Garth Wilson
Whittier, CA

wilsonmines@dslextreme.com
(562)695-7054 (landline; no text)

Exploring possibilities for involvement in the construction of microhouses for the homeless

Background: In 1992, my car broke down, and I shrugged and said, "I don't need a car. I'll go back to riding bike!" I started making a trailer, using thin plywood, to carry big things. Soon my parents gave us another car, kind of defeating the purpose of seeing if I could go without a car, and progress stopped.

In late 2025, I resumed the project, for prepping, and also to cut my need for my van, for a few reasons. I finished it up:



It has many nice features not found on commercially available bicycle trailers, including springs. My site has detailed pictures and descriptions, at http://wilsonminesco.com/bikes/trailers/ .

After some experience towing it to take things back and forth to work, I decided to use what I learned, to build a second, better one, for much bigger, heavier loads, even up to something like a clothes dryer. I finished it in late summer 2026:





For more pictures and description, see http://wilsonminesco.com/bikes/trailers/2ndTrailer.html . This one's tongue and suspension (shown in detail on my site) are entirely different from those on the first trailer; and as I was looking for ideas, I kept coming across videos of bike trailers that a homeless person could get inside of and lock the door to sleep. Here are some examples:

























For years, I kind of wished I could help the homeless improve their deplorable living conditions; so this caught my interest. After I finished the second trailer, I kind of binge-watched videos to learn about homelessness. Most of what I thought I knew about homelessness turned out to be wrong.

There are also ones made to push by hand, ie, not pull with a bike, approximately the same size, but on wheels perhaps 4" diameter, and using handles in the style of a shopping cart or of a wheelchair. Like

the bike-trailer types, they will have a means to prevent rolling when parked. They would be a bit simpler and cheaper, having small castors, not requiring a tongue and hitch mechanism to attach to the bike. Some examples:







Up the scale from there, are houses that usually come in on a truck, many per load, and are assembled on site by volunteers, in as little as a few hours each, often church groups or schools. These are not as mobile, but can be moved with a forklift once assembled. They are usually put on an available lot, often dozens per lot, in a transitional-housing community which has a separate building with showers, bathrooms, a shared cooking facility, and an office with staff on site to enforce rules, vet the applicants, etc.. Unlike the smaller things above, these are not simply *given* to the people who live in them.





There's an in-between step between the hand-push box shelters and the houses shown last above, shown in this excellent 28-minute video with history, description, and practical considerations:

> How Americans Are Building $500 Tiny Homes On Wheels For Homeless People
> https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vbVy5SiOKEQ

In some cases, materials to make these are collected as waste scraps from construction sites or picked up from alleys where people have for example replaced still-useful doors or windows with nicer ones. This may bring the total materials cost for each house down to a few hundred dollars or even less, and then labor is done by volunteers.

Further up the scale are the tinyhouses, "tiny" meaning 200 to 400 square feet, which have actually have kitchen and bath in each, and normal electrical and plumbing, and they're arranged in tinyhouse villages, again with rules and administrators. Some of these tinyhouses are truly beautiful. They are of course far more expensive, and in some cases exist in a rent-to-own arrangement, where they can actually be considered permanent housing.

I would like to see all of these gain traction and succeed; but my initial interest came from what I might transfer from my having built my bicycle trailers. I'm a retired electronics engineer. Although these may not involve electronics, the engineering mind does transfer to other areas; and from details shown in my web pages linked above, you can see that I've been able to build, with wood, things that are quite sophisticated considering the simple tools I have.

