁷	4.14%	309	3.06
Seneca	55	4,847	1.13%	1,031	18.75
St. Lawrence	272	16,629	1.64%	2,372	8.72
Steuben	445	14,869	2.99%	1,070	2.40
Suffolk	356	129,856	0.27%	15,481	43.49
Sullivan	194	11,515	1.68%	1,816	9.36
Tioga	105	6,456	1.63%	366	3.49
Tompkins	246	9,467	2.60%	811	3.30
Ulster	572	23,952	2.39%	3,048	5.33
Warren	524	8,025	6.53%	740	1.41
Washington	344	7,061	4.87%	1,477	4.29
Wayne	103	12,036	0.86%	1,087	10.55
Westchester	821	81,330	1.01%	11,650	14.19
Wyoming	25	4,768	0.52%	1,531	61.24
Yates	11	2,897	0.38%	339	30.82
TOTALS	27,968	2,074,594 ⁸	1.4%	220,277	7.88

The first column of table 1.1 is an alphabetical listing of all 62 counties in New York State. The second column (column “A”) looks at the Independent Living (IL) network service data by county for Fiscal Year 2010-2011. It shows the number of Consumer Service Records (CSR’s) active in each county, which is an indication of the total number of consumers served on an on-going basis by the

⁷ There were no figures given the ACS-census data for the incidence of disability in Hamilton and Schuyler counties. The figures used above were derived from taking the average rate of disability in the 60 available counties (13.04%), multiplied by the total population of the individual county.

⁸ Total ACS survey sample was adjusted to accommodate estimates for Hamilton and Schuyler Counties and include the “with a disability” estimates for the other counties.

Independent Living Centers in New York. It does not include consumers who only received information and referral services and for whom a CSR was not started. The ten counties with the lowest number of CSR's have been identified from this column and highlighted in bold. These ten counties have been ranked according to lowest numbers served in Table 1.2 below.

Table 1.2 Most Underserved Counties in NYS Served by IL Network Based on CSRs

NYS County	# of CSR's FY 2010- 2011 ⁹
Hamilton	10
Yates	11
Livingston	16
Wyoming	25
Orleans	33
Essex	41
Seneca	55
Schoharie	65
Ontario	69
Greene	96

These counties are generally the smallest counties in the state by population, so it is not surprising that they would serve the fewest consumers. This is presented for general information purposes and was not used to calculate counties with the greatest need.

The third column of table 1.1 (column "B") indicates the total number of people with disabilities in each county (civilian population). The ten highest are displayed in descending order in the table below.

Table 1.3 Highest Incidence of Disability by County

NYS County	Incidence of Disability
Kings	244,165
Queens	209,722
Bronx	183,928
New York	157,488
Suffolk	129,856
Erie	115,455
Nassau	114,837
Monroe	89,275
Westchester	81,330
Onondaga	52,720

The ten counties with the highest numbers have been highlighted in bold. In Table 1.3, they are ranked according to the largest populations. Again, it is not surprising that these are among the largest counties in the state by population. This data is also presented for general information purposes and was not included in calculations to identify counties with the greatest need.

⁹ Based on ACCES VR data, yearend statewide totals, FY 2010-2011, Statistical Report.

In the fourth column of table 1.1, is an attempt at weighting these differences. The number of people served by the network in each county (column A) is divided by the total population of people with disabilities in that county (column B) to obtain a “penetration rate” for each county (A/B). (This is based on the California model.)

The penetration rate represents the percent of the people with disabilities in a county who are currently served, compared to the potential of the full number of people with disabilities in a county. While this is not intended to show the number of people who are not receiving needed services (some people with disabilities are currently able to live independently and don’t need additional services, while others are receiving services from other providers), it is designed to show a relative ranking of which counties seem to be providing Independent Living services to the largest and smallest percentage of their populations of people with disabilities.

The ten counties which have extremely low penetration rates are highlighted in bold and are displayed in table 1.4 below.

Table 1.4 Lowest Penetration Rates by County

NYS County	Penetration Rates
Bronx	0.17%
Livingston	0.23%
Queens	0.23%
New York	0.24%
Suffolk	0.27%
Kings	0.29%
Yates	0.38%
Wyoming	0.52%
Ontario	0.54%
Orleans	0.61%

This analysis helped us sort among a wide range of situations (urban/rural, large/small disability populations). It identifies a relative degree of providing services to a specific population.

The fifth column of table 1.1 (column “C”) shows the total institutionalized population of people with disabilities by county. This is a summary – for more detailed data see Table 1.5A in Appendix II page 25). Table 1.5A shows the institutionalized population broken down by the type of institutions. This data did not previously exist in one place and while this is a good summary, it is not fully complete. Some individuals may return to other counties upon release from the institution. It is also likely that the data does not identify all institutionalized people with disabilities in New York State. However, we believe the chart captures most individuals and is enough to provide a general relative ranking among the counties. This data is taken from the last column of Table 1.5A Total Institutionalized Population by County (page 25).

Table 1.5 Highest Institutionalized Populations by County of People with Disabilities in NYS

NYS County	Highest Institutionalized Population PWD
Queens	20,285
Kings	19,121
Bronx	17,250
Suffolk	15,481
New York	14,774
Nassau	14,437
Westchester	11,650
Erie	11,507
Monroe	9,051
Oneida	5,986

This data was organized to show the potential for needed services if de-institutionalization efforts had full success. The ten counties with highest institutionalized populations have been highlighted in bold and are shown in rank order in Table 1.5 starting with the highest population. Again, these are among the largest counties in the state by population. This data is for general information and was not included in calculations to identify counties with the

greatest need.

This institutionalization data was further analyzed to try to determine which counties had the greatest relative need. In the sixth column of Table 1.1 (C/A), the institutionalized population from column C is divided by the number of people currently served by the network in each county (column A). The result is considered the potential “inundation index” for each county should there be a large de-institutionalization effort. (This is also based on the California model.) The ten counties with the highest Inundation Indices are shown in Table 1.6 below.

Table 1.6 Highest Inundation Indices in NYS by County

NYS County	Inundation Indices
Livingston	76.31
Wyoming	61.24
Bronx	56.01
Suffolk	43.49
Queens	42.89
New York	38.78
Yates	30.82
Orleans	29.30
Kings	27.08
Seneca	18.75

This shows the proportion of people in a county who are institutionalized in relation to the number of people with CSRs in that county. Counties with extremely high inundation indices are most at risk for having their local independent living services overwhelmed if there was a large exodus from local institutions. The ten highest inundation indices are marked in bold and are ranked starting with the highest number in Table 1.6.

Finally, Table 1.7 identifies the ten counties with the greatest need for additional services based on an analysis combining their proportional relative rankings of penetration and inundation rates. The data with the full details is shown in Table 1.7 A (see Appendix II, page 28).

Table 1.7 – What geographic areas are most in need of additional IL services?

Rating is combination of ranking for (penetration rate + inundation rate)	
NYS County	Combined Rating
Livingston	87.1%
Bronx	86.7%
Queens	65.2%
New York	60.0%
Suffolk	59.0%
Wyoming	56.1%
Kings	46.7%
Yates	42.2%
Orleans	32.9%
Ontario	26.0%

A relative ranking analysis was utilized for each of the 62 counties based on their penetration and inundation rates. Their relative ranking was based on the ratio of each county’s rates compared to the rate of the county with the highest rated need (lowest penetration rate and highest inundation index). These two proportions (percentages) were averaged, and the highest average equaled the highest rate of need for services.

From this assessment, the ten counties with the greatest need for additional services (starting with the highest need) were: Livingston, Bronx, Queens, New York, Suffolk, Wyoming, Kings, Yates, Orleans, and Ontario.

Wyoming, Kings, Yates, Orleans, and Ontario.

Question # 2: What unserved / underserved ethnic, minority and disability communities are most in need of IL services?

Center directors were asked to indicate which of 21 different target populations they thought were underserved or hard to reach. The two most underserved disability communities were male and female veterans. The third was rural residents. (See Table 2.4 below for details.)

