



City and County of San Francisco

Shelter Monitoring Committee

MEMORANDUM

TO: Shelter Monitoring Committee
FROM: Committee Staff
DATE: February 15, 2017
RE: December 2016 SOC Staff Report

Standards of Care Staff Report

December Client Complaints

There were a total of eighteen complaints submitted to the Shelter Monitoring Committee by twelve different clients in December 2016. Of those eighteen total complaints, three received responses that satisfied the client. Two of the complaints resulted in the clients requesting an investigation due to responses that were unsatisfactory. The remaining thirteen complaints are pending a response from the client.

The narrative below for each site provides an overview of the types of complaints forwarded to each site. Not all sites have had a chance to respond to the complaints. ***Note: The complaints below may have already been investigated to the satisfaction of the site or its contracting agency; however, the Committee must allow for each complainant to review the responses and the complainant determines whether s/he is satisfied. If the complainant is not satisfied, the Committee conducts an investigation.

A Woman's Place Shelter

- **Client #1**
- **Complaint submitted: 12/15/16**
- **Response received: 12/20/16**
- The complainant alleged that shelter staff woke her up and brought her to the front door of the shelter to speak to someone who was looking for her. The complainant stated that this was inappropriate because the person that was looking for her was drunk and belligerent and that shelter staff violated her privacy by confirming that the complainant was staying at the shelter.
- In the response, A Woman's Place stated that management spoke to shelter staff that were involved with the incident and reminded them of the primary need for safety and confidentiality with the site. The response also stated that staff were reminded to keep the front door locked after 4:30 PM and that they are never to disclose the presence or absence of a client to outside parties.

Closed – Complaint closed due to client's satisfaction with site response

- **Client #2**
- **Complaint submitted: 12/19/16**
- **Response received: 12/21/16**

- The complainant alleged that one shelter employee consistently uses inappropriate and abusive language when speaking to clients. The complainant also alleged that one shelter employee always gives out rotten fruit when serving breakfast and that shelter staff will play favorites when giving out towels and other hygiene supplies. The complainant also alleged that the restrooms were not being cleaned on a regular basis.
- In the response, A Woman's Place stated that they reminded all staff to be mindful of profanity while speaking to clients. Shelter management stated that they recently received a large donation of towels so there should not be any ongoing issue with shortages. The site also stated that they investigated the allegations of rotten fruit and dirty restrooms but that they were unable to find evidence of those allegations.

No Contact – Complaint is closed due to No Contact from the client

- **Client #3**
- **Complaint submitted: 12/22/16**
- **Response received: 12/27/16**
- The complainant alleged that a specific shelter employee is very rude when speaking to shelter clients. The complainant stated that this employee rushed her out of the shelter one morning while speaking to her in a demeaning and harassing manner.
- In the response, A Woman's Place stated that they had spoken to the shelter employee about her interactions with guests and reminded her of the need to be respectful when speaking to shelter clients. The site also stated that they checked in with the complainant and that the complainant did not mention that she had any issues with the employee.

No Contact – Complaint is closed due to No Contact from the client

A Woman's Place Drop In

- **Client #1**
- **Complaint submitted: 12/8/16**
- **Response received: 12/23/16**
- The complainant stated that she was subjected to harassment by other clients and staff did not intervene. The complainant also stated that when she left the site, another client followed her and pushed her to the ground. The complainant alleged that shelter staff did not write up the other client because she pushed the complainant after both parties had exited the site. The complainant also alleged that a shelter employee asked her about her medications in front of other clients, which the complainant states was a violation of her privacy.
- In the response, shelter management stated that they interviewed all staff present during the incident and none of them had received reports about clients harassing the complainant. Shelter staff also stated that none of them witnessed the complainant being pushed as she left the site or any other clients following her outside. The response also stated that they had given a warning the employee that asked the complainant about her medications and that he has since corrected his behavior.

No Contact – Complaint is closed due to No Contact from the client

- **Client #2**
- **Complaint submitted: 12/19/16**
- **Response received: 12/29/16**
- The complainant alleged that she was visiting the site in October, she was harassed by other clients at the site and shelter staff did not step in to stop the harassment. The complainant also

alleged that she began to experience symptoms of a heart attack as a result of the harassment and asked that an ambulance be called but stated that shelter staff refused to call one for her.

