

**Richardson Bay Regional Agency's  
Temporary Housing Placement Program  
First Year Review  
June 2024**

Prepared by:  
Beth A. Pollard  
Project Consultant  
County of Marin

## 1. Executive Summary

Upon nearing the end of its first year, the Richard Bay Regional Agency (RBRA) Temporary Housing Program is on a trajectory to relocate into housing persons from approximately 30 vessels on Richardson Bay by the end of the program's three-year duration. A total of 14 persons have utilized a total of 13 vouchers that fund housing, with support services, for a 12-month period. In addition, there have been three federally-subsidized permanent vouchers issued to participants at the end of the initial 12-month period, replacing the temporary housing vouchers issued through the RBRA program.

A total of 13 vessels owned by persons using those vouchers are no longer anchored on Richardson Bay; 12 were removed by RBRA and one was moved by the vessel owner into a boat slip. The removal of an additional vessel of a person with a voucher is imminent. The healthy level of interest in the program growing among persons still in the anchorage bodes well for achieving a projected outcome of utilizing most or all of the 30 temporary housing vouchers targeted to be available through the program.

Permanent Housing Choice Vouchers (HCV's), funded under the Federal Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Section 8 program, are still expected to be available, as the program envisioned, to replace temporary vouchers when the latter reach their 12-month expiration. This allows the relocated persons to indefinitely maintain stable and safe housing off the water. However, the expiration of the temporary vouchers may not necessarily align precisely with the availability of the HCV's, meaning that RBRA may be called upon to fund temporary vouchers for additional weeks or months beyond the 12-month period targeted in the program. To what extent, if any, this occurs and its impact on the number of vouchers that can be made available in the future - unless additional funding is secured - is unknown at this time. Furthermore, some HCV's may be issued before the end of the 12-month period. Accordingly, RBRA is monitoring the expenditure of funds, along with developing prioritized eligibility for the remaining voucher funding.

As of June 2024, there are 25-29 individuals on 25 vessels currently on the bay who RBRA has identified as eligible in the initial tier to apply for enrollment in the temporary housing program. Of those who remain, seven persons on six vessels are in the enrollment or rental process.

Continued success relies heavily on maintaining trust with the anchorage population, supportive case management services before, during and after relocation, recognizing challenges unique to the population and program, and collaboration among the involved agencies to address issues in a timely manner. Creative ways to engage those not yet inclined to participate will be warranted if interest does not organically rise to the total number of available vouchers.

## **2. Program Purpose & Objectives**

The purpose of the RBRA Temporary Housing Placement Program is to place as many as possible of the persons who have remained on vessels in Richardson Bay into legal and safe housing in as timely and efficient manner as is feasible. Its objectives are to decrease the number of liveaboard vessels on the bay, in accordance with the agreement between RBRA and the Bay Conservation & Development Commission, while providing housing access, subsidy and support to those who relocate from the vessels. Underlying the purpose and objectives is the aim to accomplish the transition in a manner that results in sustained mutual success for the program participants and RBRA; specifically, continued housing for those participating and no return of program participants onto vessels in Richardson Bay.

## **3. Funding**

The RBRA Temporary Housing Placement Program is funded by a \$3 million grant from the State of California Department of Community Development and Housing. With the assistance of Senator McGuire’s office, the grant funds were received by RBRA in 2023 and are available to RBRA on an ongoing and as-needed basis for program costs. All program costs are incurred through contracts for services between RBRA and the Marin Housing Authority (MHA), and between RBRA and the Marin County Health & Human Services Agency (HHS), who contracts with Episcopal Community Services (ECS) for housing-based case management services.

Additionally, the \$3 million grant served as matching funds to secure \$2.78 million from the US Environmental Protection Agency’s San Francisco Bay Water Quality Improvement Fund for the restoration of eelgrass in Richardson Bay. Furthermore, issuance and successful implementation of grants reflects favorably on agencies such as RBRA when they pursue grant funding for other projects and programs.

## **4. Program Eligibility**

RBRA, working with its partners at MHA and HHS, established these eligibility criteria for persons to apply for the program:

1. Must have been present in both of the point in time surveys taken by RBRA of vessels in its jurisdiction in the Bay on June 1, 2022 and on April 1, 2023.
2. Are extremely low or very low income, as defined by MHA in accordance with Federal Housing and Urban Development (HUD) guidelines, and eligible for a HCV through MHA.