Tables 2.1 and 2.2 below compare how ethnic and disability groups are served by IL centers in proportion to their representation in the overall disabled population. Table 2.3 shows employment and poverty rates in New York State by type of disability. It was difficult to find data that is organized consistently by category, so the comparisons are not precise. The data shows that the groups that are underrepresented in consumers served by IL centers include Hispanics, Asians, and people with sensory disabilities. Persons with visual disabilities may more often seek services from other providers, or it could represent an increased need by deaf and or deaf/blind community. This data on its own does not necessarily mean that any one category is being underserved. It just raises the question.

Table 2.1 compares how various ethnic groups are served by IL centers in proportion to their representation in the overall disabled population. Most groups are served close to their representation overall, except for Asians, Hispanics and people with disabilities reporting two or more races, who are significantly underrepresented.

Table 2.1 Ethnic Groups served in the IL network compared to overall disability population in NYS

Column A Race/Ethnicity Category	Column B IL Network Service Data By Race/Ethnicity FY 2010-2011 ¹⁰	Column C NYS Disability Characteristics: Rates By Race/Ethnicity ¹¹	Column D Variance (-/+)	Column E Relative comparison of percentages in Columns B & C
American Indian/ Alaska Native	429 (2%)	11,596 (<1%)	+2%	200%
Asian (Includes Pacific Islander)	314 (1%)	80,921(3%)	-2%	33%
Black or African	4,529 (16%)	352,277	+1%	106%

¹⁰ Based on ACCES VR data, yearend statewide totals, FY 2010-2011, Statistical Report; contains some duplicate counts.

¹¹ Based on US Census Bureau, American FactFinder, Disability Characteristics (S1810), 2008-2010 American Community Survey 3-Year Estimates, New York State by County. Assistance locating the data was provided by the Employment and Disability Institute at Cornell University.

American		(15%)		
Hispanic/Latino	2,131 (8%)	337,289 (14%)	-6%	57%
White	18,626 (66%)	1,437,908 (60%)	+6%	110%
Two or more races	364 (1%)	47,845 (2%)	-1%	50%
Other/Unknown	1,667 (6%)	143,372 (6%)	0%	100%
Total	28,060 (100%)	2,411,208 (100%)		

Table 2.2 Types of disability served in the IL network compared to overall disability population in New York State

Type of Disability	IL Network Service Data By Type of Disability FY 2010-2011 ¹²	Adjusted data to exclude mental health disability and multiple disabilities**	NYS Statewide Disability Type ¹³	Percentage Variance Adjusted Data (-/+)
Physical	27,938 (34%)	27,938 (58%)	1,161,163 (42%)	16%
Sensory	5,897 (7%)	5,897 (12%)	881,399 (32%) ¹⁴	-20%
Mental	19,335 (24%)	0**	**	-
Cognitive	14,723 (18%)	14,723 (30%)	753,734 (27%)	3%
Multiple Disabilities	13,358 (17%)	0**	**	-
Total	81,251 (100%)	48,558 (100%)	2,796,296 (100%)	

** The data set the general statewide data did not include mental health disabilities or multiple disabilities, so the comparisons are not accurate. However, when those categories are excluded from the first set of data, there is more of an “apples to apples” comparison.

Note: numbers in table 2.3 include duplicate counts.

Table 2.3¹⁵ Statewide Employment and Poverty Rates by Type of Disability

Type of Disability	Employment Rate	Poverty Rate
--------------------	-----------------	--------------

¹² Based on ACCES VR data, yearend statewide totals, FY 2010-2011, Statistical Report.

¹³ Based on US Census Bureau, American FactFinder, Disability Characteristics (S1810), 2008-2010 American Community Survey 3-Year Estimates, New York State by County.

¹⁴ Combination of hearing and visual disability types.

¹⁵ NYS Disability and Employment Status Report 2009, Employment and Disability Institute, Cornell University, 2009.

Physical	28.9%	28.9%
Sensory	43.2%	25.5%
Mental	25.3%	35.7%

This table shows that the employment rate is highest for those with sensory disabilities and lowest for people with mental health disabilities. Likewise, poverty rates are highest for those with mental health disabilities and lowest for those with sensory disabilities. Data for people with cognitive or multiple disabilities was not available.

On the Center directors’ survey respondents were asked to rate a list of population groups that are most underserved or most difficult to reach. Table 2.4 shows the number of respondents who selected each of the population groups.

Table 2.4 Groups of people with disabilities that are most underserved or hard to reach.

(Sorted by highest response first) (From Center Directors Survey - 30 out of 34 survey individuals responded to this question.)

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Male Veterans	60.0%	18
Female Veterans	56.7%	17
Rural Residents	40.0%	12
Homeless	33.3%	10
Children / Young adults	30.0%	9
Immigrant groups / Non-native English speakers	30.0%	9
Seniors	23.3%	7
Hispanic	23.3%	7
Deaf	23.3%	7
Deaf / Blind	23.3%	7
Blind	20.0%	6
Multi-ethnic	16.7%	5
LGBT	16.7%	5
Mental / emotional disabilities	16.7%	5
Dual diagnosis - intellectual / mental health	16.7%	5
Dual diagnosis - mental health / chemical abuse	16.7%	5
Black non-Hispanic	13.3%	4
American Indian	10.0%	3
Asian/Pacific Islander	10.0%	3
Physical disabilities	10.0%	3
Cognitive disabilities	10.0%	3

Those selecting “immigrant groups/non-native English speakers” were asked to specify which groups in a comment box. The only two immigrant populations that were noted were West African and Middle Eastern. One comment mentioned the need for resources for the homeless, and another for minority populations. One comment identified the middle class as hard to reach thinking they don’t need services and are surprised to find out the IL system can be helpful.

Question #3: What are the most important unmet service needs for New Yorkers with disabilities who live, or wish to live, independently?

This issue was examined through several questions on both the center director and consumer surveys. Consumers were asked about the greatest challenges they face and about which services are most important to help them live independently. Center directors were asked directly to rate which consumer needs were met well, met adequately, or not well met.

Consumers indicated that their greatest challenges were:

1. finances (paying bills)
2. transportation
3. employment.

None of these received more than 47% of the responses, so no single challenge was universally felt. Approximately 20% of respondents added a comment to this question. Many related to the three highest rated challenges and a sizable number also referenced the challenge of finding appropriate helpers in the home, such as *“Securing reliable and friendly people to come into my home and provide support as needed.”* Other comments related to greater acceptance of people with disabilities. *“...More education to become familiar with all disabilities both physical and mental.”*

When this data was filtered by whether consumers lived in rural, urban or suburban settings, the responses were very similar. The top three issues for each were:

Rural	Urban	Suburban
Finances (paying bills)	Employment	Transportation
Transportation	Finances (paying bills)	Finances (paying bills)
Social (needing support from family and friends)	Transportation	Employment

Social (needing support from family and friends) was number four for suburban respondents and number five for urban. Employment was number seven for rural respondents. (For a full display of the responses, for each item in this question, sorted by rural, urban and suburban, see Table 3.1 page 32.)

Center directors were asked to rate how well specific needs for people with disabilities were being met in their community overall. The two needs ranking lowest in being well met in their community echoed the consumers’ highest

rated challenges: employment opportunities and adequate income. Tied for third at the bottom in the center survey were affordable housing and integrated housing (these were combined into one category and rated sixth lowest on the consumer survey).

Consumers were asked which services were most important to help them live independently. Again, no single issue received more than 50% of the consumer responses. Transportation was the highest rated, followed by advocacy and medical / health services. Transportation scored highly as both a challenge and a critical service, so this seems to be an important area to focus on. The results were again fairly consistent when this data was filtered by whether consumers lived in rural, urban or suburban settings.

Rural	Urban	Suburban
Transportation	Advocacy	Transportation
Medical / health services	Transportation	Advocacy
Advocacy	Benefits assistance and advice	Medical / health services

Medical / health services were number four for consumers who were urban respondents, and benefits assistance was five for both rural and suburban consumers. For a full display of the responses for each item in this question sorted by rural, urban and suburban, see Table 3.2 page 33.

Consumers were also asked what services were most readily available and which were not available in their area. The most readily available services were: advocacy, medical / health services and information and referral to other services. Advocacy and medical / health services were also cited as among the top three most important services, so it is especially good that a large number of consumers feel these are readily available.