- In the response, shelter management stated that they had reviewed sign-in sheets, incident reports, guest inputs and spoke to all staff present during the month of October and that they could not find any record of the incident described in the complaint or any record that the complainant had utilized services at the site during that time period. Shelter management offered to meet with the complainant in order to discuss her concerns.

No Contact – Complaint is closed due to No Contact from the client

Bethel AME

- **Client #1**
- **Complaint submitted: 12/21/16**
- **Response received: 1/9/17**
- The complainant alleged that a shelter employee is very rude to clients while he collects their bedding. The complainant also alleged that shelter staff were heard making discriminating comments about another client based on her ethnicity.
- In the response, the site stated that the employee was upset at clients because the clients were not following the site's procedures for turning in bedding, which forced staff to collect the linens from individual clients. The response also stated that staff treat all clients equally regardless of race or gender.

No Contact – Complaint is closed due to No Contact from the client

- **Client #2**
- **Complaint submitted: 12/27/16**
- **Response received: 1/9/17**
- The complainant alleged that she has been written up for brushing her teeth and washing her face on multiple occasions even though she has been given permission to do so by a supervisor. The complainant alleged that she is getting picked on because no other clients are written up for washing their face or brushing their teeth.
- In the response, the site stated that the client has been seen breaking shelter rules and not cooperating with staff for the past month. The site also stated that the client was given a non-immediate DOS but that the client has rescheduled her hearing several times.

No Contact – Complaint is closed due to No Contact from the client

Jazzie's Place

- **Client #1**
- **Complaint submitted: 12/8/16**
- **Response received: 12/19/16**
- The complainant stated that she was using the restroom at Jazzie's when a female employee broken into the restroom and threw the client's property out of the restroom. The complainant alleged that the employee pushed her out of the shelter and denied her services. The complainant alleges that shelter staff never gave her the paperwork for her denial of service.
- In the response, the site stated that the complainant had rushed into the shower during a time when another client had signed up to use the shower. The site stated that when shelter staff told the complainant that it was not her turn to use the shower, the complainant became belligerent and started cursing at shelter staff and damaging the restroom/shower facilities. The site stated that they unlocked the restroom door and asked the complainant to gather her belongings and to

leave the shelter. The site stated that the complainant was denied services for destruction of shelter property and was told that she could pick up her paperwork the next morning.

No Contact – Complaint is closed due to No Contact from the client

- **Client #2**
- **Complaint submitted: 12/19/16**
- **Response received: 1/3/17**
- The complainant alleged that a female client is allowed to hang out and sleep in the shelter with a breast exposed on even though all other clients must be clothed at all times. The complainant also alleged that there are a male client and female client are engaging in sexual activity during “Lights On” and “Lights Off”.
- In the response, the site stated that staff had already spoken to the female client regarding the incident. The female client stated that her shirt had moved while she was sleeping and that she had rearranged it once she woke up and realized that her breast was exposed. The site also stated that staff had not seen anything to indicate that two clients listed in the complaint were engaging in sexual activity but that they still moved the female client from the “gender non-conformant” section to the female section of the shelter.

Pending – Client has not yet responded to the site’s response

MSC South

- **Client #1, Complaint #1**
- **Complaint submitted: 12/13/16**
- **Response received: 12/22/16**
- The complainant alleged that two shelter employees frequently make rude comments about the complainant and that another client saw the shelter employees throwing out the complainant’s belongings into a trash can.
- In the response, MSC South stated that management spoke to the two shelter employees listed in the complaint and both denied ever making rude or inappropriate comments towards the complainant. Both employees stated that they only spoke to the complainant when he was seen breaking shelter rules, and one of the employees had been placed at different posts to prevent any misconception that the employee was targeting the complainant. The response also stated that shelter management explained to the complainant that shelter staff do not throw away client property into trash cans and instead bag and store property.

Closed – Complaint closed due to client’s satisfaction with site response

- **Client #1, Complaint #2:**
- **Complaint submitted: 12/22/16**
- **Response received: 1/3/17**
- The complainant states that shelter employee is picking on him and harassing him by following him and walking behind the complainant very closely. The complainant also alleges that the shelter employee told another client that the complainant is racist.
- In the response, MSC South stated that they interviewed the complainant and the employee listed in the complaint. The employee stated that he found the complainant in the sleeping area past the 8 AM even though all clients are supposed to be out of the area by 8 AM. The employee stated that when he reminded the complainant that he wasn’t allowed in the area, the complainant became upset and verbally abused him. The employee also denied calling the complainant a racist. The response states that when management spoke to the complainant, he admitted to

verbally abusing the employee. Site management stated that they spoke the complainant and explained that it was inappropriate for him to speak to shelter staff using disrespectful language and that the complainant could always talk to management if he was unhappy with shelter staff.

