Material Dignity Infrastructure: A Distributed Stewardship Model for Homelessness Resolution

Abstract

This paper examines homelessness as a systemic infrastructure and governance failure rather than a transient social condition. Drawing on publicly available data, established Housing First research, and comparative international experience, it evaluates the fiscal, legal, and operational limits of prevailing emergency shelter and service-based responses. The analysis reviews evidence from high-cost United States jurisdictions and international models, including Finland, indicating that chronic homelessness is associated with substantial public expenditures across healthcare, emergency response, and criminal justice systems. It further reviews program-level outcomes from permanent supportive housing and community-based developments that emphasize housing stability, basic material security, and voluntary service engagement. Building on this evidence, the paper proposes a modular, low-cost housing and service infrastructure framework designed to reduce reliance on emergency systems while improving housing retention and individual stability. Cost and savings estimates are presented as modeled projections based on conservative assumptions and comparator programs. The paper concludes that a material dignity-oriented infrastructure approach has the potential to achieve improved outcomes at lower public cost, subject to local implementation conditions and governance design.

Keywords

homelessness policy, distributed infrastructure, material dignity, housing first critique, stewardship model, hygiene access, urban planning, social integration, federal housing policy, human rights framework, and capabilities approach

JEL Classification

Primary:

- I38 - Government Policy; Provision and Effects of Welfare Programs
- H53 - National Government Expenditures and Welfare Programs
- R58 - Regional Development Planning and Policy

Secondary:

- I18 - Health: Government Policy; Regulation; Public Health
- R23 - Urban, Rural, Regional, Real Estate, and Transportation Economics
- D63 - Equity, Justice, Inequality, and Other Normative Criteria and Measurement
- H41 - Public Goods
- K38 - Human Rights Law; Gender Law

Document Type

Policy Analysis; Comparative Framework Study

SSRN Research Paper Series Classifications

eJournal Classifications (Primary):

- Public Economics eJournal
- Housing & Urban Development eJournal
- Social Welfare & Social Insurance eJournal
- Public Policy & Administration eJournal

Network Classifications:

- Political Economy Research Network (PERN)
- Law & Society Research Network (LSRN)
- Sustainable Development Research Network (SDRN)
- Health Economics Research Network (HERN)

Author Note

This framework synthesizes lived expertise with economic modeling and international comparative analysis to propose an architectural solution to homelessness. It introduces hygiene infrastructure as a prerequisite capability for economic reintegration and distributed stewardship as a scalable alternative to institutional concentration. The model positions Material Dignity as an operationalized capability in the Senian framework, addressing gaps in current Housing First implementation.

Correspondence regarding this paper should be addressed to Charles Joseph DiBella.

Citation

DiBella, Charles Joseph (2026). Material Dignity Infrastructure: A Distributed Stewardship Model for Homelessness Resolution. Available at SSRN:
https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/cf_dev/AbsByAuth.cfm?per_id=9703312

Executive Summary

Homelessness in the United States remains persistent despite decades of investment in emergency shelters, outreach, and fragmented service delivery. On a single night in recent national counts, more than 650,000 individuals experienced homelessness, with a disproportionate concentration in high-cost states and metropolitan regions. In these jurisdictions, individuals experiencing chronic homelessness are frequently associated with high public expenditures through repeated use of emergency medical care, law enforcement, and crisis services. Studies in multiple states estimate these costs in the tens of thousands of dollars per person annually, though amounts vary significantly by locality and methodology.

Evidence from Housing First programs in the United States and abroad demonstrates that providing stable housing without preconditions is associated with high housing retention rates and reduced reliance on emergency systems. International experience, most notably in Finland, indicates that sustained application of this approach can produce large reductions in long-term homelessness, alongside cross-system cost avoidance. Community-scale developments and integrated service campuses in the United States further suggest that housing stability combined with access to basic facilities, including hygiene and storage, supports engagement with employment, healthcare, and social services.

Despite this evidence, existing responses remain constrained by high capital costs, zoning barriers, and program designs that prioritize compliance over stability. This paper advances a framework for Material Dignity Infrastructure that emphasizes low-cost modular housing, shared essential facilities, and governance structures that enable rapid deployment at scale. Proposed operating costs and projected savings are derived from scenario-based economic modeling informed by existing programs and public expenditure data. These projections indicate the potential for substantial cost reductions relative to emergency shelter and street homelessness, particularly in healthcare and criminal justice domains, while improving housing retention and individual outcomes.

The analysis also examines legal mechanisms available at the federal and state levels to support deployment, including conditional grant structures and zoning overlays, drawing on established constitutional principles and regulatory analogues. While outcomes depend on local implementation, the findings suggest that a shift from emergency response to material dignity-oriented infrastructure offers a fiscally responsible and operationally feasible pathway to reducing chronic homelessness at scale.

1. Introduction: The Crisis of Expensive Failure

1.1 The Scale and Persistence of Homelessness

On a single night in January 2023, over 650,000 individuals experienced homelessness in the United States, with approximately 260,000 classified as chronically homeless (HUD, 2023). Despite decades of policy intervention and billions in annual expenditures, this crisis persists with geographic concentration in high-cost coastal cities. California alone accounts for approximately 30% of the nation's homeless population, spending over $24 billion between 2018–2023 with minimal measurable impact (LAO, 2023).

The paradox is stark: significant public expenditures frequently correlate with poor population-level outcomes. In many high-cost jurisdictions, each person experiencing chronic homelessness is estimated to cost taxpayers between $30,000 and $50,000 annually through emergency services, hospitalization, jail stays, and crisis interventions (Greendoors, 2024; Culhane et al., 2002). Emergency shelter beds in California and other high-cost coastal regions frequently cost $40,000–$50,000 per person annually while achieving housing placement rates estimated in some systems at 2–16% (Guardian, 2024; Maine Housing, 2023). Even Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH), the most effective intervention with 80–92% retention rates, operates at $20,000–$25,000 annually and faces severe capacity constraints due to land acquisition costs and intensive staffing requirements (Berkeley, 2023).

1.2 The Concentration Paradigm and Its Failures

The prevailing model for homelessness resolution in the United States relies on what we term the "Concentration Paradigm." This approach sequesters unhoused populations in large-scale institutional facilities (shelters, navigation centers, and congregate housing) located on expensive urban land. While intended to centralize services and achieve economies of scale, this model generates mechanical inefficiencies that can inflate costs while degrading outcomes.

Large facilities strip individual autonomy through institutional rules, create high-stress environments that may discourage utilization, concentrate predatory behaviors requiring expensive security apparatus, and generate fierce community resistance (Dear and Wolch, 1987). The concentration of visible poverty in specific urban districts transforms homelessness from a distributed social challenge into a localized political crisis, making the problem both more visible and more intractable.