Consumers were also asked to rate those services that were not available in their area and these all had much lower responses, indicating that overall, services are more available than not. The three least available services were: recreation services, housing services, and peer counseling. However, approximately the same number of consumers said these services *were* readily available, so the data doesn't point strongly to any one service that needs to be expanded. Also, none of the low rated services were ranked as the most important services or the most challenging issues, so while they are important issues, only a small minority finds them unavailable *and* important.

Interestingly, transportation, which was one of the choices, was not rated strongly as unavailable. However, one-third of consumers' comments related to the inadequacy or absence of transportation services. In cases where transportation is severely lacking, consumers feel it strongly. One consumer

indicated that there are lots of services available, but transportation is needed to get to them: *“There is a DESPERATE NEED for paratransit. There are services but NO WAY to get to them.”* Another spoke of the unreliability of transportation services: *“Though transportation is somewhat available, the bus system is horrible and it is very hard to attend events, college/vocational training, and especially hold a job while being considered reliable.”* Another comment focused on the need for more long distance transportation: *“Transportation is available within the community. I have many appointments outside my local community and it is very difficult to find transportation to these appointments.”*

Consumers were asked if they have any other comments about the services that help them live independently. There were 135 comments and the largest number (23, or 17%) were positive statements about the services they currently receive:

- *Access VR and Search for Change are helping me*
- *So far, I have been exceptionally fortunate in finding services and support*
- *My local Independent Living Center and case manager are excellent*
- *The staff is well trained and concerned about creating barriers inadvertently*
- *I just appreciate the help.*

There were a few negative comments as well:

- *In the 25 years I've lived here, all the existing services have been a great disappointment. Most the time, I do better by going it alone & not counting on anyone's help (which always falls short of the need)!*
- *There should be independent oversight of agencies, and real consequences when administrators misbehave.*

In addition, there were 10 comments for each of the following needs: transportation, housing and expanded services.

Several consumers commented on their appreciation for NYSILC conducting this survey: *“Thank you for this survey.”*

Question #4: *What are the most important needs that the SILC should address to strengthen New York's independent living network?*

The Center survey addressed this question by asking center directors about barriers they faced in delivering existing services and in expanding or starting new services.

Not surprisingly, the major barriers to current, expanded or new services were lack of financial resources and the restrictions that were part of current funding. The other high ranking barrier was lack of transportation for consumers. This lined up with a major need identified by consumers.

When Center directors were asked which services they wanted to initiate or expand to better address needs in their area, the top rated ones were: architectural barrier services, benefits advisement, advocacy/legal services and vocational services. This lines up well with many of the consumers' highest rated needs. (This summary reflects the data for new and expanded services in combination. Overall, there was less interest in starting new services than in expanding existing services.)

When asked to respond to a list of resources that would be needed to overcome these barriers, center directors reported that additional funding was number one for existing services, expansion and starting new services. Additional space/infrastructure was also cited as a needed resource for all three. Transportation for consumers was ranked high as an important resource for overcoming barriers to existing services; but for expanding or starting new services, more assistance from local and state providers was the third highest rated. This might reflect the need for advice, technical assistance or new networks that are needed to start or expand services.

Center directors were also asked what services are no longer needed. None of the services listed received more than 3 votes out of 34.

Another question looked at how to strengthen the services network to better reach unserved/underserved groups. Nearly two-thirds of center directors cited the need for more outreach. This lines up well with consumer feedback on the need for increased outreach. A few center directors cited more funding for staff and programs, and several cited opening satellite offices. One expressed the need for advice and training.

In the consumer survey, consumers were also asked questions related to strengthening the services network. One question asked consumers: What

would make it easiest for you to access services at your local Independent Living Center (ILC)?

Transportation was the highest rated selection which lines up with findings from both consumers and center directors as to this being a critical barrier to service. The next two highest rated suggestions both related to increasing outreach, which again parallels the findings from the Center survey. These two selections were home visits and for centers to advertise existing services. There were a large number of consumer comments (217) on this question and many of the comments also reflected these top choices. Comments related to outreach were the most common (45 comments) and transportation was second (31 comments).

The majority of the outreach related comments asked for increased home visits, closer satellite facilities, increased on-line information, and advertising to inform them about the availability of services and events. They include recommendations as to how to get the word out: *“Mail out information packets for new services as they become available.” “Tell what services they offer; create email updates; put articles in journal news services; have seminars and advertise.”* Outreach comments also meant literally getting out of the center to reach out: *“Be ready and willing and able to go out in the field.” “Come to my house.”*

Many of the comments asked if there was a center in their area and/or indicated they didn't know enough about ILC's to comment. *“I don't even know where there is one in my area.”*

There were a number of comments indicating satisfaction with current services and access:

“I'm satisfied with the services I receive at this time.” “The help we DO get is TERRIFIC.” Other comments indicated a need for increased staff and services and faster response times: *“The current services they offer are limited and not individualized.” “More one on one and more added timed with your counselors.” “More immediate response to request for services.”*

To broaden the focus, consumers were also asked where else they go to receive services or support that helps them live independently. Counseling or therapy was the highest rated response, at 43%. Half of those who selected this reported having a mental health disability and the other half reported a range of other disabilities. The second highest other services was internet resources and social services was third. Internet resources reflect the comments from the prior question regarding a desire for more on-line information and access.

And finally, consumers were asked how often they were able to resolve problems they might have with service agencies. Nearly two-thirds said they always, or most of the time, are able to resolve problems or that this was not applicable, meaning they did not generally have problems with service agencies.

Only 8% said they could never resolve problems, and 30% said they were only sometimes able to resolve problems.

Comparison with results from NYAIL needs assessment 2008.

NYAIL results and comments are in bold italic font.

Overall, the results from the NYSILC and NYAIL surveys were fairly consistent.

Table 2.4 From Center Directors Survey: Groups of people with disabilities that are underserved or hard to reach. (Sorted by highest response first on NYSILC survey)

Answer Options	Response Percent	NYAIL
Male Veterans	60.0%	<i>n/a</i>
Female Veterans	56.7%	<i>n/a</i>
Rural Residents	40.0%	24%
Homeless	33.3%	<i>n/a</i>
Children / Young adults	30.0%	13%
Immigrant groups / Non-native English speakers	30.0%	24%
Seniors	23.3%	13%
Hispanic	23.3%	*
Deaf	23.3%	<i>n/a</i>
Deaf / Blind	23.3%	<i>n/a</i>
Blind	20.0%	<i>n/a</i>
Multi-ethnic	16.7%	<i>n/a</i>
LGBT	16.7%	<i>n/a</i>
Mental / emotional disabilities	16.7%	<i>n/a</i>
Dual diagnosis - intellectual / mental health	16.7%	<i>n/a</i>
Dual diagnosis - mental health / chemical abuse	16.7%	<i>n/a</i>
Black non-Hispanic	13.3%	*
American Indian	10.0%	*
Asian/Pacific Islander	10.0%	*
Physical disabilities	10.0%	<i>n/a</i>
Cognitive disabilities	10.0%	<i>n/a</i>

* **Combined Into one category: racial/ethnic minorities – 18%**

n/a: Note: the NYAIL survey had fewer categories and those marked “n/a” were not listed on the NYAIL survey. The deaf population was most frequently cited in the “other” category on the NYAIL survey

Consumers were asked what their greatest challenges were:

1. finances (paying bills) ***(NYAIL: same)***
2. transportation ***(NYAIL: same)***
3. employment ***(NYAIL: was fourth behind medical/health coverage)***

Center directors were asked to rate how specific needs for people with disabilities were being met in their community overall. The two needs that were least well met were: employment opportunities ***(NYAIL: 2)*** and adequate income ***(NYAIL: 1)***. Tied for third at the bottom were affordable housing ***(NYAIL: 3)*** and integrated housing.

Consumers were asked to rate which services were most important to help them live independently. Transportation was the highest rated ***(NYAIL: transportation and mobility services)***, followed by advocacy ***(NYAIL: 3rd)*** and medical / health services ***(NYAIL: 6th) (NYAIL: Benefits assistance and advice was second.)***

Consumers were also asked to rate services that were not available in their area. The three most unavailable services were: recreation services ***(NYAIL: 6)***, housing services ***(NYAIL: 4)***, and peer counseling ***(NYAIL: 8)***, ***(NYAIL: Transportation was number one, medical services 2, and employment services 3.)***

Center directors were asked what barriers they faced in delivering existing services and in expanding or starting new services. The major barriers to current, expanded or new services were lack of financial resources ***(NYAIL: 1)*** and the restrictions that were part of current funding ***(NYAIL: 2)***. The other high ranking barrier was lack of transportation for consumers ***(NYAIL: 2 - tied)***.