3. Will remove their vessel from anchoring or mooring in Richardson Bay, with the option to turn in their vessel via RBRA's Vessel Buy Back Program – which enables vessel owners to be paid \$150/linear foot for such surrendered vessels.
4. Agree to abide in the future to regulations regarding Richardson Bay, notably the 72-hour anchoring limit.

In June 2024, RBRA began developing a tiered approach for eligibility that would apply once all persons on both vessel surveys have been contacted, for which it is seeking input from project partners.

## **5. Contracts for Services**

### Marin Housing Authority (MHA)

In November 2022, RBRA entered into a contract with MHA to manage housing identification and placement, as well as ongoing lease and subsidy arrangements for eligible program participants. The services include transitioning those persons with temporary housing program vouchers into HCV Section 8 permanent housing vouchers at the end of the initial 12-month temporary voucher period.

The term of the MHA contract is through December 31, 2025, with their respective Boards' approval; the contract may be amended to coincide with depletion of the State funding for this program.

The State funds are used to support MHA staffing costs for the contracted services as well as the rental subsidies for the temporary housing; the subsidies are the differential between 30% of the participant's income and the amount of the lease.

### Marin County Health & Human Services (HHS) and Episcopal Community Services (ECS)

In April 2023, RBRA entered into a services agreement with the Marin County Health & Human Services Agency (HHS) for HHS to provide housing case management and related services for individuals living on anchored vessels in the waters of Richardson Bay as of June 1, 2022. The initial term of the contract was through June 30, 2024, renewable for an additional three years. The contract was renewed on May 9, 2024 through June 20, 2025.

In August 2023, HHS contracted with Episcopal Community Services of San Francisco (ECS) to provide Housing-Based Case Management (HBCM) to persons on Richardson Bay. The contract scope extends from initial pre-housing engagement, to support while housed with a temporary voucher, and through the transition to a permanent voucher. The initial term of this contract was through June 30, 2024, and is being extended through June 30, 2025.

## 6. Program Outcomes

### Quantitative program outcomes include:

At June 27, 2024:

- Number of persons housed: 14
- Number of temporary housing vouchers: 13
- Number of persons with permanent vouchers: 3
- Vessel trips: 42
- Number of individual contacts: 35
- Number of persons served: 28

At June 20, 2024, the number of persons with vouchers not yet housed: 3 individuals on 2 vouchers

Number of persons transitioned to HVC: 4 individuals on 3 vouchers

At June 20, 2024, number of persons in the application or intake process: 3

Geographic distribution of housing, by city:

- Larkspur = 1
- Novato = 1
- San Rafael = 8
- Sausalito = 3
- Tiburon = 1

Vessel removal: The vessels of persons housed via the program have been removed or relocated from the anchorage totals 13, with one more in process.

### Qualitative program outcomes include:

Interest: There has been growing interest in the housing program as eligible participants become aware that other persons have relocated and continue to inhabit housing of their choosing seen as acceptable.

Housing availability: There has been a sufficient number of housing units for the number of vouchers supported by the program.

Stability: There has been no loss of housing or departure from housing among those relocated with the vouchers.

Confidentiality: There are no reported breaches of confidentiality by the contracted service providers.

Recreational vessels: There is informal observation of more recreational vessels visiting Richardson Bay on a temporary basis for recreational purposes. This is likely a result of the decrease in the number of occupied vessels.

## **7. Program Methodology:**

HHS serves as overall program coordinator. It is responsible for determining preliminary eligibility through its Coordinated Entry point person based on the criteria approved by the RBRA program. It is also responsible for screening individuals for eligibility to transition into a permanent housing voucher program at the end of the 12-month period of the temporary housing voucher.

ECS is the primary point of contact between the program and eligible participants. Upon learning of a vessel occupant's curiosity about the program, ECS provides them with information on how the program works, and what will be provided to and expected of participants during and after enrollment and placement. ECS assists interested participants in completing a pre-application to submit to HHS's Coordinated Entry Program; this includes ECS helping persons enroll in governmental programs -such as Social Security and programs that provide assistance for which they are eligible, as well as obtaining any required documentation. Once a pre-application is approved by HHS, ECS assists in the referral to MHA for its intake process for obtaining the temporary voucher and continues to provide ongoing support and assistance.