Despite these documented limitations, the concentration model persists because it aligns with bureaucratic logic: centralized facilities are easier to monitor, contract, and report on. Yet this organizational convenience comes at substantial human and economic cost. The question this paper evaluates is not merely whether current approaches are failing, but whether a fundamentally different architectural model can achieve improved outcomes at lower public cost.

1.3 Housing First and the Missing Infrastructure Tier

The Housing First model represents the most significant policy innovation in homelessness services over the past three decades (Tsemberis, 2010). By providing immediate access to permanent housing without preconditions of sobriety or treatment compliance, Housing First has been associated with high housing retention rates and substantial reductions in total public service utilization (Padgett et al., 2016).

Yet Housing First contains a critical assumption: that individuals transitioning from homelessness can access the basic hygiene infrastructure necessary for workforce participation and social reintegration. This assumption holds in contexts where public restrooms, showers, and laundry facilities are readily available. In many fragmented American landscapes, however, this infrastructure remains inadequate. This paper evaluates the "Material Dignity" gap—the lack of reliable access to hygiene—as a significant barrier to employment and service engagement.

Building on these insights, the paper evaluates Material Dignity Infrastructure as a potential bridge between street outreach and permanent housing. By establishing universal hygiene access (Tier 1: Comfort Stations) and distributed transitional housing (Tier 2: Stewardship Network), the model seeks to create the foundational capabilities that Housing First research indicates are necessary for long-term stability.

1.4 International Evidence: The Finnish Goal

Finland provides an essential proving ground for the sustained application of Housing First principles. Since 2008, Finland has reduced long-term homelessness by approximately 68% and has adopted a national objective to eliminate street homelessness entirely by 2027 (SDG 16+, 2023). The Y-Foundation, a non-profit housing provider with over 17,000 apartments, has achieved housing retention rates estimated at 80% while generating societal savings across multiple systems (The Atlas, 2023).

Finnish evaluations estimate annual societal savings of approximately $16,500–$57,200 USD per person, reflecting avoided costs across healthcare, emergency response, and criminal justice systems rather than direct line-item budget reductions (SDG 16+, 2023; Y-Foundation, 2024). This success rests on three pillars: (1) housing as a fundamental human right, (2) national coordination with local implementation, and (3) integration with mainstream services.

The paper examines whether comparable outcomes can be achieved through a distinctly American mechanism: distributed private stewardship incentivized through tax credits and liability coverage. Evidence from Community First! Village suggests that distributed spatial organization can achieve retention rates and cost-effectiveness that are competitive with the Finnish model (MLF, 2024).

1.5 Paper Structure and Contribution

This paper makes four core contributions: (1) theoretical, by operationalizing Material Dignity as a capability and identifying the "Dignity Barrier" as a barrier to economic reintegration; (2) empirical, through systematic comparative analysis of distributed housing models; (3) economic, by presenting modeled cost projections and savings scenarios; and (4) legal-institutional, by evaluating a Spending Clause mechanism for implementation.

Section 2 develops the theoretical framework. Section 3 presents comparative evidence. Section 4 specifies the two-tier architecture. Section 5 presents a modeled economic cost analysis. Section 6 proposes legal and implementation frameworks. Section 7 analyzes risks and failure modes. Section 8 maps stakeholder strategies. Section 9 concludes with implications for federal policy.

2. Theoretical Framework: Capabilities, Dignity, and Distribution

2.1 The Capabilities Approach to Housing and Human Development

Amartya Sen's capabilities approach provides the philosophical foundation for Material Dignity Infrastructure (Sen, 1999). Sen argues that development should be evaluated not by income or utility but by people's substantive freedoms: their real opportunities to achieve the lives they value. These opportunities, termed "capabilities," represent the effective freedom to achieve valued "functionings" (states of being and doing such as being well-nourished, mobile, educated, or socially integrated).

Martha Nussbaum operationalized Sen's framework by proposing a list of central human capabilities, including "bodily health" with "adequate shelter" as a core component (Nussbaum, 2011). Housing, in this view, is not merely a commodity but a foundational capability enabling the pursuit of other valued functionings. Decent, affordable, and secure housing provides the essential base (what Saunders (1989) terms "ontological security") from which individuals can engage in economic activity, social relationships, political participation, and personal development.

Recent scholarship extends the capabilities approach explicitly to housing policy, arguing that policy should focus on expanding housing-related capabilities rather than merely providing shelter as a resource (Cambridge, 2019). This framework considers not just access to physical structures but the broader freedoms that housing enables: freedom from chronic stress and health insecurity, freedom to participate in community life, and freedom to pursue employment and education without the constant disruption of housing instability.

The Material Dignity Infrastructure model operationalizes this approach by identifying hygiene access as a prerequisite capability: one that must be secured before housing can effectively enable other functionings. Without reliable access to showers, laundry, and restrooms, an individual lacks the material conditions for workforce participation, regardless of housing status. This represents our core theoretical contribution: identifying and addressing the "Dignity Barrier."

2.2 The Dignity Barrier: Hygiene as Precondition for Economic Participation

The "Dignity Barrier" describes the mechanical exclusion from economic and social life caused by lack of access to hygiene infrastructure. This barrier operates independently of housing status, motivation, or individual capacity. An individual may possess skills, education, and willingness to work, yet remain unemployable without the ability to present professionally at job interviews or maintain workplace hygiene standards.

Empirical research confirms this linkage. Studies of mobile shower and laundry programs document that hygiene access enables professional presentation, reduces employer discrimination, restores self-esteem essential for job-seeking, prevents health complications that hinder work capacity, and serves as a gateway to engagement with other support services (The Share Community, 2024;

Simply the Basics, 2024). Homeless individuals cite lack of access to showers and clean clothing as primary barriers to employment, ahead of other commonly cited factors including transportation and childcare (NIH, 2024).

The mechanism operates through multiple pathways. Employers hold explicit and implicit biases against individuals who cannot maintain hygiene standards, interpreting visible signs of homelessness as indicators of unreliability or mental health challenges regardless of actual capacity (Oregon Business, 2024). Individuals lacking hygiene access experience psychological barriers (shame, reduced self-efficacy, and social withdrawal) that compound the material obstacle (Portland State, 2024). Health consequences of poor hygiene, including skin infections and ectoparasites, create additional employment barriers.

Current Housing First policy addresses housing but often fails to ensure hygiene access during the critical transition period. An individual placed in housing may still lack functioning plumbing, face utility shutoffs due to inability to pay, or be placed in shelters with limited shower access and restrictive hours. The Dignity Barrier persists even within the service system, creating a gap between housing provision and economic reintegration.

Material Dignity Infrastructure addresses this gap by establishing hygiene access as Tier 1: a universal, low-barrier entry point requiring no behavioral prerequisites and operating 24/7. This architectural decision reflects the theoretical understanding that hygiene is not an earned privilege following compliance but a prerequisite capability enabling all subsequent interventions.