When asked to respond to a list of resources that would be needed to overcome these barriers, center directors reported that additional funding was number one for existing services, expansion and starting new services ***(NYAIL was the same for all three)***. Additional space/infrastructure was also cited as a needed resource ***(NYAIL: 3, 4, 3 respectively for existing, expanding, starting new)***. Transportation for consumers was ranked highly as an important resource for overcoming barriers to existing services ***(NYAIL: 2)***; but for expanding or starting new services, more assistance from local and state providers was the third highest rated ***(NYAIL: 6, 5 respectively)***. ***In second place on the NYAIL survey for expanding new services was a public relations plan and for starting new services was training/technical assistance)***.

When asked how to strengthen the services network to better reach unserved/underserved groups, nearly two-thirds of center directors cited the need for more outreach (*NYAIL: similar*)

In the consumer survey, consumers were asked what would make it easiest for them to access services at their local Independent Living Center (ILC). Transportation was the highest rated selection (*NYAIL: 2*). The next two highest rated suggestions were home visits (*NYAIL: 5*) and for centers to advertise existing services (*NYAIL: 3*). *On the NYAIL survey, expanding services was number 1.*

Consumers were also asked how often they were able to resolve problems they might have with service agencies. Sixty-two percent (**56%**) said they always, or most of the time, are able to resolve problems, or that this was not applicable, meaning they did not generally have problems with service agencies. Only 8% (**6%**) said they could never resolve problems, and 30% (**37%**) said they were only sometimes able to resolve problems.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Based on the data collected and analyzed, NYSILC has identified a number of priority areas for resources and services. These findings will be combined with other input collected through the SPIL planning process to guide the emphasis for the next three year plan.

The following are the recommendations that come from this needs assessment:

1) Increase resources for the following geographic areas most in need of IL services:

- Livingston
- Bronx
- Queens
- New York
- Suffolk
- Wyoming
- Kings
- Yates
- Orleans
- Ontario.

2) Increase resources for the following most underserved populations most in need of IL services:

- Male veterans with disabilities
- Female veterans with disabilities

- Rural residents with disabilities
- Homeless individuals with disabilities
- Young adults with disabilities
- Immigrants with disabilities
- Hispanic/Latinos and Asians with disabilities
- Institutionalized individuals with disabilities.

For a few of these underserved groups, this is the second consecutive SPIL cycle that they have been identified. As a result, their persistent need has to be recognized:

- Veterans with disabilities
- Homeless individuals with disabilities
- Young adults with disabilities
- Hispanic/Latinos and Asians with disabilities.

3) Direct increased resources to the following most important service needs of New Yorkers with disabilities:

- Finances/paying bills
- Transportation
- Employment
- Advocacy
- Medical/health issues
- Poverty.

4) The most important resources to strengthen the IL center network:

- Additional financial resources
- Transportation for consumers
- Additional space/infrastructure
- Increased awareness about ILCs.

5) An effort should be made to better identify and help more of the disabled institutionalized population in New York State transition to Independent Living.

The following is recommended:

- The IL center network should plan local strategies to transition as many of the 220,277 individuals to the “most integrated setting” per Olmstead.
- Undertake efforts to direct system change to make all state agencies post institutionalized data publically as NYS OMH currently does for better planning and for tracking of institutional bias.

Appendices

The following pages include:

- Appendix I: a list of the Needs Assessment Committee members.
- Appendix II: tables and charts with additional statistical data that relates to the tables for questions 1 and 2 above.
- Appendix III: tables and charts from the Consumer survey that provides a respondent profile.
- Appendix IV: tables and charts from the Center and Consumer surveys that provide additional data for some of the questions.
- Appendix V: copies of the two surveys used in the study.

Appendix I: List of the NYSILC Needs Assessment Committee (NAC) members

Council Members:

- Chair, Denise Figueroa, NYSILC, ILCHV, dfigueroa@ilchv.org.
- Melanie Shaw, NYSILC, NYAIL, mshaw@ilny.org.
- Chad Underwood, NYSILC, ATI Cortland, cwunderwood@aticortland.org.
- Carla Lewis-Irizarry, NYSILC, Carlalewis34@gmail.com.
- Susan Ruff, NYSILC, STIC, advocate@stic-cil.org.
- Julie Cardone, NYSILC, CBVH, Julie.cardone@ocfs.state.ny.us.

Non-Council Members:

- Joe Bravo, jbravo@wilc.org.
- Doug Usiak, Former NYSILC Chair, WNYIL, djusiak@buffalo.edu.
- Fred Ayers, ACCES-VR, fayers@mail.nysed.gov.
- Brad Williams, NYSILC Executive Director, bradw@nysilc.org.
- Alan Krieger, Krieger Solutions, Consultant, alan@kriegersolutions.com.

Appendix II: Tables and charts with additional statistical data that relates to the tables for questions 1 and 2 above

Table 1.5A: State Institutionalized Population by County

NYS County	DOH Nursing Home ¹⁶	DOH Assisted Living ¹⁷	OPWDD Developmental Center ¹⁸	OPWDD All Other Group Home Care ¹⁹	OMH Psychiatric Or RTF ²⁰	OMH All Other Community Care ²¹	Correctional Facilities ²² <i>(Represents 31% of the total number)²³</i>	Total Institutionalized Population²⁴ <i>(Top Ten Counties Highlighted in Bold)</i>
Albany	1,789	73		733	261	830		3,686
Allegany	304	2		75	3	41		425
Bronx	11,217	542 ²⁵		1,779	976	2,736		17,250
Broome	1,439	77	183	374	173	417		2,663
Cattaraugus	527	27		348	32	112		1,046

¹⁶ This data was not available to the public. It was requested from the state agency and refused. Data obtained by formal FOIA request to NYS DOH. "Number of residents in Nursing Homes by County and Ownership." It includes columns for State/County/Municipal nursing homes and Private nursing homes.

¹⁷ This data was not available to the public. It was requested from the state agency and refused. Data obtained by formal FOIA request to NYS DOH. "NYS Medicaid Recipients in Assisted Living Programs By County of Fiscal Responsibility, Calendar Year, 2011" (Claims as of April 2012).

¹⁸ This data was not available to the public. It was requested from the state agency that has the primary authority NYS OPWDD and refused. It was further explained that such data would have to be obtained through a FOIA request to NYS DOH. The request was made and the data was obtained for only developmental centers, "Number of Clients by County in NYS Development Center as of 1/1/2012."

¹⁹ This data was not available to the public. Several requests were made by NYSILC by staff, a council member, and a consultant to the NYS OPWDD Commissioner's Office for the information. Eventually the request was honored by early July 2012, providing the breakdown of individuals living in all other OPWDD residential group home care settings by county (excluding developmental centers) as of March 2012.

²⁰ This data was obtained via NYS OMH website at the following link, <http://bi.omh.ny.gov/pcs/Summary%20Reports?pageeval=prog-re>. It consists of the following categories: Psychiatric Centers and Residential Treatment Facilities (RTF's).

²¹ This data was obtained via NYS OMH website at the following link, <http://bi.omh.ny.gov/pcs/Summary%20Reports?pageeval=prog-re>. It consists of the following categories: Private Residences (which includes unlicensed supported housing, independent living and living with family), Licensed MH Housing, Adult Care, Foster Care, Youth-Community Based, Homeless, Youth Institution-Residential Treatment Center, Youth Institution-Juvenile Justice Facility, Nursing Home, Incarcerated, Inpatient or Residential Treatment Facility, and Other.

²² This data was not available to the public. It was requested from the state agency and refused. It was explained that a FOIA request needed to be sent to the State Commission of Correction. The Office of Counsel responded back to the FOIA request that they had "no such documents responsive to the request." Outraged, NYSILC staff looked up state legislators with corrections committee assignments and found a local Assembly member. They were informed of the situation and provided with the documentation. The Assembly member's office investigated the situation and came up with the data that previously "didn't exist," NYS Department of Corrections and Community Supervision Daily Population Capacity Report (6/7/12)" for all levels of correctional and treatment facilities in the State.