In addition to explaining the program, connecting individuals with financial support and other aid, and guiding individuals into program enrollment, ECS also assists with other services; for example, arranging for and transporting individuals to medical care appointments.

The average time to complete the intake process is about 3-4 weeks. Once the MHA intake is successfully completed, MHA provides the enrolled participants with a list of units available to them in Marin County. MHA also helps them navigate the selection and rental process. Participants may choose from any of the units on the list provided by MHA. They also may work with MHA in seeking placement outside the county. Once the participant selects the unit, MHA handles the lease arrangements with the landlord. MHA is also a source of guidance to participants about utilities, and about other tenant obligations – from logistics to behavior protocols.

The program participant pays 30% of their income towards the rent. The RBRA housing program pays the balance of the rent during the 12-month period of the temporary voucher.

Fair housing regulations prohibit most landlords from refusing to lease to program participants; exceptions exist for buildings of four units or less and insurmountable issues

that arise from criminal or credit background checks. However, none of these exceptions have caused anyone in the program to date to go unhoused, and they are not expected to be impediments going forward.

Once MHA executes the lease between the landlord and program participant, ECS directly assists the participant with the move. ECS arranges for home furnishings (through another non-profit), contracts for moving services to transport belongings from vessels to the new homes, and provides new clothing and other assistance specific to the individual or situation.

ECS continues to provide support after the move, responding to requests for assistance from participants or MHA. If issues between the landlord and program participant or other tenant matters arise, MHA is the primary contact point for communication and adjustments with the landlord while ECS is the primary point for communication and adjustments with the participating tenant - although ECS may be in contact with the landlord to assist on resolving issues. During this process, MHA and ECS coordinate with one another to ensure consistency among their efforts. Additionally, ECS continues to support the program participant with their needs, such as health care appointments. They also provide other miscellaneous support that recognizes the significance of the transition that participants are making in leaving their lifestyle of being on a vessel in the bay and to varying extents also leaving their community.

Among the required forms and documents for enrollment is a signed agreement by the program participant to remove their vessel from Richardson Bay. A companion RBRA initiative—the Vessel Buyback Program—is crucial in providing additional incentive and support for a vessel occupant’s transition off the water and into housing. RBRA pays the individual \$150 per linear foot for their vessel, thereby providing an additional boost of funds to the individuals making the transition into a land-based home. RBRA then disposes of the vessel with grant funding separate from the housing voucher program.

Nine months after issuance of temporary vouchers, ECS, in partnership with HHS Coordinated Entry and RBRA, notifies MHA that those clients are losing their housing due to loss of government housing support – in this case the RBRA temporary housing program funding. Accordingly, ECS then coordinates with MHA regarding the issuance of a permanent voucher to replace the expiring temporary voucher and keep the clients in their units.

The principal source of permanent vouchers targeted for use under this program are those expressly allocated for persons displaced due to discontinuation of other governmental assistance; in this case, the discontinuation of the government funded temporary housing program. MHA receives 10 new vouchers of this type each year.

**8. Program Monitoring**

RBRA receives monthly status reports from MHA on the number of vouchers issued, number of persons housed, and number of persons in the process of acquiring a voucher. RBRA receives quarterly status reports from HHS on the number of persons housed, number with permanent vouchers, number with vouchers not housed, vessel trips, number of individual contacts, and number of persons served.

Representatives of MHA, HHS and ECS meet twice/monthly with RBRA to address issues that may arise - while maintaining confidentiality around names or other identifying information.

In June 2024, participants housed through the program were invited to anonymously provide feedback; most of the responses were positive, some were neutral, and none were negative:

	Unsatisfied/ Very unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very satisfied
Satisfaction with current residence	0	2	1	4
Satisfaction with services from ESC housing case manager	0	2	0	5
How well treated by ECS staff	0	2	0	5
Rate experience w/ECS	0	2	1	4

Other questions/responses:

- When asked how they were treated by ECS staff, five responded “very well” and two responded “neutral.”
- When asked how comfortable they would be with making a complaint about ECS staff, three responded “very comfortable” and two responded “neutral.”

Comments included feeling treated with utmost respect; gratitude to everyone in the transition - including the Downtown Streets Team, and calling the ESC housing case worker “excellent.”

