



City and County of San Francisco
Shelter Monitoring Committee

**DRAFT MEETING MINUTES
 SHELTER MONITORING COMMITTEE
 POLICY SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING**

**May 10, 2016
 4:30 PM – 5:30 PM
 1380 Howard St.
 Room 515 (5th Floor)
 San Francisco, CA 94103**

Present:

*Subcommittee Chair Mwangi Mukami
 Subcommittee Member Kendra Amick
 Subcommittee Member Matthew Steen (SMC Vice-Chair)*

Excused:

*Subcommittee Member Terezie Bohrer (SMC Secretary)
 Subcommittee Member Gary McCoy*

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL/AGENDA ADJUSTMENTS *2 min*

I. MINUTES *ACTION*
A. March and April 2016 Minutes **Chair Mukami** *5 min*
 The Subcommittee tabled approval of the Draft March 2016 and Draft April 2016 meeting minutes until the June Policy Subcommittee meeting.
Explanatory document- March 2016 and April 2016 Committee Minutes
No public comment
Proposed Action: Table Approval of the Draft March 2016 and Draft April 2016 meeting minutes until the June Policy Subcommittee meeting
M/S/C: Amick/Steen/Unanimous

II. NEW BUSINESS *DISCUSSION*
A. HSA Domestic Violence/Imminent Danger Policy **Cindy Ward** *20 min*
 Cindy Ward presented the draft HSA Domestic Violence/Imminent Danger policy.
Explanatory documents – Draft Domestic Violence/Imminent Danger Policy, Imminent Danger Resolution 508-15
 Shelter Monitoring Member Ward presented the draft HSA Domestic Violence/Imminent Danger Policy. She provided an overview of the different sections of the draft policy and provided background information on how Human Services Agency (HSA) had several meetings with the Department on

Status of Women (DOSW) to work on the draft. She stated that HSA tried to include the recommendations from the Shelter Monitoring Committee and the DOSW but were unable to reach consensus on a few points with DOSW. She stated that the DOSW recommended including an assessment for the risk of imminent danger prior to denying services to victims, the provision of non-immediate DOS's if a victim chooses not to seek an EPO or civil restraining order and not denying services to victims that refuse EPO or civil restraining orders until after alternative shelter arrangements could be made. She stated that HSA disagreed with those recommendations based on shelter provider feedback and their views on the risk that shelters may face if they allow victims to stay if they refuse EPOs or civil restraining orders.

Member Comment: Subcommittee Member Steen asked if it was the intent of the Policy Subcommittee for the lethality assessment to be conducted at initial intake and that the information would travel with clients as they move to different shelters. He stated that lethality assessments should be something that case managers proactively explain to clients.

Public Comment: Minouche Kandel from DOSW stated that there is a more detailed domestic violence assessment that advocates are trained to administer. She stated that shelter staff aren't expected to be experts in domestic violence and that the assessment is just a first step. She stated that if red flags are raised, then clients can be directed towards a more detailed assessment.

Public Comment: Committee Member Cindy Ward stated that family homeless providers are not expected to become experts in domestic violence but that training and expertise would be provided.

Member Comment: Subcommittee Member Steen asked how victims would get access and referrals to domestic violence resources.

Public Comment: Minouche Kandel (DOSW) responded that there is a DPH website that has a list of resources for victims of domestic violence and that victims would be directed to that site for information on resources.

Public Comment: Beverly Upton from the SF Domestic Violence Consortium (SFDVC) stated that it is important to establish a supportive community that can speak different language and understand different cultures because it is not realistic for one shelter to take on all of these challenges on their own.

Cindy Ward concluded her presentation at 5:03 and left the meeting while other attendees continued the discussion.

Public Comment: Minouche Kandel (DOSW) stated that this policy only refers to when someone can be asked to leave a shelter and that there are additional policies and procedures that shelters can adopt to address domestic violence.

Member Comment: Subcommittee Member Steen stated his belief that this highlights the need for additional domestic violence shelter beds in San Francisco. He also noted that Point #1 on Page 2 of the draft stated that victims of domestic violence would be allowed to remain in the shelter if the incident took place after 7:00 PM.

Public Comment: Jemari Foulis (HSA) stated that it is a separate issue because clients still must follow through with the EPO or civil restraining order at 7:00 PM in order to be allowed to stay. She stated that if victims don't bring the EPO or civil restraining order process, that they will still be asked to leave in the morning but victims would be allowed to stay for the remainder of the evening.