²³ The figures in this column have been prorated to 31% of the total amounts based on the following report. Research Brief: A Review of Disability Data for the Institutional Population, Cornell University Rehabilitation Research and Training Center on Disability Demographics and Statistics, <http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1205&context=edicollect>. "Disability in the Incarcerated Population: Based on data from three Department of Justice (DOJ) surveys ...31 percent of state prison inmates...report a disability of some sort. Mental and learning disabilities are particularly prevalent in the jail and state prison populations."

²⁴ The Total Institutionalized Population figures will be transferred over to the fourth column of Table 1.1 for the number of individuals institutionalized per county.

²⁵ Figure based on total number given for New York City prorated for each county/borough based on a percentage scale according to ACS disability statistics.

NYS County	DOH Nursing Home ¹⁶	DOH Assisted Living ¹⁷	OPWDD Developmental Center ¹⁸	OPWDD All Other Group Home Care ¹⁹	OMH Psychiatric Or RTF ²⁰	OMH All Other Community Care ²¹	Correctional Facilities ²² <i>(Represents 31% of the total number)²³</i>	Total Institutionalized Population²⁴ <i>(Top Ten Counties Highlighted in Bold)</i>
Cayuga	558	71		158	63	142	325	1,317
Chautauqua	1,006	212		431	46	222	268	2,185
Chemung	708	14		239	149	405	832	2,347
Chenango	520	2	47	102	22	37		730
Clinton	440	21		161	54	126	1,002	1,804
Columbia	630	17		218	24	37	118	1,044
Cortland	364	1		122	8	33		528
Delaware	324	6	116	130	2	26		604
Dutchess	1,795	197		928	152	710	1,608	5,390
Erie	5,675	260		2,303	552	1,638	1,079	11,507
Essex	291	12		236	5	8	166	718
Franklin	197		183	271	6	58	1,019	1,734
Fulton	321	43		395	9	99	163	1,030
Genesee	465			121	5	71		662
Greene	248	34		87	4	30	812	1,215
Hamilton		1		75	0	0		76
Herkimer	490	5		212	5	47		759
Jefferson	517	2		205	56	157	444	1,381
Kings	9,965	715 ²⁶	265	2,935	1,370	3,871		19,121
Lewis	153	0		88	1	7		249
Livingston	338	1		284	5	14	579	1,221
Madison	377	7		166	2	27		579
Monroe	4,995	159	122	1,735	471	1,545	24	9,051
Montgomery	526	44		219	30	167		986
Nassau	6,831	198		1,770	1,469	4,169		14,437
New York ⁱ	6,410	468 ²⁷		1,022	1,695	4,619	560	14,774
Niagara	1,344	167		420	74	281		2,286
Oneida	2,465	186		944	355	647	1,389	5,986
Onondaga	2,828	338		641	265	693		4,765
Ontario	559	28		368	20	122		1,097
Orange	1,331	70		866	266	641	177	3,351
Orleans	281	6		73	7	23	577	967
Oswego	585	14		119	32	85		835
Otsego	375	31		245	45	69		765
Putnam	285	13		246	3	164		711
Queens	11,477	616 ²⁸	79	1,963	1,342	4,725	83	20,285
Rensselaer	1,194	75	40	309	83	267		1,968
Richmond	2,896	123 ²⁹	40	1,006	457	1,060		5,582

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Ibid.

NYS County	DOH Nursing Home ¹⁶	DOH Assisted Living ¹⁷	OPWDD Developmental Center ¹⁸	OPWDD All Other Group Home Care ¹⁹	OMH Psychiatric Or RTF ²⁰	OMH All Other Community Care ²¹	Correctional Facilities ²² <i>(Represents 31% of the total number)²³</i>	Total Institutionalized Population²⁴ <i>(Top Ten Counties Highlighted in Bold)</i>
Rockland	1,551	148		1,095	451	1,067		4,312
Saratoga	758	8		419	167	220	130	1,702
Schenectady	1,014	18	46	431	100	250		1,859
Schoharie		34		102	1	22		159
Schuyler	119	30		64	3	30	63	309
Seneca	271	7		132	4	373	244	1,031
St. Lawrence	650	41		355	239	397	690	2,372
Steuben	639	12		213	51	155		1,070
Suffolk	8,115	444		2,949	1,059	2,914		15,481
Sullivan	416	9		793	22	226	350	1,816
Tioga	251	21		74	0	20		366
Tompkins	428	2		201	32	148		811
Ulster	1,180	82		601	54	226	905	3,048
Warren	378	6		193	49	114		740
Washington	502	3		175	8	52	737	1,477
Wayne	512	26		376	7	77	89	1,087
Westchester	6,079	83		1,580	1,140	1,925	843	11,650
Wyoming	188	1		96	21	48	1,177	1,531
Yates	191	2		84	4	58		339
TOTALS	108,282	5,855	1,121	35,055	14,011	39,500	16,453	220,277

Table 1.7A Ranking by penetration rate; inundation index, and overall combined ranking.

NYS County	CSRs Served by IL Network	# Incidence of Disability	Penetration Rate	# Institutionalized	Inundation Index	Proportional ranking by penetration rate	Proportional ranking by inundation rate	Average percent
Albany	760	34,197	2.22%	3,686	4.85	7.53%	6.36%	6.95%
Allegany	165	6,855	2.41%	425	2.58	6.96%	3.38%	5.17%
Bronx	308	183,928	0.17%	17,250	56.01	100%	73.39%	86.70%
Broome	877	28,507	3.08%	2,663	3.04	5.44%	3.98%	4.71%
Cattaraugus	649	11,518	5.63%	1,046	1.61	2.97%	2.11%	2.54%
Cayuga	543	9,486	5.72%	1,317	2.43	2.93%	3.18%	3.05%
Chautauqua	430	19,412	2.22%	2,185	5.08	7.56%	6.66%	7.11%
Chemung	264	12,714	2.08%	2,347	8.89	8.06%	11.65%	9.86%
Chenango	256	8,383	3.05%	730	2.85	5.48%	3.74%	4.61%
Clinton	116	11,076	1.05%	1,804	15.55	15.99%	20.38%	18.18%
Columbia	161	7,486	2.15%	1,044	6.48	7.79%	8.50%	8.14%
Cortland	198	5,399	3.67%	528	2.67	4.57%	3.49%	4.03%
Delaware	231	7,525	3.07%	604	2.61	5.46%	3.43%	4.44%
Dutchess	588	35,270	1.67%	5,390	9.17	10.04%	12.01%	11.03%
Erie	1,992	115,455	1.73%	11,507	5.78	9.71%	7.57%	8.64%
Essex	41	5,238	0.78%	718	17.51	21.39%	22.95%	22.17%
Franklin	160	6,101	2.62%	1,734	10.84	6.39%	14.20%	10.29%
Fulton	187	8,314	2.25%	1,030	5.51	7.45%	7.22%	7.33%
Genesee	291	7,844	3.71%	662	2.27	4.51%	2.98%	3.75%
Greene	96	5,737	1.67%	1,215	12.66	10.01%	16.58%	13.30%
Hamilton	10	701 ³⁰	1.43%	76	7.60	11.74%	9.96%	10.85%
Herkimer	608	8,859	6.86%	759	1.25	2.44%	1.64%	2.04%
Jefferson	834	14,708	5.67%	1,381	1.66	2.95%	2.17%	2.56%
Kings	706	244,165	0.29%	19,121	27.08	57.91%	35.49%	46.70%
Lewis	163	3,525	4.62%	249	1.53	3.62%	2.00%	2.81%
Livingston	16	7,107	0.23%	1,221	76.31	74.38%	100.00%	87.19%
Madison	242	7,329	3.30%	579	2.39	5.07%	3.14%	4.10%

³⁰ There were no figures given the ACS-census data for the incidence of disability in Hamilton and Schuylar counties. The figures used above were derived from taking the average rate of disability in the 60 available counties (13.04%), multiplied by the total population of the individual county.