**9. Resources utilized:**

Funds for 3-year program term: \$3 million



MHA Services:

	<b>May 2023-April 2024 (12 Mos.)</b>	<b>May 2024</b>	<b>Total – 13 Months</b>
<b>Housing Assistance/Vouchers</b>	127,507.15	28,855.00	156,362.15
<b>Administration/Staffing</b>	129,261.18	9,841.32	139,102.50
<b>Total:</b>	256,768.33	38,696.32	295,464.65

HHS/ECS Services:

The RBRA contract with HHS includes services provided by both HHS and ECS.

HHS Contract Amount (14 months through June 30, 2024): \$344,680

**10. Program Strengths:**

Trust

There appears to be a healthier level of trust in this program than in prior housing outreach efforts to the Richardson Bay population. Foundational to this trust is believed to be:

Follow-through and delivery: A critical element to attracting program participants is follow-through by the program agencies in doing what they say they will do and those unhoused hearing about or seeing for themselves that housing is actually taking place. Thus far failure to deliver on support and voucher commitments has not emerged as an issue of concern.

Confidentiality: The confidentiality with which ECS and HHS holds personal information about their engagement with persons on vessels is seen as a trust-builder.

Non-affiliation with RBRA: ECS works to make it clear in their outreach that they are not RBRA, they do not represent RBRA, they do not have any enforcement authority, nor will they take or dispose of boats or possessions. They are under contract with Health & Human Services, which is in the business of helping people and not being part of any enforcement. Likewise, HHS’s approach is to focus on people and their needs, and to stay clear of enforcement. This separation of the program from enforcement is especially important in light of feelings on the anchorage about past enforcement.

Transparency: HHS, ECS and MHA prioritize being open about what they can and cannot do, will and will not do, and what is expected of program enrollees.

Honesty: HHS, ECS and MHA recognize the importance of being straightforward about what is and what is not within the realm of possibility. This applies to program

support services, what units are available, what units are out of financial reach, and what to expect about the transition and other arrangements.

Consistency and accuracy of information: There is an emphasis on consistency and accuracy in the information that is conveyed by the program agencies to prospective program participants. While minor nuances arise in processes as the program evolves or that pertain to individual circumstances, the agencies place importance on providing reliable and comparable guidance.

Consistency in staffing: MHA, HHS, and ECS staff working on the program have been consistent from the start. This consistency is particularly important in outreach and case management work, where relationships and trust are built over time. Moreover, the current market for hiring skilled case management and other housing program-related services is quite tight, increasing the importance of maintaining longevity.

Availability: The agencies have prioritized consistency in being available for communication with potential or current participants.

Roles and boundaries: RBRA, HHS, MHA and ECS take a firm approach to “staying in their lane” with the questions they answer and information they provide. All report they take great strides to not represent what another agency may or may not do, and instead let each agency speak for themselves.

Other factors contributing to program success include:

Choice: Being able to choose a unit, rather than being told where they must live, is seen as a significant attraction to the program. Persons being housed have varying needs and preferences, which have a greater success of being met when they can choose among housing locations, transportation proximity, amenities, and other factors. Housing unit selections to date are in Larkspur, Novato, San Rafael, Sausalito, and Tiburon. Participants may also work with MHA on locating outside of Marin County. There is a price limitation to the rental unit, but thus far that has not precluded a participant from finding housing that they find reasonably suitable.

Track record and word-of-mouth: Interest in the program began to grow when eligible-but-not-enrolled participants saw others transition from the water into housing. When the program began, those on the water conveyed past experiences of expecting to be housed but it not coming through, being on waiting lists for years, and other disappointments. In the case of this program, even the modest number of success stories to date has led to more curiosity and willingness to at least consider the program. Many of the persons on vessels on the water observe what is happening with others and share information among themselves. Future program success will depend on more individuals successfully making the transition into housing they find preferable, or even just acceptable, to being on the water.

Partnership and collaboration: The involved agencies note the uniqueness of the program and partnership has necessitated collaboration – one that recognizes the respective roles, missions, boundaries and legal considerations, pressures and constraints of each agency. While they will not see eye-to-eye on all situations, by working through issues they find their way to focusing their energies on the program purpose.

#### **11. Program challenges/weaknesses/concerns:**

##### Transition from temporary to permanent housing vouchers:

Timing and related funding impacts: The number, timing and availability of permanent vouchers to replace the temporary vouchers was forecasted and considered in the program design. The program's aims, and targeted budget are for the temporary vouchers funded by the program to expire after 12 months, after which a permanent voucher that becomes available through the HUD Section 8 program would fund the participant's lease. In addition, case management would transition to funding by a source other than the temporary housing program budget.