2.3 Spatial Politics: Concentration, Distribution, and the Social Production of Stigma

Jane Jacobs's foundational insight in *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* (1961) identifies "eyes on the street" as the organizing principle of safe, vibrant urban neighborhoods. Natural surveillance from residents engaged in daily activities provides informal social control superior to formal security apparatus. Concentration of vulnerable populations disrupts this mechanism by creating districts where formal surveillance replaces natural community oversight, paradoxically increasing both actual and perceived danger.

Dear and Wolch (1987) analyzed the spatial politics of "service-dependent ghettos": urban districts where concentration of homeless services creates zones of concentrated poverty, degraded urban form, and intense stigmatization. These districts emerge from a rational but counterproductive logic: centralize services to achieve economies of scale and ease access for clients. The result is spatial concentration that amplifies predatory behaviors, requires expensive security infrastructure, degrades surrounding property values, and generates fierce NIMBY resistance to any expansion.

The concentration paradigm creates a self-reinforcing cycle. Providers locate services in low-cost districts with weak political constituencies. Concentration attracts street-level drug markets, informal economies, and predatory actors. Degraded conditions justify more intensive security and institutional control. Surrounding communities mobilize against expansion. Political pressure forces

further concentration in already-burdened districts. The unhoused population becomes simultaneously hyper-visible (concentrated in specific zones) and invisible (politically marginalized, spatially segregated from decision-makers).

The Distributed Stewardship model inverts this logic. By dispersing single-occupancy units throughout stable residential neighborhoods at density of one unit per 50 homes, the system embeds formerly homeless individuals within existing social fabrics rather than segregating them. The unit resident becomes a neighbor (someone known personally to the hosting property owner) rather than a member of an undifferentiated, stigmatized population.

This distribution operates through multiple mechanisms. Natural surveillance by neighbors replaces formal security, reducing costs and increasing social integration. Personal relationships between residents and stewards create accountability and mutual obligation. Geographic dispersion prevents formation of concentrated drug markets or predatory ecosystems. Neighbors experience homelessness as a personal relationship (my neighbor is being helped) rather than abstract threat (those people are invading).

Critically, the economic incentive structure transforms NIMBY into YIMBY (Yes In My Back Yard). Traditional models impose negative externalities on neighbors (perceived property value decline, safety concerns) with no compensation. The Distributed Stewardship model provides positive externalities (tax credits, property value enhancement through ADU addition, and federal liability coverage) that mechanically reverse political economy. Property owners have financial incentive to participate; neighbors see material benefit flowing to community members rather than external service providers.

2.4 Asset-Limited Housing and Capital Mobility

The Distributed Stewardship Network introduces Asset-Limited Modular Units (ALMUs) as the core housing technology. ALMUs are factory-built, single-occupancy structures of 120–150 square feet, designed for 20–30 year lifespan, with federal government retaining ownership. This ownership structure is the critical innovation enabling several key features:

Capital Mobility: Because ALMUs remain federal property, they can be relocated if a steward withdraws from the program. This prevents capital loss and enables responsive adjustments to changing homeless population distribution. Traditional shelter construction creates immobile capital locked to specific sites; ALMUs function as a deployable fleet.

Quality Control: Federal ownership enables imposition and enforcement of uniform quality standards nationwide. Unlike local shelter systems with variable standards, all ALMUs meet identical specifications for safety, habitability, accessibility, and dignity. This standardization supports bulk procurement, reducing per-unit costs while ensuring consistent quality.

Maintenance Certainty: Federal ownership clarifies maintenance responsibility and enables centralized maintenance contracting. Residents do not bear maintenance obligations (as they would in traditional rental housing). Property owners (stewards) do not bear structural maintenance (only providing land and utilities). This clear division prevents the deterioration common in ambiguous ownership structures.

Transitional Clarity: Federal ownership reinforces the transitional nature of the program. ALMUs are not permanent housing but a stepping stone to permanent placement. This distinction is critical for property owner buy-in (concern about permanent transformation of neighborhood) and program integrity (avoiding prolonged stays that would indicate program failure).

The ALMU model differs from related approaches in crucial ways. Unlike tiny home villages (single-site concentration, often on publicly owned land), ALMUs disperse onto private property. Unlike scattered-site PSH (permanent housing in market-rate units), ALMUs are purpose-built transitional units. Unlike ADUs (privately owned, permanent additions), ALMUs remain mobile federal assets. This hybrid architecture enables the distributed spatial pattern while maintaining federal control, cost-effectiveness, and transitional character.

3. Comparative Evidence: Validation from Distributed Models

3.1 International Goal: Finland's Housing First Model

Finland's transformation of homelessness policy represents the most compelling evidence that Housing First principles can succeed at national scale. Between 2008 and 2022, Finland reduced long-term homelessness by approximately 68%, from over 2,500 individuals to fewer than 850 (SDG 16+, 2023). The Finnish government has adopted a national objective to eliminate homelessness entirely by 2027: an objective supported by over 15 years of consistent progress.

The Y-Foundation (Y-Säätiö), established in 1985, serves as the primary implementing organization. As Finland's fourth-largest landlord, Y-Foundation converted former emergency shelters into permanent housing units while maintaining support services without preconditions (The Atlas, 2023). This approach demonstrates that removing sobriety and treatment prerequisites before accessing housing is associated with higher stability and lower system costs.

3.1.1 Cost-Effectiveness and Societal Savings

Finland's economic analysis indicates substantial societal savings from Housing First implementation. A 2011 evaluation by Tampere University of Technology estimated annual societal savings of $16,500–$57,200 USD per person, stemming from avoided costs in multiple systems (SDG 16+, 2023). These savings are not direct budget line items but rather broad societal cost avoidance:

- **Emergency Services**: Reduced ambulance calls and emergency room visits.
- **Healthcare**: Decreased hospitalizations and better medication adherence.
- **Criminal Justice**: Fewer arrests for survival crimes and reduced jail bookings.
- **Social Services**: Lower demand for emergency shelter beds.

Critically, these evaluations suggest that Housing First functions as an investment that generates positive societal returns through cost avoidance in neighboring systems: a finding replicated in longitudinal studies of high-acuity cohorts (Larimer et al., 2009).

3.1.2 Policy Framework and Implementation

Finland's results are achieved through three institutional pillars. First, the framing of housing as a fundamental human right creates political durability. Second, the model employs national coordination with local implementation flexibility. Third, Finland integrated housing with mainstream services (standard healthcare and social security) rather than creating parallel, homeless-specific bureaucracies.

3.1.3 Applicability to the American Context

The Material Dignity Infrastructure model adapts Finland's principles to American institutional realities. Rather than government-owned housing stock, DSN mobilizes private property through

tax incentives. Rather than universal healthcare, DSN provides case management linking residents to existing fragmented systems. Rather than a rights-based framing, the framework focuses on cost-savings and community benefit arguments.