Public Comment: Minouche Kandel (DOSW) stated that the powerful thing about EPOs is that they are available 24 hours a day through police and judges.

Member Comment: Subcommittee Member Amick asked where the policy states that the police must be contacted?

Member Comment: Subcommittee Chair Mukami stated that the language can be found at the top of the 3rd page.

Public Comment: Jemari Foulis (HSA) stated that shelter staff should already be calling the police if domestic violence happens inside shelters because it is an existing policy.

Public Comment: Beverly Upton (SFDVC) stated that she had a few concerns about the draft. She stated that she believes it is overly reliant on the criminal justice system, although she stated that SFDVC has been pushing EPOs as a remedy for domestic violence for some time. She stated that she would like to see something in place to protect clients who may be afraid of ICE due to immigration concerns or would be afraid to interact with law enforcement. She stated that she believes it is important to have some type of "Know Your Rights" card available for clients and supported the possibility of civil restraining orders for clients.

Public Comment: Jemari Foulis (HSA) clarified that clients are not required to receive the EPO or civil restraining order before being allowed to stay, they simply need to start the filing process.

Member Comment: Subcommittee Chair Mukami stated that on Page 1, the policy states that "This policy...should not replace the shelter provider's ability to make any decisions necessary to ensure the safety of shelter residents and staff." He stated that he was concerned that shelter staff may try to take advantage of this language. He also pointed out that on Page 2, it states that "Consideration will be given for extenuating circumstances that affect the victim's safety, such as..." He stated his belief that this language may confuse shelter providers and recommended adding clear language that states if the

perpetrator is incarcerated, the client should be allowed to stay because the imminent danger no longer exists. He finished by asking how shelter providers would handle the lethality assessment.

Public Comment: Jemari Foulis (HSA) responded by stating that when families come to Connecting Point, they will be screened with the lethality assessment. She stated that if there is a denial of service, the client has the right to the grievance procedure. She stated that if the denial is upheld that there will be the opportunity to go to arbitration and that it is up to the client to decide what to bring to the hearing.

Public Comment: Erik Enriquez (Compass Family Shelter) asked if the concern was that a lethality assessment can be used to influence a shelter hearing?

Member Comment: Subcommittee Chair Mukami confirmed that the possibility of lethality assessment results being used at a shelter hearing was a concern.

Public Comment: Jemari Foulis (HSA) responded by stating that the arbitrator should only be looking at whether or not a rule is broken.

Public Comment: Minouche Kandel (DOSW) clarified that the concern is that shelters may try to deny clients if they are designated as being “at risk” from the lethality assessment.

Public Comment: Jemari Foulis (HSA) stated that clients can’t be denied services for being at risk of violence, it is only if domestic violence takes place.

Public Comment: Dyanna Quizon (Sup. Tang’s Office) asked if a client came to a shelter with domestic violence, could they still be denied services? She also asked if shelters could deny services to at risk clients during the grievance process.

Public Comment: Minouche Kandel (DOSW) suggested adding language to the draft that states that the lethality assessment results should be kept confidential.

Member Comment: Subcommittee Member Amick stated that the Committee has heard from many clients that police are not being called for every case of violence that takes place in the shelters.

Public Comment: Erik Enriquez (Compass Family Shelter) stated that the language in the draft is vague because it does not clarify if staff need to see the domestic violence taking place before they will be required them to call the police. He stated that currently, Compass calls the police if they actually see violence taking place but not if it is reported by clients.

Member Comment: Subcommittee Member Amick stated that the language in the draft makes it sound like domestic violence is only when one person physically harms another person.

Public Comment: Jemari Foulis (HSA) stated that while the definition of domestic violence is very broad, this policy is only for when incidents of violence take place and people must be denied services.

Public Comment: Beverly Upton (SFDVC) suggested expanding the language in the “Definitions” section of the draft.

Member Comment: Subcommittee Member Steen asked if the 15 day denial of service had been changed and if it applied to all shelters or just family shelters.

Public Comment: Jemari Foulis (HSA) stated that denials of service were still limited to 15 days, which was a change from the original 30 day denial of service.

Public Comment: Beverly Upton (SFDVC) stated that two big recommendations were to not force clients to leave the shelters in the middle of the night and to not deny them access to services across the system. She stated that the 15 day DOS term is not spelled out in the policy.

Member Comment: Subcommittee Chair Mukami stated that he believes this draft policy should be presented to the full Shelter Monitoring Committee and for the Policy Subcommittee to review it in greater detail. He emphasized that this was a great step forward and thanked everyone for their involvement.