So I am seeking others whom I might be able to work with in the Whittier area to minister to homeless people in this way. If there's already a group working on it, I would like to see if I can be part of it. I have no profit motive. I can imagine various components to the project, some of which may be beyond my particular capabilities. The components may include, but not be limited to:

- working with the city to make sure that what we make will be accepted, not seized or chased away; also to get approval for places for these, with a community faucet, and with dumpsters and porta-potties which will actually save the city money compared to having to clean up messes. (The resulting reduction in ER visits and police & fire burden also saves money.) The lots will ideally be within walking distance of a laundromat, supermarket, etc..
- finding local sources for cheap, used bikes I can fix for the homeless to pull the trailers and find and keep jobs
- solicit donations of materials or the funds to buy them
- cooperate with other local organizations that help the homeless

I realize this will help only a certain segment of the homeless population; but I'd like to try.

Even a bike-trailer house (a "bicycle camper") can be important in these ways:

A major problem for the homeless is lack of sleep. There are several reasons for this, and several detrimental effects, and ways that a bike-trailer house remedies them.

- If the homeless person is on the ground, even in a tent, the ground is a practically infinite heat sink, taking away body heat. The trailer gets them off the ground.

- Without any kind of mattress, lying on the hard ground quickly becomes painful in any position. With a trailer, they can have a pad inside, and it does not make the job of moving any harder.

- Even in a tent, rain may soak a sleeping bag, even from under the tent floor. The trailer not only keeps the water off them from above, but water on the ground is several inches below the floor, and won't get the floor wet.

- Security: Without a tent, they must constantly worry about getting their stuff stolen if they sleep. If they do have a tent, it can still be opened or cut easily from the outside. Also, it gives no protection from anything or anyone accidentally crashing into it from the outside. The trailer remedies this to some extent. Coroplast (the stuff political yard signs are made of) is light, inexpensive, and waterproof; but it's easier to cut or crush, even accidentally, than thin plywood.

- The lack of sleep quickly takes a heavy toll on health, both physical and mental. It also contributes to emergency-room costs. The homeless are five times as likely as the general public to be hospitalized for preventable conditions. A house, no matter how small or simple, with a door that can be locked from the inside, is important for getting the needed sleep.

- Without sleep, they can't be coherent in a job interview. They may not even be able to get there, especially if leaving the tent behind means they lose everything. (The trailer moves with them, not requiring packing up and taking a tent down. The bike and trailer together can be locked to a rack or fence if necessary.)

- If they're told they have to move, moving the trailer takes only as long as it takes to get their shoes on, whereas otherwise they have to pack up everything, take down the tent, find another place, and take several trips to get everything there; and since they can't be at both ends of the trip at once, their stuff again gets stolen.

- The problems with losing everything, whether from theft, or from sanitation crews putting everything in a trash truck, include:
    - They lose their ID, which they need to get a job and various services, or to rent anything.
    - Veterans may lose their discharge papers, so they can't get VA benefits.
    - They lose their medications, which may include diabetics' insulin.
    - Loss of a phone makes it all the harder to get a job or keep other appointments.
    - They may lose important contact information.
    - They lose family photos and other small treasures, the last reminder that they're human and have human value.
    - They lose hope, all the more.

In this video, "How Americans Are Turning Old Bikes Into Tiny Mobile Homes For Homeless People" at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hszDYODpCUo, a case worker who helps the homeless get into jobs said the hardest part is finding people. Appointments get missed because someone got swept to the other side of town; but her bike-camper clients never missed appointments. They rode to her office.

The problem with "shelters":

Since some of the homeless refuse the "shelters," some people I've talked to said some of the homeless actually want to be homeless. The truth is that no, they don't, but they may have valid reasons not to be in a shelter, including, but not necessarily limited to:

- Someone may not have the documents needed to get in.
- When there are 100 cots in a large room, the person still can't sleep, or his stuff will get stolen. With constant light and noise, he can't sleep well anyway.
- There is often still violence and other crimes in the shelters.
- The lack of privacy is too stressful.
- Curfews may be too limiting to someone who has a night-shift job.
- A person is not allowed to stay there long enough to recover.
- Dogs are not allowed, and a person may not be willing to dump his dog, which he probably also had for protection.
- Couples may be separated, and they're not willing.
- The shelters may be full.
- In one video I saw a man said *even the security guards* were dealing drugs. (He didn't say what organization that was.)