Monroe	1,721	89,275	1.93%	9,051	5.26	8.69%	6.89%	7.79%
Montgomery	496	8,144	6.09%	986	1.99	2.75%	2.60%	2.68%
Nassau	976	114,837	0.85%	14,437	14.79	19.70%	19.38%	19.54%
New York	381	157,488	0.24%	14,774	38.78	69.22%	50.81%	60.02%
Niagara	578	28,810	2.01%	2,286	3.96	8.35%	5.18%	6.76%
Oneida	2,221	34,114	6.51%	5,986	2.70	2.57%	3.53%	3.05%
Onondaga	1,253	52,720	2.38%	4,765	3.80	7.05%	4.98%	6.01%
Ontario	69	12,863	0.54%	1,097	15.90	31.22%	20.83%	26.03%
Orange	815	41,385	1.97%	3,351	4.11	8.50%	5.39%	6.95%
Orleans	33	5,402	0.61%	967	29.30	27.41%	38.40%	32.91%
Oswego	790	15,843	4.99%	835	1.06	3.36%	1.39%	2.37%
Otsego	261	8,719	2.99%	765	2.93	5.59%	3.84%	4.72%
Putnam	238	8,637	2.76%	711	2.99	6.08%	3.91%	5.00%
Queens	473	209,722	0.23%	20,285	42.89	74.25%	56.20%	65.22%
Rensselaer	354	20,251	1.75%	1,968	5.56	9.58%	7.28%	8.43%
Richmond	894	45,649	1.96%	5,582	6.24	8.55%	8.18%	8.37%
Rockland	441	24,335	1.81%	4,312	9.78	9.24%	12.81%	11.03%
Saratoga	579	20,813	2.78%	1,702	2.94	6.02%	3.85%	4.94%
Schenectady	264	17,636	1.50%	1,859	7.04	11.19%	9.23%	10.21%
Schoharie	65	4,964	1.31%	159	2.45	12.79%	3.21%	8.00%
Schuyler	101	2,440 ³¹	4.14%	309	3.06	4.05%	4.01%	4.03%
Seneca	55	4,847	1.13%	1,031	18.75	14.76%	24.56%	19.66%
St. Lawrence	272	16,629	1.64%	2,372	8.72	10.24%	11.43%	10.83%
Steuben	445	14,869	2.99%	1,070	2.40	5.60%	3.15%	4.37%
Suffolk	356	129,856	0.27%	15,481	43.49	61.08%	56.98%	59.03%
Sullivan	194	11,515	1.68%	1,816	9.36	9.94%	12.27%	11.10%
Tioga	105	6,456	1.63%	366	3.49	10.30%	4.57%	7.43%
Tompkins	246	9,467	2.60%	811	3.30	6.44%	4.32%	5.38%
Ulster	572	23,952	2.39%	3,048	5.33	7.01%	6.98%	7.00%
Warren	524	8,025	6.53%	740	1.41	2.56%	1.85%	2.21%
Washing-	344	7,061	4.87%	1,477	4.29	3.44%	5.63%	4.53%

³¹ There were no figures given the ACS-census data for the incidence of disability in Hamilton and Schuyler counties. The figures used above were derived from taking the average rate of disability in the 60 available counties (13.04%), multiplied by the total population of the individual county.

ton								
Wayne	103	12,036	0.86%	1,087	10.55	19.57%	13.83%	16.70%
West- chester	821	81,330	1.01%	11,650	14.19	16.59%	18.59%	17.59%
Wyoming	25	4,768	0.52 %	1,531	61.24	31.94%	80.25%	56.09%
Yates	11	2,897	0.38 %	339	30.82	44.10%	40.38%	42.24%

Appendix III: Tables and charts from the consumer survey that provides a respondent profile. Total number of respondents = 578

Do you live in a rural, urban or suburban location?

Rural	30.1%	162
Urban	25.8%	139
Suburban	44.2%	238
<i>answered question</i>		539

Race/ethnic group:

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
American Indian	1.1%	6
Black non-Hispanic	7.9%	43
Asian/Pacific Islander	2.4%	13
Hispanic	3.7%	20
White	79.9%	437
Multi-ethnic (More than one)	3.8%	21
Other (please specify)	1.3%	7
<i>answered question</i>		547

Age range:

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Under 6 years old	0.0%	0
6-17 years old	9.2%	51
18-22 years old	7.4%	41
23-54 years old	49.5%	275
55-64 years old	22.2%	123
65-74 years old	7.0%	39
75 years and older	4.7%	26
<i>answered question</i>		555

What region of the state do you live in? N = 535

Region	Responses
NORTH COUNTRY: Franklin, Clinton, Essex, Hamilton, St. Lawrence, Warren, Washington, Jefferson, Lewis	28
CAPITAL DISTRICT: Albany, Schenectady, Rensselaer, Saratoga, Fulton, Montgomery, Schoharie, Columbia, Greene)	84
LOWER HUDSON VALLEY: Westchester, Rockland, Orange, Putnam, Sullivan, Dutchess, Ulster	133
SOUTHERN TIER: Delaware, Broome, Tioga, Chemung, Schuyler, Chenango, Otsego	27
CENTRAL: Herkimer, Madison, Oneida, Oswego, Onondaga, Cayuga, Tompkins, Cortland	119
WESTERN: Chautauqua, Cattaraugus, Erie, Allegany, Wyoming, Orleans, Niagara, Genesee	59
FINGER LAKES: Wayne, Steuben, Livingston, Yates, Ontario, Seneca, Monroe	28
NEW YORK CITY: Brooklyn, Queens, Staten Island, Manhattan, Bronx	38
LONG ISLAND: Nassau, Suffolk	19
Total responding	535

Please describe your disability. (Respondents were asked to check all that apply, so the total number of responses (861) exceeds the number of respondents (536)).

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Cognitive Disabilities	28.4%	152
Mental Health Disabilities	37.1%	199
Physical Disabilities	45.1%	242
Sensory Disabilities	14.6%	78
Multiple Disabilities	17.0%	91
Other (please specify)	18.5%	99
	answered question	536

19 comments identified as autism; 11 listed a brain or head injury.

Appendix IV: Tables and charts from the Center and Consumer surveys that provide additional data for some of the questions.

Table 3.1 N= 539 total

Rural respondents N= 162		Urban respondents N= 139		Suburban Respondents N=238	
Finances (paying bills)	49%	Employment	49%	Transportation	47%
Transportation	46%	Finances (paying bills)	49%	Finances (paying bills)	47%
Social (needing support from family and friends)	39%	Transportation	44%	Employment	46%
Medical/health coverage	38%	Housing (accessibility, affordability)	38%	Social (needing support from family and friends)	40%
Recreation	36%	Social (needing support from family and friends)	37%	Housing (accessibility, affordability)	35%
Housing (accessibility, affordability)	31%	Medical/health coverage	35%	Medical/health coverage	35%
Employment	31%	Recreation	31%	Recreation	34%
Applying for benefits	21%	Personal care (eating, bathing, housekeeping)	26%	Education	29%
Education	21%	Applying for benefits	24%	Personal care (eating, bathing, housekeeping)	23%
Mobility (accessibility, assistive devices)	20%	Mobility (accessibility, assistive devices)	24%	Applying for benefits	21%
Personal care (eating, bathing, housekeeping)	20%	Education	21%	Discrimination	19%
Discrimination	13%	Discrimination	20%	Mobility (accessibility, assistive devices)	17%

**Table 3.2 N= 539 total
Consumer Survey Q2: What services are most important to you for Independent Living?**

(filtered by rural / urban / suburban)

Rural respondents N= 162		Urban respondents N= 139		Suburban Respondents N=238	
Transportation	50%	Advocacy	49%	Transportation	51%
Medical / health services	48%	Transportation	49%	Advocacy	49%
Advocacy	44%	Benefits assistance and advice	49%	Medical / health services	48%
Information and referral to other services	44%	Medical / health services	45%	Employment / work readiness services	46%
Benefits assistance and advice	41%	Employment / work readiness services	41%	Benefits assistance and advice	44%
Employment / work readiness services	32%	Information and referral to other services	38%	Housing services	38%
Recreation services	31%	Housing services	37%	Information and referral to other services	36%
Home care / personal assistance services	29%	Home care / personal assistance services	29%	Education services	32%
Independent living skills training	28%	Independent living skills training	27%	Independent living skills training	32%
Housing services	27%	Education services	25%	Home care / personal assistance services	30%
Family services	20%	Peer counseling	25%	Recreation services	28%
Education services	16%	Recreation services	25%	Peer counseling	24%
Mobility services	15%	Mobility services	16%	Family services	14%
Assistive devices training	12%	Family services	14%	Mobility services	12%
Peer counseling	12%	Assistive devices training	13%	Assistive devices training	11%

Appendix V: Copies of the two surveys used in the study

NYSILC Consumer Survey

(This is the text version of the survey as an alternative to the on-line version.)