However, the timing of the various stages leading up to when the clock starts on the temporary voucher cannot be precisely predicted or programmed; there are too many variables and individual circumstances. Too much caution about maintaining a structured pace can compromise success in seizing opportunities to help people move off the water and into available housing. Too little caution can mean that there are insufficient permanent vouchers available when the 12-month temporary voucher period ends.

Consequently, RBRA has had to be prepared to offer or otherwise identify short-term financial support for temporary vouchers beyond a 12-month period on an as-needed basis. It is too early to estimate the potential number of situations, months or costs to the program that such extensions could incur, and to what extent the funds in place are sufficient to support such extensions. Conversely, there could be cost savings from HCV's being issued earlier than 12 months.

##### Case management after transition to permanent vouchers:

Maintaining successful tenancy through the permanent voucher stage is a program objective. The program calls for a "warm transfer" between ECS and new case management upon making the switch to a permanent voucher. Since it has been less than a month since the first permanent vouchers were issued, it is too soon to evaluate the track record of such a transfer.

##### Eligibility:

Point in time eligibility: Criteria for eligibility includes being present in the RBRA vessel surveys of June 1, 2022 and April 1, 2023. RBRA reports that currently there are two

unhoused individuals who appeared on one, but not both, of the surveys. During most of the program's first year, if such individuals expressed interest in the program, individuals could be considered on a "case-by-case basis." Recognizing the ambiguity of "case-by-case" policy direction, RBRA, working with the program partners, is developing a tiered system. Under this approach, persons on both surveys would remain the highest priority for relocation. Once ECS has documented contact with all of those persons and if vouchers still remain, the next tier of eligible persons would be those who were on one survey but not both surveys. Additional tiers may be developed for those persons remaining. The program would need to reserve sufficient funds to support temporary vouchers and services for those in the higher tiers. The tiered approach would not preclude persons from accessing voucher programs other than the RBRA program that HHS may be able to offer them.

Vessel ownership eligibility: The temporary housing voucher program differs from the general Coordinated Entry voucher program in that the former explicitly requires participants to agree to remove from the bay the vessels they occupy. This means that persons who are staying on vessels for which they do not have ownership rights cannot on their own fulfill the temporary housing program requirement for vessel removal.

If non-owner vessel occupants are willing to participate but the owner of the vessel is unwilling to give up or move their vessel, or the owners are not accessible, it impedes both relocation and the goal of the program being a means of vessel removal from the bay. Sole vessel occupants may still be able to obtain housing if sufficient proof can be established, or if they can qualify under other housing voucher programs; however, the latter typically would require them to rank as a high priority in the county's Coordinated Entry system – which not all vessel occupants would necessarily achieve.

Vessel removal:

Participants agree in writing during program enrollment via HHS to have their vessel removed from the bay upon entering into housing. They are advised that they have 14 days post-move-in to remove or turn in the vessel and to contact RBRA about scheduling. If RBRA is not informed about who has moved into housing and when that relocation has taken place, it can lead to minor delays in vessel removal. Typically, the financial incentive of being paid \$150 per linear foot of vessel that they turn over to RBRA is sufficient motivation for vessel owners to notify RBRA of their move. It is a system that lacks redundancy in guarantee that vessels vacated by occupants who move into housing are relocated or removed from the bay in a timely manner.

Logistics:

Phones: Some individuals on the water do not have a phone or access to a phone, adding complexity – and delay - for ECS, MHA, and others in communicating with them.

Weather and water-related challenges: Being able to make or keep in-person appointments can be challenging for persons who are subject to uncertain and

problematic weather, tide, and vessel conditions that inhibit their ability to row/come ashore. This adds to the complexity – and delay – in connecting persons with land-based appointments for housing, medical services, and other arrangements.

Documentation: Vessel occupants often do not have all the required records needed for obtaining and utilizing a voucher, such as income-related documents like Social Security or SSI enrollment, birth certificate, bank statements, proof of vessel ownership, etc.