The key insight from Finland is that distributed, low-barrier housing generates superior outcomes and societal savings compared to concentration models. The mechanism (whether government-owned or privately-stewarded) appears less critical than the underlying principles: distribution over concentration and low-barrier access over strict prerequisites.

3.2 Community First! Village: Indicative Outcomes

Community First! Village in Austin, Texas, represents a compelling American iteration of distributed spatial organization. Although a single-site development, its "neighborhoods of knowingness" model clusters small groups of homes to achieve outcomes comparable to international Housing First implementations.

3.2.1 Scale and Structure

Community First! Village houses over 420 formerly homeless individuals and is expanding toward a capacity of 1,900 residents (KUT, 2024). Housing consists of tiny homes, RVs, and 3D-printed homes, with residents paying modest rent that covers a portion of operating costs.

3.2.2 Indicative Results and Survival Outcomes

Community First! Village reports outcomes that align with evidence-based standards:

- **Retention Rate**: A reported 86% of residents remain housed, consistent with high-performing PSH programs (Substack, 2024).
- **Survival Outcomes**: Available data indicate significant improvements in health and survival outcomes relative to street homelessness, with residents experiencing substantially longer average lifespans and better access to care (KVUE, 2024).
- **Substance Use**: Residents report substantial decreases in alcohol and drug use without mandatory treatment requirements (KVUE, 2024).
- **Economic Participation**: Nearly 200 residents earned a combined $1.2 million through on-site micro-enterprise programs (Dell Foundation, 2024).

These internal reports suggest that operating costs of $20,000–$25,000 annually per resident (from all sources) can achieve high retention when combined with community infrastructure. This informs the DSN modeled projection which targets $18,000 in annual federal operating cost.

3.3 Grace Marketplace: Contributory Impact

Grace Marketplace in Gainesville, Florida, provides direct validation of the low-barrier entry principles proposed for Tier 1 (Comfort Stations). During the period of Grace Marketplace's

operation, Alachua County experienced a reported reduction of more than 50% in unsheltered homelessness: a reduction to which the program was a major contributing factor (Grace Marketplace, 2024; Alachua County, 2023).

3.3.1 Low-Barrier Entry Points

Grace Marketplace functions as a hygiene-first entry point, prioritizing immediate access to showers and laundry without behavioral prerequisites. Building on nonprofit self-reporting and program metrics, the organization reports a one-year housing retention rate of approximately 92% (CauseIQ, 2024).

This model validates the theoretical proposition that reliable hygiene access functions as a significant bridge to service engagement. By providing material dignity without preconditions, the program builds the trust necessary to engage individuals who have been repeatedly excluded from traditional institutional settings.

3.4 Tiny Home Villages: Comparative Effectiveness

A review of tiny home programs reveals that their success is sensitive to program design. Studies comparing tiny home villages to traditional dormitory shelters generally show superior outcomes, though success rates vary by duration and service integration (Center for Health Journalism, 2024).

Resident Satisfaction: A 2022 study by Portland State University found that 86% of pod-based residents were satisfied with their individual units, a metric that substantially exceeds satisfaction rates reported for congregate shelters (PDX Homeless Research, 2022).

The variation in capital costs ($2,300 to $130,000 per unit) demonstrates the need for standardized procurement and regulatory streamlining. The DSN specification balances privacy, sanitation, and capital mobility to target a mid-range cost that enables national scalability.

3.5 Conclusion of Evidence

The comparative evidence across Housing First, Project Homekey, and community-level developments suggests that housing stability, basic material security, and voluntary engagement are consistently associated with improved outcomes. The Material Dignity Infrastructure framework seeks to operationalize these findings by creating the prerequisite hygiene infrastructure and distributed housing tiers that current policy often assumes but does not provision.

4. Proposed Architecture: A Two-Tier Solution

4.1 Tier 1: Homeless Comfort Stations

4.1.1 Facilities and Operations

Homeless Comfort Stations serve as the universal entry point to the system, providing essential hygiene infrastructure without prerequisites.

Facility Spec	Requirement / Scale	Implementation Detail
Footprint	2,000–5,000 sq ft	Scaled to local population
Showers	4–8 private stalls	Individual locking doors
Laundry	4–6 cycles	Industrial washers and dryers
Restrooms	6–8 units	Individual gender-neutral
Storage	20–30 lockers	Secure personal belongings
Mail	Address provision	Critical for ID/Benefits
Connectivity	WiFi + Charging	Free high-speed access

Stations operate 24/7 to accommodate non-standard schedules. Access is unconditional: no identification, sobriety verification, or behavioral compliance is required for basic hygiene services.

4.1.2 Service Integration

Comfort Stations function as low-friction integration nodes for outreach and mobile medical services.

Service Category	Integration Method	Operational Goal
Case Management	Voluntary drop-in conversations	Relationship established
Street Outreach	Designated gathering points	Contact and referral
Primary Care	Mobile health unit co-location	Immediate medical triage
Employment	Job boards and prep access	Economic reintegration

4.1.3 Coverage and Cost

The system is designed for a coverage ratio of one station per 500 individuals experiencing homelessness.

Infrastructure Metric	Target Value	Fiscal Basis
Coverage Ratio	1 station : 500 people	Population-based load
Operating Cost	\$300,000–\$500,000	Annual station operations
City-Scale Cost	\$600k–\$1M	For 1,000 person population

4.2 Tier 2: The Distributed Stewardship Network

4.2.1 Asset-Limited Modular Unit (ALMU) Specifications

The ALMU is a factory-built, single-occupancy structure designed for rapid deployment and federal ownership.

Physical Spec	Standard Unit	ADA-Compliant Unit
Size	120–150 sq ft	180 sq ft (10% of fleet)
Interior	Kitchen + Bed + Desk	Full accessibility clearance
Sanitation	Half-bath (Sink/Toilet)	ADA-compliant fixtures
Climate	Localized HVAC	Insulated for all climates
Safety	Smoke/CO Detectors	Emergency egress windows
Lifecycle	20–30 years	Federal asset title

4.2.2 Stewardship Incentive Structure

To ensure voluntary participation, property owners receive a comprehensive financial and protection package.

Benefit Category	Yearly Impact	Implementation Mechanism
Tax Credit	\$8,000–\$12,000	Refundable income tax credit
Liability	\$2 Million Aggregate	NSIP Federal Coverage
Utilities	\$1,440–\$2,160	Direct monthly reimbursement
Asset Entry	20–35% Value Add	Property improvement (Prep)

4.2.3 Support Ecosystem

The network is supported by a 1:20 case management ratio and a digital coordination platform.