"They should just get a job!" is a common argument. Many do have jobs, especially of those living in cars or RVs, but don't make enough to get into an apartment. Others may live in a motel, and it costs more per month than an apartment might, but they can't scrape enough money together at once to pay the first & last months' rent, security deposit, and perhaps an application fee, to get into an apartment. But for those living on the street (who in some cases had a house or apartment, and a car, and already lost them), consider that getting a job requires a degree of stability, and:

- documents,
- appointments,
- transportation,
- clean clothes, hair, etc.,
- a working phone (which has a monthly cost), and
- a way to stay in contact,

all without getting their stuff stolen while they're going to apply. If they haven't been able to sleep, they're extra sunk. Without an ID, they can't get hired, can't claim benefits, and can't rent anything.

Jobs can be very difficult to get anyway in this changing job market. I myself am retired only because I got laid off and I'm 66, and most of the jobs in my field are in pockets far from Whittier, like Irvine/Tustin, Torrance/El Segundo, Rancho Cucamonga, etc., and I am not open to long commutes.

There are many reasons a person might be homeless, and only a few are because of things like drugs or laziness. In fact, many who are on drugs got that way after they became homeless, as someone enticed them with the idea that you can escape reality and forget your problems for however

long a fix lasts; and then if there was any fentanyl in it, it's extremely addicting. (I have no idea what the solution to that is.) Reasons for homelessness include, but are not be limited to:

- job loss, or hours cut, particularly if it coincides with a big rent increase on their apartment.
- Seniors, who worked for decades and then retired, are the fastest-growing segment of the homeless population. Mobilehomes had been an economical retirement; but now private-equity companies are buying up MH parks and running the space rent way up since they figure people will have to pay since they can't afford to move their MH. Owners who can't pay get evicted and their old MHs get destroyed and removed, making room for new tenants with new MHs.
- other costs rising faster than a senior's Social Security check
- medical emergency, with no insurance since they just lost their job (Actually, over half a million Americans each year experience medical bankruptcy, and 3/4 of those had insurance!)
- domestic violence, divorce, or sudden death of a spouse, and they don't make enough to pay the rent and other expenses on their own
- wage garnishments leaving too little income to pay the rent
- fire or other disaster strikes the home, and insurance doesn't come through in a timely manner
- Once they're living in their car, if it breaks down and they don't have money to fix it, or they can't make the payment or afford the insurance or registration, it gets towed, and daily impound fees exceed income.
- Zoning laws forbid building small houses, for example 300 sq ft, or putting a tinyhouse or small mobilehome on the lot. A mortgage would have been tiny and locked in, and perhaps paid off before a financial crisis hits. But if that's all a person wants or can afford, he's not allowed to own, only told to rent an apartment; and later he falls victim to big rent increases he can't pay.

A homeless woman I saw interviewed had a Ph.D. in math, and taught in a university. You don't get a Ph.D. in math by being lazy, stupid, or addicted. If I remember correctly, she lost her job at the same time her husband left her. They were overextended on their house, with no equity, and on their cars too. She lost everything, and then the stress of it all precipitated a medical emergency, and now she had no insurance, because it was with her job, so here she was, out on the street with a shopping cart.

A homeless woman I met in Sep 2026 had, along with her husband, a nice house with a pool. They, too, were overextended, with no equity, no savings, and upside down on their cars. Her health insurance was with his job, but he died unexpectedly, and then she had a health emergency. She lost everything; so in spite of where she started out only two years earlier, I met her under a bridge in a wheelchair and with a shopping cart. A local supermarket was letting her spend the night out in front. I went home and got some food and a few things, all in original unopened packages, and came back and gave them to her, and said, "Because you matter." I don't think anyone had ever said that to her before.