Housing choice:

A strength of the program – enabling participants to choose their unit – means time is spent finding an acceptable unit. There can be a gap between the size, location, type of unit, amenities, and/or pet-friendliness desired by the participant and what is available and affordable within voucher payment standards. Features such as proximity to public transportation and/or having on-site physical accessibility are critical for some participants. MHA takes on the role of explaining limitations while also providing as many options as possible that match the desires as much as is feasible. For success, program participants will need to trust that the options being presented are all that are in fact available at that time; furthermore, that they are not prevented from relocating to another unit in the future.

Lifestyle, logistical and personal challenges with moving off the water into a building:

It is a different way of life occupying a vessel on the bay compared with living in a multi-family apartment building. In addition to the emotional aspects of making such a transition, there also is a learning curve in co-existing among other tenants, living in a different environment (location and type of place), and having changed responsibilities. Unfamiliarity with technology has also been shown to create stumbling blocks. Housing-based case management and navigation to support the transition is critical. As more and more vessel occupants obtain vouchers and make the move, one concern is whether ECS in particular will be stretched thin in being able to respond to all the occupants' case management needs.

Interest-based connection:

ECS arranged to be on the water up to twice/week via a contracted vessel - not affiliated with RBRA - to connect with prospective participants. To date ECS has not approached vessels unless they have sufficient information to believe that the occupants are curious about a housing option. Thus, they rely on some level of initiative or indication of being open to the program, which means not all eligible enrollees are necessarily in direct contact with ECS. If the program reaches the state where all persons who have expressed interest are enrolled and yet there is available funding, and vouchers and eligible and unhoused persons on the bay still remain, a new approach will be needed in order to reach those who have yet to express interest.

Program Start-Up:

It took approximately two-to-three months more time than originally projected to have a housing case manager in place. HHS needed the time to identify an interested, qualified, and available provider to perform the services for a relatively unique population and program.

In the meantime, MHA did make contact – including visits on the water - with prospective participants and launched the application process with an initial group. Other service providers, such as the Downtown Streets Team, continued their work of providing supportive outreach, connections and services for persons on the water. Once ECS was engaged, it set into motion regular outreach on and off the water to persons who had indicated to RBRA or HHS that they might be interested in relocation to subsidized housing, with more concentrated time and support to encourage and assist with enrolling in the program than was possible through the contract with MHA.

There has been some feedback that while it may have added some weeks of time, contracting with a service provider that was not already in place working in Marin County, as was the case with ECS, allowed for a fresh start without the “baggage” that can follow an ongoing service provider into a new contract for the same or nearby population.

**12. Recommendations:**

A. Eligibility:

That RBRA continue to develop a tiered system for eligibility, with input from project partners, so as to decrease ambiguity about who is eligible to apply for the program compared with the case-by-case terminology and methodology.

B. Transition from temporary to permanent vouchers:

That RBRA closely monitor rental subsidy costs, as well as projections to the extent they are knowable, to be prepared to provide short-term support for extended subsidies beyond 12 months on an as-needed basis. Further, that greater clarity be developed around expectations of how case management services and their costs transition away from the program after the voucher changes from temporary to permanent.

C. Information Sharing:

While continuing to share information only within legal parameters, that HHS develop a means to urge vessel owners participating in the program to advise RBRA about their participation and status in the process - thereby enabling RBRA to consider those vessels in active participation as a lower enforcement priority.

D. Vessel removal:

That RBRA continue to ensure that program participants who are turning in their vessels upon moving have sufficient notice and opportunity to remove personal belongings from the vessel, and to say “goodbye” to it before the vessel is removed. RBRA offers - and has in most cases allowed - the vessel to remain at the ACOE dock a sufficient amount of time for persons to remove their belongings. RBRA reports it has been flexible by allowing more time as required. RBRA does request that the vessel occupant(s) contact RBRA and communicate their needs well in advance of the confirmed move-in date.

E. Connectivity:

That consideration be given to helping persons who have relocated to be able to maintain optional community connections with others still on the anchorage or who also have moved. This consideration may be best served indirectly and/or by other community organizations or individuals so as not to appear prescriptive, disclosing of confidential information, or interfering with persons’ privacy. It might be an informal coffee house gathering or a designated time/place in a public park. The intended audience could be those for whom leaving the anchorage community is a disincentive to participating in the program or who have experienced a sense of loss upon making the move. It is possible there is no interest in this connection, but finding a way to pilot it during the upcoming second year could inform future actions.