Public Comment: Jemari Foulis (HSA) stated that if the attendees wanted to submit additional comments about the policy, they should email Cindy and CC Jemari.

Member Comment: Subcommittee Member Steen stated that it would be nice to get feedback from the Shelter Monitoring Committee on some of the concerns that were brought up during this meeting. He also stated that it would be interesting to find out how many people have been affected by the Imminent Danger policy since the Committee had begun advocating for changing the policy. He also asked if this draft policy would be formally adopted.

Public Comment: Jemari Foulis (HSA) stated that it will be adopted as a formal policy. She stated that since many people working on the draft will eventually be moved to the new department, that there is no guarantee that any of these suggestions will be adopted by the leadership team in the new department. She stated that HSA is in charge of the policy on June 30th and that anything afterwards would have to be approved by the new department.

Member Comment: Subcommittee Member Steen asked if the policy would be adopted by the new department if it was approved before the end of the fiscal year.

Public Comment: Jemari Foulis (HSA) stated that the new department will be able to adopt or not adopt any policies that it chooses to and that she could not speak on what the new department will take on.

Member Comment: Subcommittee Chair Mukami thanked everyone for participating in the meeting and stated that the Committee may be able to advocate for shelters to use some funds for domestic violence staff. He then requested a motion to table all other agenda items until the next month and to adjourn the meeting.

- B. Utilization of Shelter Reservations** **Chair Mukami** 20 min
The Subcommittee will continue the discussion on shelter utilization and shelter vacancies. Update on meeting with Sam Dodge.
Explanatory documents – draft Terms of Reference, draft Survey for Residents Tabled until June Policy Subcommittee Meeting

- III. INFORMATION REQUESTS** **DISCUSSION**
A. Information Requests **Chair Mukami** 15 min
The Committee will review the responses to the information request made to HSA regarding shelter use data and the information request made to HOPE Office regarding tracking CAAP and HOT bed vacancies.
Tabled until June Policy Subcommittee Meeting

Adjournment

This item requires a motion, a second, and to be carried.

No Public Comment

Proposed Action: Approve adjournment

M/S/C: Steen/Amick/Unanimous

Adjournment Approved

To obtain copies of the agenda, minutes, or any explanatory documents, please contact Jeff Simbe at 415.255.3642 or jeff.simbe@sfdph.org 72 hours before the meeting.

To obtain a disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services to participate in the meeting, please contact Jeff Simbe at 415.255.3642 or jeff.simbe@sfdph.org at least two business days before the meeting.

City Hall is accessible to persons using wheelchairs and others with disabilities. Assistive listening devices are available and meetings are open-captioned. Agendas are available in large print. Materials in alternative formats, American Sign Language interpreters, and other format accommodations will be made available upon request. Please make your request for alternative format or other accommodations to the Shelter Monitoring Committee at 415.255.3642. Providing at least 72 hours notice prior to the meeting will help ensure availability.

The nearest BART station is Civic Center Plaza at the intersection of Market, Grove, and Hyde Streets. The MUNI Metro lines are the F, J, K, L, M, and N (Civic Center Station or Van Ness Avenue Station). MUNI bus lines

serving the area are the 47 Van Ness, 9 San Bruno, and the 6, 7, 71 Haight/Noriega. Accessible curbside parking is available on Oak and Hickory Streets.

The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers, and similar sound producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager or other similar sound-producing electronic devices. In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illness, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees maybe sensitive to various chemical based scented projects. Please help the City to accommodate these individuals.

Know Your Rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code)
Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decision in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. **FOR MORE INFORMATION ON YOUR RIGHTS UNDER THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE, OR TO REPORT A VIOLATION OF THE ORDINANCE, CONTACT THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE TASK FORCE THROUGH:**

Administrator
Sunshine Ordinance Task Force
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Phone 415.554.7724
Fax 415.554.7854
E-mail sotf@sfgov.org

Copies of the Sunshine Ordinance can be obtained from the Clerk of the Sunshine Task Force, the San Francisco Public Library, and on the City's website at www.sfgov.org.

Lobbyist Registration and Reporting Requirements

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance [SF Campaign & Governmental Conduct Code § 2.100] to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the San Francisco Ethics Commission at 30 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 3900, San Francisco, CA 94102; telephone (415) 581-2300; fax (415) 581-2317; web site: sfgov.org/ethics.