I knew a lawyer who was homeless for a while because of marital problems, who lived in his car and went to work every day.

Homelessness may then make it even harder to get back on one's feet financially. For example,

- One must make more trips to buy food, and then limit it to prepared foods that don't require a stove or refrigerator.
- Having to move frequently, or run a car's engine for heat or A/C, means having to buy more gas.
- Not having a washer and dryer means using a laundromat, at eight dollars a load.
- Every shower may cost money.
- If somehow they scrape together enough money for first & last months' rent, security deposit, application fee, etc. to get into an apartment, they'll still have to show proof of steady income for some minimum amount of time, have a credit check (which might not go so well, for the reasons that made them homeless in the first place), and an old eviction filing may further shrink the options. Then there are the up-front costs of getting the electricity turned on, getting internet, and more. Someone may make enough to survive once housed, but still lack the up-front cash or qualifications to get through the door.

I'm becoming more sympathetic. There will be segments of the homeless population I know I cannot help, like women with children; but in this project, I want to prioritize women, veterans, and seniors.

Anticipated questions and objections:

What if they die or go unconscious in their microhouse? It would be pretty much the same as if this happened in an apartment. Worst come to worst, it may be necessary to break in. But in the case of transitional-housing communities, although each person has a key that goes to their own door and no one else's, the office staff should have a master key that goes to all the tinyhouses. Experience shows that neighbors start looking out for each other, and will notify someone if ol' Fred hasn't been seen in a couple of days, whether he's inside or something happened to him while he was out.

What about our property values?! It's the NIMBY ("not in my back yard") mentality, and the unfortunate tendency to treat the homeless as disposable. I envision designated areas being far enough from middle-class neighborhoods that it shouldn't be a problem, especially if what we provide reduces crime and filth, and reduces police & other emergency calls. I can think of a few areas that might be suitable less than two miles from my house.

It's not safe. Obviously we want to make these microhouses as safe as we can, while producing them as inexpensively as we can, so as to help as many homeless as we can; but *anything* we do will be safer than having them sleeping on a sidewalk, especially as the cold, rainy season approaches.

If we give them any of these kinds of microhouses, it will postpone or cancel plans to build "real" housing. (I put "real" in quotes, because I don't know why "real" has to mean some large minimum number of square feet.) Here's a good video about inexpensively giving the homeless a house, rather than government projects that cost a fortune in money, time, and red tape:

> Feels Like a $80,000 Tiny Home. Costs Just $300. Could This Folding Shelter End Homelessness? https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PX44-vYnbJ0

Here is a typical government pattern it identifies:

- identify a problem
- commission a study
- form a committee
- allocate funding
- put out bids
- review bids
- award contracts
- begin environmental review
- begin permitting process
- begin construction
- get the inspections
- open the facility

and by the time a homeless person sleeps in a government-funded shelter shed, millions have been spent, and years have passed; but it only takes eight hours of a sub-freezing night to take the life of a homeless person on the street.

The homelessness industrial complex: California has spent $25,000,000,000 (yes, 25 **b**illion) on homelessness, yet most of that money has apparently gone to buying luxury vacations, yachts, and expensive cars, not helping the homeless. Riverside County Sheriff Chad Bianco, when running for governor, called out Sacramento's dirty secret: the homeless crisis is being kept alive on purpose—because it's too profitable to solve. He says lawmakers, lobbyists, and nonprofits are all in on it: "It's a homeless industrial complex. Thousands of people are making millions. If homelessness goes away, so does their funding."

The homelessness industrial complex also doesn't want any competition. I've seen several videos about private individuals who made tiny movable houses for the homeless for a few hundred dollars each, worst case a couple thousand each, and then cities crushed and disposed of them, saying they don't meet code and aren't safe therefore we'll throw the homeless back out on the street—as if that were safer! If the general public knew what was going on, they'd be very angry. There are lots of reasons why the shelters they want to put them in will never meet the need.