Support Component	Specification / Ratio	Management Purpose
Case Management	1 manager per 20 residents	High-intensity stability
Platform	Digital logistics system	Routing and maintenance
Success Goal	Exit in 12–24 months	Transition to permanency

5. Economic Analysis: The Distribution Dividend

5.1 Methodological Note on Economic Projections

The figures presented in this section are modeled projections based on a synthesis of empirical data anchors from existing homeless service programs and conservative operational assumptions. They are intended as scenario-based estimates rather than guaranteed empirical findings. The actual fiscal and societal impacts will depend on regional implementation conditions, local labor markets, and the fidelity of the distributed stewardship model.

5.2 Cost Model Derivation

The $18,000 annual operating cost target is established through a bottom-up derivation using data from established service programs (e.g., Community First! Village and Finland) and conservative infrastructure assumptions.

5.2.1 Modeled Annual Operating Cost Per Resident

The following table presents a modeled breakdown of the direct and indirect expenses required to support a single resident within the Distributed Stewardship Network.

Cost Category	Annual Allocation	Calculation / Basis
Capital Amortization	$2,800	$70,000 unit cost / 25-year life
Maintenance Reserve	$1,400	2% of capital cost annually
Utilities (Electricity)	$960	$80 / month metered average
Utilities (Water/Sewer)	$540	$45 / month metered average
Utilities (Internet)	$360	$30 / month steward WiFi
Case Management	$3,850	1:20 ratio ($77k salary+ben)
Insurance Premium	$500	NSIP actuarial estimate
Digital Platform	$20	$2M annual ops / 100k users
Admin Overhead	$530	5% of subtotal direct costs
Tier 1 Access	$640	Comfort Station allocation
Gross Direct Cost	**$11,600**	**Subtotal per resident**

In addition to direct costs, the federal government provides a tax incentive to the property owner.

Incentive / Offset	Annual Impact	Rationale
Steward Tax Credit	$10,000	Average federal refund per unit
Gross Federal Outlay	**$21,600**	**Total per-resident expenditure**
Emergency Offset	($8,000)	50% reduction in crisis usage
Net Public Cost	**$13,600**	**Balanced fiscal impact**

5.2.2 Comparison to Prevailing Interventions

The following table compares modeled projections for the DSN with reported cost ranges for traditional interventions.

Intervention Type	Housing Cost	Emergency Costs	Total Public Cost	Retention Rate
Street (Status Quo)	$0	$30,000–$50,000	$30,000–$50,000	N/A
Emergency Shelter	$40,000–$50,000	$10,000–$15,000	$50,000–$65,000	$< 40\%$
Traditional PSH	$20,000–$25,000	$5,000–$8,000	$25,000–$33,000	80–92%
Community First!	$20,000–$25,000	$10,000–$21,000	$35,000–$46,000	86%
Material Dignity	**$12,000**	**$6,000–$8,000**	**$18,000–$20,000**	**Target 85%**

5.3 Capital Deployment Projections: 10,000-Unit Pilot

The pilot phase requires an initial investment to establish the manufacturing pipeline and the foundational software layers.

Capital Requirement	Modeled Investment	Deployment Purpose
ALMU Production	$700 Million	10,000 units at $70,000 each
Comfort Stations	$90 Million	60 stations across 20 cities
Digital Platform	$5 Million	Software and matching engine
HUD Admin Setup	$10 Million	Personnel and protocols
Insurance Seed	$50 Million	Initial NSIP capitalization
Total Pilot Capital	**$855 Million**	**Total startup investment**

5.4 Modeled National Savings and Dividends

At a scenario-based scale of 100,000 residents, cross-system modeling indicates the potential for significant national savings, particularly in healthcare and criminal justice expenditures.

System Segment	Projected Savings	Primary Driver
Healthcare	$800 Million	Reduced ER and inpatient stays
Criminal Justice	$400 Million	Reduced survival-crime arrests
Emergency Services	$200 Million	Fewer ambulance/crisis calls
Net Savings Potential	**$1.4 Billion**	**Full-scale national dividend**

The DSN model differs from traditional contracting by recirculating funds directly into local communities through property owner tax credits. This creates local economic multipliers that concentrated shelter contracts cannot match.

6. Legal and Institutional Framework: A National Stewardship Infrastructure

The implementation of a national distributed housing network requires an innovative legal architecture capable of reconciling federal objectives with local land-use authority. While the United States lacks a direct federal preemption precedent for residential zoning, the Material Dignity Infrastructure framework employs a hybrid mechanism of Spending Clause authority and functional analogues from telecommunications infrastructure to create a viable implementation pathway.

6.1 Constitutional Foundation: The Spending Clause Mechanism

The primary constitutional basis for the Material Dignity Infrastructure Act (MDIA) rests on the Spending Clause of the United States Constitution (Article I, Section 8, Clause 1). Following the precedent established in *South Dakota v. Dole* (1987), the federal government may condition the receipt of federal funds on state or local government actions: provided those conditions are in pursuit of the "general welfare," expressed unambiguously, and related to the federal interest.

Under the MDIA, the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) would establish "Material Dignity Grants" available to municipalities. Eligibility for these grants would be contingent upon local adoption of a model "Stewardship Overlay Zone" (SOZ) ordinance. This ordinance would grant "by-right" permitting for Asset-Limited Modular Units (ALMUs) on properties meeting specific objective criteria: such as residential zoning, non-HOA status, and minimum setback requirements. By utilizing a voluntary, incentive-based approach rather than direct preemption, the framework avoids 10th Amendment challenges while effectively creating a national standard for distributed housing placement.

6.2 The Telecommunications Act Precedent: Infrastructure of Necessity

The 1996 Telecommunications Act provides a compelling conceptual analog for the MDIA. To ensure the rapid deployment of essential wireless infrastructure, Congress implemented "shot clock" mechanisms and prohibited local governments from enacting bans that have "the effect of prohibiting" service provision. While local authorities retained control over specific tower placement (subject to objective standards), they were precluded from denying placements based on non-objective criteria or environmental concerns already regulated at the federal level.

The MDIA adapts this logic to human infrastructure. The Act would categorize ALMUs as "essential human infrastructure" rather than conventional dwellings. This classification allows for the imposition of "shot clocks" on local permit reviews (for example, a 60–day maximum) and limits local denial authority to objective standards: safety, utility access, and density. By treating the ALMU as a mobile capital asset owned by the federal government and deployed for a specific public welfare purpose, the legal framework differentiates it from permanent Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs), thereby bypassing more restrictive local building codes designed for permanent primary structures.

6.3 Stewardship Overlay Zones (SOZ) and Zoning Reform

The SOZ serves as the surgical legal instrument for spatial distribution. Unlike broad zoning reform which often generates intense political opposition across entire municipalities, the SOZ targeting is specific and regulated:

1. **Density Controls**: To prevent "clustering" and maintain the distributed character of the network, the MDIA mandates a maximum density of one ALMU per 50 single-family parcels within a census tract, with a minimum 500–foot dispersion requirement. This density cap ensures that no single neighborhood bears a disproportionate "stewardship load": preserving the natural surveillance and social integration benefits identified by Jacobs (1961).
2. **Objective Permitting**: The SOZ ordinance requires "by-right" approval if the placement meets federal ALMU specifications and local utility safety codes. Discretionary reviews (such as design review boards or neighborhood character assessments) are expressly prohibited for SOZ placements.
3. **Appeals Pathway**: Denials of SOZ permits are subject to an expedited administrative appeal process overseen by federal administrative law judges, mirroring the appeals process for telecommunications infrastructure.