1. What are the most challenging issues you face day to day?

Check all that apply.

- Medical/health coverage
- Employment
- Transportation
- Finances (paying bills)
- Discrimination
- Applying for benefits
- Recreation
- Education
- Mobility (accessibility, assistive devices)
- Social (needing support from family and friends)
- Housing (accessibility, affordability)
- Personal care (eating, bathing, housekeeping)
- Other (please specify)

2. What services do you use that are most important for you to continue living independently? Check all that are most important.

If you have questions about the meaning of terms used in the next two questions, see the list at the end of this document.

- Advocacy
- Assistive devices training
- Benefits assistance and advice
- Education services
- Employment / work readiness services
- Family services
- Home care / personal assistance services
- Housing services
- Independent living skills training
- Information and referral to other services
- Medical / health services
- Mobility services
- Peer counseling
- Recreation services
- Transportation
- Other (please specify)

3. How available are the following services in your area? Please rate each one.

	Readily available	Somewhat available	Not available	N/A
a) Advocacy				
b) Assistive devices training				
c) Benefits Assistance and Advice				
d) Education services				
e) Employment / work readiness services				
f) Family services				
g) Home care/personal assistance services				
h) Housing services				
i) Independent living skills training				
j) Information and referral to other services				
k) Medical/health services				
l) Mobility services				
m) Peer counseling				
n) Recreation services				
o) Transportation				

Comment / Other (please specify)

4. Rank the following items in order of which would make it easiest for you to access services at your local Independent Living Center. Use 1 as the most important and 6 as the least important.

- ___ Expand services
- ___ Expand hours of operation (nights and weekends)
- ___ Hire additional staff
- ___ Advertise existing services
- ___ Make home visits
- ___ Expand transportation to / from the center

5. How else could your local Independent Living Center make it easier for you to access services? Please describe below.

6. Where else do you go to receive services or support to help you live independently? Check all that apply.

- School
- Hospital
- Place of worship
- Community center
- Counseling / Therapy
- Place of employment
- Social services
- Park or gymnasium
- College or university
- Internet resources
- Group meetings
- Physical therapy
- Other disability agencies
- Other (please specify)

7. If you have problems with service agencies, how often are you able to resolve them? Check one answer.

- Never
- Sometimes
- Most of the time
- Always
- Not applicable

8. Please check one answer for your age.

- Under 6 years old
- 6-17 years old
- 18-22 years old
- 23-54 years old
- 55-64 years old
- 65-74 years old
- 75 years and older

9. Please check one answer for your race/ethnic group.

- American Indian
- Black non-Hispanic
- Asian/Pacific Islander
- Hispanic
- White
- Multi-ethnic (More than one)
- Other (please specify)

10. Please describe your disability. Check all that apply.

- Cognitive Disabilities
- Mental Health Disabilities
- Physical Disabilities
- Sensory Disabilities
- Multiple Disabilities

___ Other (please specify)

11. Do you have any other comments about the services that help you to live independently? Use this space to reply.

12. What county do you live in?

- | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| ___ Albany County | ___ New York County (Manhattan) |
| ___ Allegany County | ___ Niagara County |
| ___ Bronx County | ___ Oneida County |
| ___ Broome County | ___ Onondaga County |
| ___ Cattaraugus County | ___ Ontario County |
| ___ Cayuga County | ___ Orange County |
| ___ Chautauqua County | ___ Orleans County |
| ___ Chemung County | ___ Oswego County |
| ___ Chenango County | ___ Otsego County |
| ___ Clinton County | ___ Putnam County |
| ___ Columbia County | ___ Queens County |
| ___ Cortland County | ___ Rensselaer County |
| ___ Delaware County | ___ Richmond County (Staten Island) |
| ___ Dutchess County | ___ Rockland County |
| ___ Erie County | ___ St. Lawrence County |
| ___ Essex County | ___ Saratoga County |
| ___ Franklin County | ___ Schenectady County |
| ___ Fulton County | ___ Schoharie County |
| ___ Genesee County | ___ Schuyler County |
| ___ Greene County | ___ Seneca County |
| ___ Hamilton County | ___ Steuben County |
| ___ Herkimer County | ___ Suffolk County |
| ___ Jefferson County | ___ Sullivan County |
| ___ Kings County (Brooklyn) | ___ Tioga County |
| ___ Lewis County | ___ Tompkins County |
| ___ Livingston County | ___ Ulster County |
| ___ Madison County | ___ Warren County |
| ___ Monroe County | ___ Washington County |
| ___ Montgomery County | ___ Wayne County |
| ___ Nassau County | ___ Westchester County |
| | ___ Wyoming County |
| | ___ Yates County |

13. What region of the state do you live in?

- __NORTH COUNTRY:** Franklin, Clinton, Essex, Hamilton, St. Lawrence, Warren, Washington, Jefferson, Lewis
- __CAPITAL DISTRICT:** Albany, Schenectady, Rensselaer, Saratoga, Fulton, Montgomery, Schoharie, Columbia, Greene)
- __LOWER HUDSON VALLEY:** Westchester, Rockland, Orange, Putnam, Sullivan, Dutchess, Ulster
- __SOUTHERN TIER:** Delaware, Broome, Tioga, Chemung, Schuyler, Chenango, Otsego
- __CENTRAL:** Herkimer, Madison, Oneida, Oswego, Onondaga, Cayuga, Tompkins, Cortland
- __WESTERN:** Chautauqua, Cattaraugus, Erie, Allegany, Wyoming, Orleans, Niagara, Genesee
- __FINGER LAKES:** Wayne, Steuben, Livingston, Yates, Ontario, Seneca, Monroe
- __NEW YORK CITY:** Brooklyn, Queens, Staten Island, Manhattan, Bronx
- __LONG ISLAND:** Nassau, Suffolk

14. Do you live in a rural, urban or suburban location?

- Rural Urban Suburban

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS SURVEY!

If you would like to be entered into our drawing for a gift or gas card, please give us your name, address and phone number below so we can contact you if you've won:

Name:

Mailing address:

Phone number:

Email address:

Please send the completed survey to Patty Black at NYSILC
Email: patty@nysilc.org or
Surface mail: New York State Independent Living Council, 111 Washington
Avenue, Suite 101, Albany, NY 12210

Please complete this by July 12 to be entered in our drawing for a \$50 Mobil
gift card.

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED IN QUESTIONS #2 AND #3

1. Advocacy/legal services - assistance with accessing benefits, services or programs to which you may be entitled but are having difficulty obtaining.
2. Assistive devices/equipment - help receiving specialized equipment such as TTYs, wheelchairs and lifts. This includes equipment repair and loan as needed.
3. Benefits advisement - assistance provided with applying for economic benefits. This service does not include the representation at hearings or appeals.
4. Education services - classroom or individual educational programs at the primary, secondary or college levels; this includes home tutoring.
5. Employment / work readiness services - training in job-seeking skills such as interviewing and resume writing, and/or providing supported employment opportunities and/or integrated job placement services.
6. Family services - services provided to family members of individuals with disabilities when help is needed for helping the individual to live more independently, or to engage or continue in employment. This may include respite care.
7. Home care / personal assistance services - includes providing attendant care to consumers and/or training consumers to supervise their own attendants.
8. Housing or shelter services - information, advice, and assistance related to finding or keeping affordable, accessible and/or integrated housing. Includes assistance with looking through newspaper ads, how to talk with landlords, finding lists of available accessible housing, and information and assistance in applying for housing support.
9. Independent living skills development and life skills services - Instruction to develop independent living skills in areas such as personal care, coping skills, use of assistive technology, financial management, social skills, and household management, including education and training necessary for living in the community and participating in community activities.
10. Information and referral services (I&R) - information about other needed services in the area, and/or being referred directly to specific agencies.
11. Medical / health services - services needed to treat specific medical conditions.
12. Mobility training - variety of services involved in assisting individuals with cognitive and sensory impairments to get around their homes and communities.
13. Peer counseling - counseling, teaching, information sharing, and similar kinds of services provided by other individuals with disabilities. This may include information

about disability laws, civil rights and other available protections, and strategies and resources to support personal empowerment.