I grew up in northern Argentina, because of my dad's work. There was a large middle class, but also a very visible poor class. There was no homelessness though. I remember women carrying water from a community faucet, for their cooking and other needs at home. I remember them washing clothes in the river. I remember children picking through the garbage at a market, looking for food, because for example, an apple with a bad spot could not be sold, but most of it was still good to eat.

The poor however had their own houses, of adobe or brick, even if only two rooms, usually a concrete

floor and a corrugated metal roof and no indoor plumbing or heating or A/C, maybe no electricity; but they owned it outright, no mortgage, no debt, no property tax, no insurance premiums, no utility bills, and no local government telling them it's unlivable and evicting them like what happens in the US. They kept it clean and there was minimal trouble with pests or disease. Why is it that in the US it's somehow better to throw these people out to sleep on the sidewalk? American ideas of "need" are much too lofty, and ironically, result in homelessness. Building codes should and do promote safety; but they also focus on property-tax revenue and vanity.

The homeless are not disposable. But even after people learn about the many facets of homelessness, the idea of providing microhouses seems to be foreign to everyone, and there's that unsettling feeling of unfamiliarity, of not knowing where to even begin. I'm partly there myself; but I want to brainstorm with others who are interested. I've put a few pictures above from the many videos I've watched; but the fact is, there's not much to go on yet. It's like the early years of so many other fields of development in the last 150 years. Areas that come to mind to figure out include, but will not be limited to:

- cost
- weight
- durability (resistance to water, sun, regular use & wear), and repairability
- acceptance by city hall, the public, and the homeless whom we'll give these to
- availability of materials
- our own limitations in skills and tools
- safety, against accidents, attacks, theft, fire, weather, suffocation, poisoning (like CO)
- how to attach to the majority of bikes likely to get used to pull trailers (For safe, good handling, it must attach near the bike's rear axle, <u>not</u> the seatpost!)

last update: Nov 3, 2026

Appendix A

The following is from the video "I Visited the Dome Village of LA Where Homeless People Live in $2,000 Dome Houses With Heat & Power," at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7HoqVi8PYdA . It had tons of good listings, and I took the time to transcribe them here. It's not about bike campers, but many of the same points still apply. The project was awfully structured, and far more expensive than what I'm thinking of. The reason the project eventually ended was that the land was too valuable.

The dome-house shell price is not the cost of:

- land
- power
- bathrooms
- fire safety
- maintenance
- staffing
- support

But for 13 years, a row of strange, fiberglass domes beside downtown L.A. gave people what most emergency systems struggle to provide:

- a private door
- a stable address
- room for a partner or a pet
- a community that treated residents as adults.

But a light fiberglass shell is not automatically a legal dwelling. It does not magically include:

- safe electrical service
- heating
- plumbing
- ventilation
- fire separation
- accessible paths
- drainage
- permits
- or land rights.

Any modern version would need:

- inspected wiring
- listed heaters
- smoke alarms
- carbon monoxide protection where combustion exists
- adequate exits
- ventilation

- clear separation from flammable material.

A cheap shell with a dangerous extension cord is not housing. It's a fire waiting for a date. [*I don't agree, especially with their picture of a power strip with all outlets occupied. There's a reason for power strips to exist, and the power strip has its own circuit breaker, and a dozen very light loads on a single circuit do not constitute a danger. What's important is not the number of plugs, but the total number of amps' load on the circuit.*]

Residents paid $70-$100 a month, and had chores. People did not simply receive a pod and disappear behind the door. Daily life required

- cleaning
- maintenance
- conflict management
- security
- shared rules.

The village tried to create a social environment without erasing private space. It recognized something that both street encampments and mass shelters often miss. People need neighbors, but they also need boundaries. They need help, but they do not stop being adults just because they lost housing. On the street, one person's crisis can destroy another's sleep, food, documents, or medicine. In a crowded dorm, privacy is almost impossible. In a small village, a locked personal space can reduce daily chaos, while a shared kitchen and laundry room create places where staff members and residents notice problems before they become emergencies.