6.4 Risk Mitigation: The National Stewardship Insurance Pool

A critical legal barrier to private property stewardship is the property owner's exposure to liability. Standard homeowners' insurance policies typically do not cover commercial activity or the risks associated with hosting unrelated unhoused individuals on the premises.

The MDIA establishes the National Stewardship Insurance Pool (NSIP): a federally-backed captive insurance entity. The NSIP provides primary liability coverage (up to $2 million aggregate per steward) for property damage, personal injury, and civil rights claims arising from program participation. By shifting the liability burden from the individual homeowner to a national pool capitalized by federal appropriations ($500 million initial seed) and annual premiums ($500 per unit paid by HUD), the framework eliminates the primary "risk barrier" to recruitment. The low-risk profile of screened residents and the presence of intensive case management support an actuarial model with low claims frequency, making the NSIP a cost-effective alternative to private market insurance.

6.5 Federal Asset Ownership and Regulatory Supremacy

The final pillar of the institutional framework is the retention of federal ownership of all ALMUs. By maintaining title to the physical units, the federal government asserts regulatory supremacy over the equipment's manufacture and quality standards. This prevents fragmented local jurisdictions from imposing idiosyncratic building codes that would inflate per-unit costs or prohibit deployment. The ALMU is legally characterized as "federal personal property" temporarily sited on private land via a revocable stewardship agreement, rather than a "real property improvement." This distinction

is critical for maintaining capital mobility (allowing for the rapid relocation of units) and for excluding ALMUs from local property tax assessments, which are instead handled through the federal tax credit incentive.

7. Risk Analysis and Mitigation: Navigating Systemic Challenges

The transition from a concentration-based homelessness model to a distributed stewardship network involves significant political, operational, and social risks. Achieving the projected outcomes requires a robust understanding of these failure modes and the implementation of proactive mitigation strategies.

7.1 Political Economy and Regulatory Resistance

The primary political risk is the "suburban blockade": the potential for local governments to accept federal grants while simultaneously enacting restrictive "objective standards" that effectively prohibit ALMU placement. While the Stewardship Overlay Zone (SOZ) mechanism uses financial incentives to align local and federal interests, municipalities may still attempt to engineer barriers through excessive setback requirements, utility connection fees, or onerous site preparation standards.

Mitigation: The MDIA includes a "functional ban" clause analogous to telecommunications law. If a municipality's objective standards result in a statistically significant inability to place authorized ALMUs, HUD may declare the municipality in violation of the grant conditions and invoke the administrative appeals pathway. Furthermore, the framing of stewardship as a civic contribution (reinforced by prominent faith-based and veteran-led social marketing) is designed to create a "YIMBY" (Yes In My Backyard) constituency of property owners with a material interest in opposing exclusionary zoning.

7.2 The Recruitment and Retention of Stewards

The scalability of the Distributed Stewardship Network (DSN) depends entirely on the voluntary participation of private property owners. There is a risk that even with $10,000 annual tax credits and full liability coverage, the perceived "social cost" or "safety risk" may deter recruitment, particularly in high-demand neighborhoods where social integration benefits would be greatest.

Mitigation: The recruitment strategy employs a tiered approach, targeting "early adopter" segments such as faith-based organizations, retired social workers, and civic-minded veterans' groups. Additionally, the $18,000 budget allows for a "recruitment reserve" to adjust tax credit levels in high-cost regions to ensure uptake. The presence of the digital coordination platform and 24/7 case management dispatch provides stewards with the assurance that they are part of a supported system rather than isolated hosts. Evidence from *Community First! Village* and safe parking programs suggests that when risks are managed and participation is framed as a mission, recruitment exceeds expectations.

7.3 Operational Failure Modes: Maintenance and Case Management

Scattered-site housing models face mechanical challenges that centralized facilities avoid: primarily the increased travel time for case managers and maintenance technicians. If the 1:20 case management ratio becomes diluted by administrative or travel burdens, resident stabilization may falter, leading to relationship friction with stewards and program dropouts.

Mitigation: The DSN addresses this through "architectural optimization." The digital platform uses route-optimization algorithms similar to logistics fleets to minimize case manager travel time. Furthermore, the Comfort Stations (Tier 1) serve as nodes for equipment storage and maintenance staging, reducing the "hub-and-spoke" distance. Standardizing the ALMU equipment allows for a "plug-and-play" maintenance model where failing components (such as HVAC and plumbing modules) can be swapped rapidly rather than repaired on-site, maintaining low labor costs and high resident stability.

7.4 Lessons from Failed Paradigms: The Project Homekey Caveat

The high vacancy rates observed in California's *Project Homekey* (exceeding 70% in some Los Angeles County properties) serve as a cautionary tale regarding the "readiness gap." Project Homekey failed where it prioritized property acquisition over operational infrastructure: buying hotels without having the staff, service contracts, or resident-matching systems in place.

Mitigation: The MDIA reverses this sequence. ALMU production and pilot city selection are contingent upon the completion of the digital platform and the hiring of case management foundations. Because the ALMUs are manufactured off-site and deployed only when a steward and resident are matched, the system avoids the "empty building" syndrome. The DSN is a demand-matched system rather than a supply-build-then-fill system, ensuring that capital is only deployed when the social and operational infrastructure is ready to receive it.

7.5 Social Integration and Relationship Friction

The ultimate success of the stewardship model depends on the quality of the informal relationship between the resident and the host property owner. Unlike institutional staffing, this relationship is personal and subject to human friction, boundary misunderstandings, or social mismatch.

Mitigation: The matching algorithm on the digital platform incorporates "lifestyle compatibility" metrics, similar to co-housing or senior-care matching services. Participation is governed by a clear "Stewardship Agreement" that delineates boundaries, responsibilities, and the role of the case manager as a neutral mediator. The transitional nature of the program (12–24 months) provides a clear endpoint, reducing the "permanence anxiety" that often fuels neighborhood opposition to traditional housing projects.

8. Stakeholder Analysis: Aligning Interests for Systemic Change

Developing a national infrastructure for Material Dignity requires navigating a complex landscape of entrenched interests. Traditional homelessness policy operates as a "zero-sum" game where benefits to unhoused populations are often perceived as costs to housed communities. The Distributed Stewardship Network (DSN) reconfigures this dynamic into a "positive-sum" framework by aligning economic incentives with social outcomes.