14. Recreational services – providing or identifying opportunities for individuals with disabilities to participate in accessible, integrated leisure time activities; community affairs and/or other accessible, integrated recreation activities that may be competitive, active or quiet.
15. Transportation services - provision of, or arrangements for provision of accessible transportation.

NYSILC Centers Survey

(This is the text version of the survey as an alternative to the on-line version.)

1. **Agency Name:**
2. **Name of person completing the survey:**
3. **Please review this list of potential barriers to effective service delivery of existing services and check those that are currently the most significant barriers for your Center. Please check or highlight up to a maximum of 5 (five) barriers.**
 - a) ___ Lack of financial or other resources
 - b) ___ Funding restrictions
 - c) ___ Lack of adequate transportation for consumers
 - d) ___ Lack of cooperation from other providers (e.g. schools, agencies, etc)
 - e) ___ Staffing issues – inability to recruit qualified staff due to non-competitive wages/benefits
 - f) ___ Staffing issues – inability to recruit due to shortage of qualified staff
 - g) ___ Staffing issues – difficulty retaining staff
 - h) ___ Staffing issues – lack of resources to train staff
 - i) ___ Lack of space or other infrastructure
 - j) ___ Lack of interpretation services
 - k) ___ Lack of awareness from people with disabilities of ILC services
 - l) ___ Size of service area is too large
 - m) ___ Lack of support from key agencies or other groups in the community
 - n) ___ Low demand or interest from target population
 - o) ___ Lack of board support
 - p) ___ Other– please specify and/or Comments:

4. What resources would you need to overcome these barriers to providing existing services? Please select up to a maximum of 3 (three) resources.

- a) ___Additional Funding
- b) ___Training/Technical Assistance
- c) ___Examples of successful model programs
- d) ___A well-designed and funded public relations plan
- e) ___Additional space/Infrastructure
- f) ___More assistance cooperation from local and state providers
- g) ___Transportation for consumers
- h) ___Grassroots support
- i) ___Political support
- j) ___Other If you checked "Other" above, please specify.

5. With respect to current unmet needs in your area, are there services you currently provide that you would like to expand, or new services you would like to start , or are there some services listed that you think are no longer needed?

Please circle, underline or highlight up to 5 (five) choices in each column.

Advocacy/legal services needed	Start new	Expand	Not
Architectural barrier services needed	Start new	Expand	Not
Assistive devices/equipment needed	Start new	Expand	Not
Benefits advisement needed	Start new	Expand	Not
Business/Industry/Agency services needed	Start new	Expand	Not
Children's services needed	Start new	Expand	Not
Communication services needed	Start new	Expand	Not
Counseling services needed	Start new	Expand	Not
Family services needed	Start new	Expand	Not
Housing and shelter services needed	Start new	Expand	Not

Information and referral needed	Start new	Expand	Not
Independent living skills development and life skills services needed	Start new	Expand	Not
Mobility training needed	Start new	Expand	Not
Peer counseling needed	Start new	Expand	Not
Personal assistant services needed	Start new	Expand	Not
Plan for achievement for self support needed	Start new	Expand	Not
Recreational services needed	Start new	Expand	Not
Transportation services needed	Start new	Expand	Not
Vocational services needed	Start new	Expand	Not
Voter registration needed	Start new	Expand	Not
Youth services needed	Start new	Expand	Not
Other (please specify) - Start new / expand / not needed			

6. For the services you indicated above, what barriers, if any, are there to you starting or expanding services? Please check up to 5 barriers.
- a) Lack of financial or other resources
 - b) Funding limitations or restrictions
 - c) Lack of adequate transportation for consumers
 - d) Lack of cooperation from providers (e.g. schools, agencies, etc)
 - e) Staffing issues – inability to recruit qualified staff due to non-competitive wages/benefits
 - f) Staffing issues – inability to recruit due to shortage of qualified staff
 - g) Staffing issues – difficulty retaining staff
 - h) Staffing issues – lack of resources to train staff
 - i) Lack of space or other infrastructure
 - j) Lack of interpretation services
 - k) Lack of public awareness of ILC services
 - l) Size of service areas
 - m) Lack of support from key agencies or other groups in the community
 - n) Low demand or interest from target population
 - o) Lack of board support
 - p) Other, please specify:
7. What resources would you need to overcome the barriers to *expanding* existing services *or starting* new services? Please select up to 3 (three) resources.
- 1. Additional Funding
 - 2. Training/Technical Assistance
 - 3. Examples of model programs
 - 4. A well-designed and funded public relations plan
 - 5. Additional space/Infrastructure
 - 6. More assistance from local and state government agencies
 - 7. More collaborating partners from local community service providers
 - 8. Transportation for consumers
 - 9. Grassroots support
 - 10. Political support
 - 11. Other, please specify:
8. If there are particular geographic areas *within* or *outside* your service area that you feel are not adequately served by you or other service providers, please describe those areas below. (e.g. rural areas, specific counties, specific neighborhoods)

9. If there are particular groups of people with disabilities **WITHIN** your service area that you feel are underserved or hard to reach by your organization, please check them below. (Check all that apply):

1. Children/young adults
2. Seniors
3. Rural Residents
4. American Indian
5. Black non-Hispanic
6. Asian/Pacific Islander
7. Hispanic
8. Multi-ethnic
9. Male Veterans
10. Female Veterans
11. Homeless
12. LGBT
13. Deaf
14. Blind
15. Deaf/Blind
16. Physical disabilities
17. Mental/emotional disabilities
18. Cognitive disabilities
19. Dual diagnosis – intellectual/mental health
20. Dual diagnosis – mental health/chemical abuse
21. Immigrant groups / Non-native English speakers (please specify

in

“comments/other” box below)

Comments/ Other Underserved or Hard to Reach Groups (please specify):

10. If you checked any of the groups in the previous question, please describe how you might strengthen your services to reach these groups.

11. In thinking about how the *larger* community serves people with disabilities, please indicate from the following list how well each of these needs are met overall for people with disabilities in your service area. Circle, underline or highlight your choice.

Accessible Health Care
Met

Well Met

Adequately Met Not Well

Affordable Health Care Met	Well Met	Adequately Met	Not Well
Disability Awareness among Service Providers	Well Met	Adequately Met	Not Well
Health Insurance Met	Well Met	Adequately Met	Not Well
Affordable Housing Met	Well Met	Adequately Met	Not Well
Integrated Housing Met	Well Met	Adequately Met	Not Well
Emergency Services Met	Well Met	Adequately Met	Not Well
Access to Assistive Technology Met	Well Met	Adequately Met	Not Well
Transition Services Met	Well Met	Adequately Met	Not Well
Special Education Met	Well Met	Adequately Met	Not Well
Employment Opportunities Met	Well Met	Adequately Met	Not Well
Vocational Training Met	Well Met	Adequately Met	Not Well
Transportation Met	Well Met	Adequately Met	Not Well
Information about Disability Rights Met	Well Met Not Well Met		Adequately
Access to Information and Resources Met	Well Met Not Well Met		Adequately
Assistance with Disability Benefits Met	Well Met Not Well Met		Adequately
Consumer Directed Personal Assistance	Well Met	Adequately Met	Not Well
Affordable, Accessible Exercise Opportunities	Well Met	Adequately Met	Not Well

Affordable, Accessible Opportunities Met	Well Met	Adequately Met	Adequately Met
To Socialize	Not Well Met		
Community Based Long-Term Care Met	Well Met	Adequately Met	Adequately Met
	Not Well Met		
Services and Support Met	Well Met	Adequately Met	Not Well Met
Service Coordination Met	Well Met	Adequately Met	Not Well Met
Adequate Income Met	Well Met	Adequately Met	Not Well Met
Culturally Sensitive Services Met	Well Met	Adequately Met	Not Well Met
Systems Advocacy Met	Well Met	Adequately Met	Not Well Met

12. Are there other major needs not included above that are not well met for people with disabilities in your service area? Please explain.
13. Of the unmet needs cited in question 11 and 12 above, are any more pronounced for the youth, adult or senior populations? Please describe below.
-