The design also gave residents visibility, without putting everyone on display.

- A resident could notice that someone had not come out.
- A maintenance problem could be reported.
- A person could offer help without crossing half a city.

Yet the resident still had a private room rather than a numbered mat. That balance is the reason the idea remains attractive. It's not because the domes are magical, but because the village combined private shelter with shared infrastructure.

- Laundry was not a bus ride across town with every possession in tow.
- Cooking did not require buying food one meal at a time.
- Internet access was not a luxury when job applications, benefits, maps, and communication were already moving online.

Stability creates savings that rarely appear in a construction budget.

- Replacing stolen identification costs money.
- Missing an appointment costs time.
- Sleeping in unsafe places can turn a manageable health problem into an emergency.
- Losing food because there is nowhere to store it forces people to buy the same necessities again.

A small, secure room can interrupt those repeating losses even when it's not permanent housing. For older adults, the routine may matter as much as the walls.

- Medication can stay in one place.
- Shoes and clothing can dry.
- A phone can charge.
- A person can wake up without having to solve the problem of where to stand for the next 12 hours.

Those details can make the difference between surviving the day and planning a life.

Now about the price: The phrase "$2,000 dome house" makes it sound like the problem was solved for $2K. The shell may be inexpensive compared to conventional construction; but the village still needs:

- land
- utility connections
- sanitation
- insurance
- professional work
- accessibility
- fire review
- maintenance
- administration
- and services.

Even if the dome were free,

- the trench for electrical service still costs money
- the panel and breakers still cost money
- a safe heater still costs money
- toilets
- showers
- sewage
- drainage
- and hot water still cost money. So do
- permits
- fencing
- security lighting
- pest control
- trash collection (*that's a repeat of "sanitation" above!*)
- repairs, and
- the people who keep the community working.

The useful lesson is that a private space can be delivered with a much lighter structure if the expensive systems are shared intelligently. That's the difference between a product and a program. The dome

was the product. The dome village was a program, with strengths and problems. One was serious criminal allegations involving two people. A village needs:

- fair rules
- a trained staff
- grievance procedures
- financial controls
- residents' rights
- safely plans and
- a clear response to violence.

"Community" should not mean informal power with no accountability. Good rules also need limits.

- A resident should know:
    - what behavior can lead to removal
    - who makes that decision
    - how an appeal works
    - and where the person can go next.
- Chores should also support the community without becoming unpaid punishment.
- Fees should be transparent.
- Personal searches, visitors, quiet hours, pets, and storage all need written policies that residents can understand before moving in.

Staff members need the same clarity so enforcement does not depend on who's working a shift or which residents are more popular.

A safe room can stabilize a person, but it cannot create:

- an affordable apartment
- medical care
- disability income
- or a job

by itself.

The dome village finally failed because the land became too valuable. The lot's rent increase made it impossible to continue. Modern villages need durable land tenure. That can mean:

- public land with a long agreement
- nonprofit ownership
- a community land trust
- a lease that protects the program
- or another arrangement strong enough to justify investing in utilities and services.

Without that foundation, every electrical line, bathroom, garden, and case-management office is temporary.

The closing also shows why portability mattered. The domes could be dismantled and sold, rather than bulldozed. Portability preserved some value, but did not preserve the community. So, what would a responsible version look like today?

- It would begin with the people, not a dramatic AI photo. Ask who will live there. Couples? Older adults? Veterans? People with disabilities? Parents with children? People with pets? Answers will determine:
    - unit size
    - accessibility
    - staffing
    - bathrooms
    - transportation
    - and safety.
- Separate the shelter cost from the project cost. Publish both. If a dome costs, $2K, say exactly what it buys. Then list the real cost of:
    - foundations or anchoring
    - utilities
    - fire protection
    - sanitation
    - professional labor
    - land
    - operations
    - and support.