8.1 Primary Beneficiaries: The Incentive Alignment

For those experiencing homelessness, the primary benefit is the restoration of autonomy and material dignity. By bypassing the congregate shelter system, residents gain a private and secure base: the "ontological security" required to engage in healthcare, employment, and social reintegration. For property owners, the model transforms an underutilized asset (backyard space) into a source of reliable income via federal tax credits, while simultaneously increasing long-term property value through utility improvements ready for an accessory dwelling unit (ADU). The $10,000 annual credit represents a significant financial motivation that transcends mere altruism.

Municipalities benefit from a dramatic reduction in the "crisis costs" associated with street homelessness. By diverting individuals from expensive emergency rooms, jails, and high-intensity police interactions, local governments can achieve net fiscal savings. Furthermore, the distributed model reduces the political burden of siting large shelters: allowing mayors and city councils to address homelessness without triggering the explosive NIMBY protests that often paralyze traditional projects.

8.2 Navigating Institutional Opposition

Institutional opposition is likely from two primary directions: traditional service providers and segments of the real estate industry. Large-scale non-profit shelter operators, whose business models depend on multimillion-dollar congregate facility contracts, may perceive the shift toward distribution as a threat to their organizational viability. These entities wield significant influence in the "homelessness industrial complex" and may lobby against the Material Dignity Infrastructure Act (MDIA) on the grounds that it bypasses established service hubs.

Mitigation: The MDIA positions the DSN as a complementary rather than replacement tier. Comfort Stations (Tier 1) provide new opportunities for service providers to engage unhoused populations, while the DSN (Tier 2) serves as a much-needed transitional "release valve" for overcrowded permanent supportive housing (PSH) systems. By framing the DSN as "Housing First 2.0," the policy offers existing providers a pathway to modernize their service delivery models rather than face obsolescence.

8.3 Political Economy of the "Material Dignity" Framing

The choice of terminology ("Material Dignity") is a strategic decision aimed at coalition-building across the political spectrum. For progressive advocates, the framework emphasizes human rights, autonomy, and the rejection of institutional paternalism. It addresses the "hygiene gap" that traditional models ignore, framing it as a matter of civil rights.

For conservative policymakers, the model is framed as a market-based, decentralized solution that utilizes private property and individual stewardship rather than government bureaucracy. It emphasizes cost-efficiency, personal responsibility (through the stewardship relationship), and the reduction of public disorder. The "Distributed Stewardship" concept resonates with traditional American values of civic duty and community-led problem solving: reminiscent of the *Tocquevillian* tradition. This makes it more politically palatable than centralized public housing expansions.

8.4 Strategic Coalition Building

The implementation strategy focuses on building a "Cross-Sector Material Dignity Coalition." This includes:

- **Foundational Partners**: National Alliance to End Homelessness, US Conference of Mayors, and major manufactured housing trade associations.
- **Economic Partners**: Municipal finance officers and public health associations, mobilized by evidence of cross-system savings.
- **Civil Society**: Faith communities and veterans' service organizations, who provide the "social marketing" backbone for steward recruitment.
- **Technology Partners**: Digital logistics and modular housing manufacturers, whose scale provides the necessary capital efficiency.

By transforming a "wicked" social problem into a manageable infrastructure challenge, the Material Dignity framework creates a broad political base for implementation. The goal is to move homelessness policy beyond the repetitive cycle of crisis and failure toward a sustainable, distributed, and dignified national architecture.

9. Conclusion

9.1 Theoretical Contribution

This paper examines Material Dignity as a capability in the Senian framework: identifying reliable hygiene access as a prerequisite for economic participation. The "Dignity Barrier" concept provides an analytical category for persistent unemployment among individuals who may possess housing or motivation but lack the material basics of hygiene and autonomous space.

The distributed stewardship model provides a theoretical alternative to concentration paradigms: indicating how spatial distribution combined with economic incentives can reverse NIMBY dynamics while achieving improved cost-effectiveness and social integration outcomes.

9.2 Empirical Validation

International evidence from Finland (a reported 68% reduction in long-term homelessness and substantial societal savings) and domestic evidence from Community First! Village (86% retention and significant survival improvements) validate the core principles underlying the Material Dignity model.

Comparative analysis establishes the potential position of the Distributed Stewardship Network (DSN): filling the gap between street outreach and permanent housing by creating the foundational hygiene infrastructure and distributed transitional housing that current policy research suggests are necessary for stabilization.

9.3 Economic Feasibility

Modeled cost projections based on conservative assumptions indicate annual operating costs in the range of $14,000–$18,000 per resident. These figures represent potential savings of 55–64% compared to reported emergency shelter costs and 60–72% savings compared to estimated street homelessness costs in high-cost metropolitan regions.

Cross-system modeling suggests that full-scale deployment could generate net federal savings estimated at $1.4 billion annually. This positions the DSN as a scenario-based investment that can generate positive societal returns through cost avoidance in healthcare and criminal justice.

9.4 Implementation Pathway

The Spending Clause implementation mechanism provides a constitutional foundation for federal coordination without direct coercion. Voluntary municipal participation, Stewardship Overlay Zones (SOZ) with density controls, and the National Insurance Pool (NSIP) provide a structural pathway to resolve the primary legal and liability barriers to private property stewardship.

Phased deployment starting with 2,000 units in 10 cities (Years 1–2) and scaling based on evaluation outcomes provides a structured approach from pilot to full national implementation.

9.5 Policy Implications

Material Dignity Infrastructure represents an evolution of current policy—"Housing First 2.0." It seeks to enable Housing First by creating the foundational hygiene infrastructure and distributed transitional housing that the model assumes but does not always provision. This approach addresses critical limitations in the current paradigm: (1) the absence of universal hygiene infrastructure; (2) the reliance on high-cost concentration models; and (3) the exclusion of property owners as stakeholders in homelessness resolution.

The framework suggests that federal policy can achieve improved outcomes through distributed private stewardship incentivized by tax credits and liability protection. This provides an American institutional mechanism for achieving the outcomes observed in international gold-standard models like Finland.

9.6 Future Research Agenda

Priority research needs include: rigorous pilot program evaluation; comprehensive cost-effectiveness analysis incorporating cross-system longitudinal effects; community impact assessment measuring social integration; and legal analysis of state implementation variations.

9.7 Closing Statement

Homelessness is fundamentally an architectural and governance problem. We possess the resources but frequently deploy them through concentration models that inflate public costs and degrade individual outcomes. The Material Dignity Infrastructure model demonstrates that by shifting from concentration to distribution, from institutions to stewardship, and from barriers to dignity, we can reduce chronic homelessness at a fraction of current expenditures.

The evidence from Austin to Helsinki indicates that these principles can achieve superior outcomes at lower societal costs. The question for policymakers is whether we possess the political will to evaluate and implement these alternatives. Homelessness persists not from a lack of solutions, but from a potential hesitation to move beyond documented failures toward an evidence-based, distributed, and dignified future.

This paper provides the architectural blueprint; implementation awaits policy commitment.

References

Capabilities Approach and Theoretical Framework:

Nussbaum, M. (2011). *Creating Capabilities: The Human Development Approach*. Harvard University Press.

Sen, A. (1999). *Development as Freedom*. Oxford University Press.

Saunders, P. (1989). The meaning of 'home' in contemporary English culture. *Housing Studies*, 4(3), 177–192.

Spatial Politics and Urban Planning:

Dear, M., and Wolch, J. (1987). *Landscapes of Despair: From Deinstitutionalization to Homelessness*. Princeton University Press.

Jacobs, J. (1961). *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. Random House.

Housing First and Homelessness Research:

Padgett, D. K., Henwood, B. F., and Tsemberis, S. J. (2016). *Housing First: Ending Homelessness, Transforming Systems, and Changing Lives*. Oxford University Press.

Tsemberis, S. (2010). Housing First: The Pathways Model to End Homelessness for People with Mental Illness and Addiction. *Hazelden*.

Tsemberis, S., Gulcur, L., and Nakae, M. (2004). Housing First, Consumer Choice, and Harm Reduction for Homeless Individuals with a Dual Diagnosis. *American Journal of Public Health*.

Finland and International Evidence:

Finnish Ministry of the Environment. *Programme to Eradicate Long Term Homelessness in Finland*. Helsinki.

SDG 16 Plus. (2023). How Finland Solved Homelessness. Retrieved from https://sdg16.plus/

The Atlas. (2023). How Finland is solving homelessness. Retrieved from https://the-atlas.com/

Y-Foundation. (2024). *Housing First in Finland: Successes, Challenges, and Lessons Learned*. Helsinki.

OECD. *Integrating Social Services for Vulnerable Populations: Lessons from Housing First Models*. Paris.

Community First! Village:

Community Impact. (2024). Austin's Community First! Village expands to help more people. Retrieved from communityimpact.com

Dell Foundation. (2024). Community First! Village: A Model for Ending Chronic Homelessness. Retrieved from dell.org

Housing Innovation Lab. (2024). Community First! Village Case Study. Retrieved from housinginnovation.co

KVUE. (2024). Community First! Village continues to grow. Retrieved from kvue.com

Mobile Loaves and Fishes (MLF). (2024). *Community First Village Impact Reports and Public Disclosures*. Austin, TX.

Texas Tribune. (2024). Inside Austin's Community First! Village. Retrieved from texastribune.org

Grace Marketplace:

CauseIQ. (2024). Grace Marketplace nonprofit profile and program metrics. Retrieved from causeiq.com

Grace Marketplace. (2024). *Impact Report: 10 Years of Service*. Grace Marketplace Data.

WUFT. (2023). Grace Marketplace helps reduce homelessness in Alachua County. WUFT News.

Alachua County. (2023). *Point in Time Homeless Counts and Annual Reports*. Gainesville, FL.

Tiny Home Programs:

Center for Health Journalism. (2024). What happens when people leave tiny home villages? Retrieved from centerforhealthjournalism.org

Housing Innovation. (2024). Tiny House Community Cost Analysis. Retrieved from housinginnovationeries.com

LA Times. (2024). Los Angeles tiny homes cost how much? Retrieved from latimes.com

PDX Homeless Research. (2022). *Tiny House Village Study*. Portland State University.

Project Homekey:

Berkeley. (2023). *Project Homekey Evaluation*. University of California, Berkeley.

California HCD. (2024). Homekey Program Guidelines. Retrieved from ca.gov

Enterprise Community. (2024). Project Homekey Impact Assessment. Retrieved from enterprisecommunity.org

End Homelessness. (2024). Project Homekey Outcomes. Retrieved from endhomelessness.org

Pacific Research Institute. (2024). *Project Homekey Evaluation*. Retrieved from pacificresearch.org

Guaranteed Income:

CBS News. (2024). Denver's basic income experiment shows promising results. Retrieved from cbsnews.com

Denverite. (2024). Denver Basic Income Project results. Retrieved from denverite.com

Urban Institute. (2024). *Guaranteed Income Pilot Evaluation*. Retrieved from urban.org

Safe Parking:

Circling the News. (2024). L.A. safe parking costs. Retrieved from circlingthenews.com

USC Price School. (2024). *Safe Parking Programs: A National Review*. University of Southern California.

Housing First Cost-Effectiveness:

ABQ Healthcare for the Homeless. (2024). Housing First ROI. Retrieved from abqhch.org

Culhane, D., Metraux, S., and Hadley, T. (2002). Public Service Reductions Associated with Placement of Homeless Persons with Severe Mental Illness in Supportive Housing. *Housing Policy Debate*.

Larimer, M. et al. (2009). Health Care and Public Service Use and Costs Before and After Provision of Housing for Chronically Homeless Persons with Severe Alcohol Problems. *Journal of the American Medical Association*.

Kansas City Fed. (2024). Housing First economic impacts. Retrieved from kansascityfed.org

NLIHC (National Low Income Housing Coalition). (2024). Housing First Evidence. Retrieved from nlihc.org

UNL (University of Nebraska–Lincoln). (2024). *Housing First Cost Savings Study*.

Emergency Services Costs:

Greendoors. (2024). The Real Cost of Homelessness. Retrieved from greendoors.org

NIH (National Institutes of Health). (2024). Healthcare utilization among homeless populations. Retrieved from nih.gov

Federal Policy and Legal:

HUD (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development). (2023). *2023 Annual Homeless Assessment Report (AHAR) to Congress*. Part 1: Point-in-Time Estimates of Homelessness.

HUD Exchange. (2024). Case Management Best Practices. Retrieved from hudexchange.info

South Dakota v. Dole, 483 U.S. 203 (1987).

United States Congress. *Telecommunications Act of 1996*. Public Law 104-104.

Property Values and ADUs:

Harvard JCHS (Joint Center for Housing Studies). (2024). *ADU Impact on Neighboring Properties*. Harvard University.

State ADU Laws:

California Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO). (2023). *California's Homelessness Spending*.

Hygiene and Dignity:

Portland State University. (2024). *Hygiene Access and Homeless Employment Outcomes*.

Simply the Basics. (2024). Impact of hygiene on homeless populations. Retrieved from simplythebasics.org

The Share Community. (2024). Mobile hygiene services outcomes. Retrieved from thesharecommunity.com

Additional Sources:

DiBella, C. (2025). *The Ghost in the System: Strategic Architecture for California Homelessness Funding Recovery*. Bikepaths.org.

Guardian. (2024). *The High Cost of California's Homelessness Crisis*. The Guardian.

Maine Housing. (2023). *Shelter Cost Analysis*. Maine State Housing Authority.

World Health Organization. *Social Determinants of Health and Housing Stability*. Geneva.