    Honest budgets protect donors and residents from disappointment.
- Treat utilities as life safety systems.
    - Electrical work should be permitted and inspected.
    - Heating equipment should be listed for the use and installed with required clearances. Combustion appliances require ventilation and carbon-monoxide protection.
    - Extension cords are not permanent wiring. A resident should not have to choose between freezing and starting a fire.
    - Water and sanitation deserve the same seriousness.
    - Handwashing, toilets, showers, laundry, and food preparation determine whether a site remains healthy.
    - Waste water cannot be improvised into a gutter.
    - Drainage cannot send rain beneath sleeping units.
    - Trash collection must match the number of residents.
    - Pest control should focus on the whole site rather than blaming one household for problem created by shared conditions.

    - Accessibility must be planned before a resident arrives with a walker or wheelchair. A low-cost unit is not useful if the path turns to mud, the doorway is too narrow, or the bathroom requires a step the person cannot climb.
    - Lighting should help residents move without flooding every room at night.
    - Emergency routes need to remain clear, even when donations, bicycles, and personal belongings accumulate.

- Provide privacy without isolation. A person needs:

    - a door
    - secure storage
    - a mailing address
    - ability to sleep.

  The village also needs:

    - shared spaces
    - staff presence
    - health connections
    - conflict procedures
    - a way to notice when someone is in trouble.

- Preserve choice. Some people cannot use congregate shelter safely.

    - A survivor may fear a shared sleeping room.
    - A couple may refuse separation.
    - A person may choose to stay outside rather than abandon a pet.

  Small, private units can remove those barriers, but only if rules are written around real lives instead of an imaginary perfect resident.

- Provide exits that do not feel like eviction. Transitional housing should help residents obtain:

    - identification
    - benefits
    - healthcare
    - income
    - rental history
    - and permanent housing.

  A deadline without available housing is not a transition plan, just another forced move. That work must begin in the first week, not the last month.

    - Replacing a birth certificate can take time.
    - Correcting a benefits problem can take longer.
    - A landlord may require an application fee, deposit, proof of income, and references.

  If a village waits until a resident is ready, the administrative clock may run out before the housing appears. Success also cannot only mean moving quickly. Some residents will need

more time because of disability, grief, age, or years spent outside. A useful program recognizes progress, without turning slow progress into failure. The question is whether every person is becoming safer and more stable, not whether every life fits the same calendar.

- Measure the things that residents say matter. Did people:
    - sleep safely
    - keep medication
    - protect documents
    - reconnect with family
    - start treatment
    - gain income
    - move to stable housing
    - avoid returning to the street ?
- Account of occupied domes is only the beginning. The old village:
    - welcomed households that did not fit neatly into standard shelters
    - allowed pets
    - created communal kitchen and laundry
    - offered computers
    - asked residents to participate in daily life
    - most importantly, offered private space.
- Unfortunately, it also:
    - depended on a fragile land deal
    - faced management problems
    - and could not create the larger network its founder imagined

    There is another uncomfortable story in the way the village ended. The same downtown growth that made land more valuable also made homelessness more common and visible. That's why copying the shape without copying the support will fail. The domes make a good photo.
        - Stable land
        - legal utilities
        - skilled staff
        - resident protection
        - and permanent housing options

    do not; yet those less-visible pieces decide whether a village lasts.

If another city wants to learn from L.A., it should not order a truckload of domes first. It should:

- secure the land
- design the utilities
- ask future residents what would make the site usable
- build accountable management
- protect couples, families, pets, and personal possessions

- create a path to permanent housing

then choose the structure that fits the plan. It may be a dome, a cabin, a modular room, a converted room, or a small apartment. The shape is secondary. The real question is whether we can give a person:

- a door
- power that is safe
- heat that is safe
- a place to wash
- a place to cook
- enough stability to plan for next month.