Closed – Complaint closed due to client's satisfaction with site response

Next Door

- **Client #1**
- **Complaint submitted: 12/1/16**
- **Response received: 12/8/16**
- A group of mono-lingual Chinese speaking clients alleged that other clients were ignoring the site's laundry policy and taking over laundry machines and dryers even when it wasn't their turn to do laundry. The clients also alleged that there is a member of the kitchen staff who discriminates against Chinese clients. The complainant's also stated that staff are not enforcing quiet hours during "Light's Out".
- In the response, Next Door stated that they instituted new procedures where shelter staff would periodically check on the laundry room to make sure that clients are able to do their laundry in a peaceful manner. The site also stated that they reminded all staff that they are to use an interpreter when speaking to clients whose primary language is not English. The site also stated that they held a client orientation in Mandarin Chinese to ensure that the clients were aware of Next Door's rules and policies.

Closed – Client was satisfied with the site's response

- **Client #2:**
- **Complaint submitted: 12/5/16**
- **Response received: 12/8/16**
- The complainant alleged that she returned to the shelter and found that all of the property that she kept under her bed had gone missing (fruit, medicine, toiletries and other property). The complainant states that she found some of her property in a trash can attempted to find the rest of her property but staff stopped her. The complainant states that she received a warning notice for keeping fruit underneath her bed. The complainant stated that she felt she was being retaliated against for submitted complaints because the rules were never explained to her and many other clients store food under their beds without being written up for it.
- In the response, Next Door stated that shelter staff had thrown out rotten fruit that was being kept underneath the complainant's bed after several other clients had complained about gnats being in that area. Shelter management also stated that they met with the complainant to explain what the rules were and provided her with replacement toiletries. The response also stated that they removed the write up because the complainant was unaware of the rules.

Closed – Client was satisfied with the site's response

- **Client #3, Complaint #1:**
- **Complaint submitted: 12/6/16**
- **Response received: 12/8/16**
- The complainant alleged that another client made threatening gestures and comments directed towards the complainant.
- In the response, Next Door stated that they did not know who initiated the argument between the complainant and the other client but that staff intervened and de-escalated the situation. The response also stated that the complainant insisted on the other client being denied services, but

that staff did not do so because they were unable to identify who the primary aggressor/instigator was. The response concluded by saying that staff appropriately utilized de-escalation techniques.

No Contact – Complaint is closed due to No Contact from the client

- **Client #3, Complaint #2:**
- **Complaint submitted: 12/6/16**
- **Response received: 12/8/16**
- The complainant alleged that there were only two working washing machines available at Next Door and that laundry services had been very limited for many months because of the broken machines. The complainant suggested that the site extend hours for laundry services.
- In the response, Next Door stated that they were aware that the washers and dryers need to be extended and that they were currently searching for a new vendor because the current vendor is not making repairs in a timely manner. The site also stated that they were extending laundry hours so clients have the opportunity to finish doing their laundry.

Not satisfied – The complainant was not satisfied with the site's response and requested an investigation into her complaint. This investigation is still pending.

- **Client #3, Complaint #3:**
- **Complaint submitted: 12/29/16**
- **Response received: 1/4/17**
- The complainant states that she was drying her clothes when another client came into the laundry room and tried to open her dryer. The complainant alleged that when she told the other client not to go through the dryer she was using, the other client began aggressively yelling at the complainant and chased her out of the laundry room. The complainant also alleged that staff were not making their rounds in the laundry room and that management had not responded to the complaint that she submitted about the incident.
- In the response, Next Door stated that when they investigated the incident, both the complainant and the other client alleged that it was the other party that was the aggressor. The site acknowledged that staff had not been making their regular rounds of the laundry room due to a staffing shortage but stated that staff were still monitoring the laundry room a minimum of four times per shift. The response also stated that the complainant was welcome to meet with shelter management during Office Hours.

Not satisfied – The complainant was not satisfied with the site's response and requested an investigation into her complaint. This investigation is still pending.

- **Client #4:**
- **Complaint submitted: 12/12/16**
- **Response received: 12/13/16**
- The complainant states that she had a reservation at Next Door. The complainant stated that she attempted to enter the shelter but was approached by a group of clients who verbally threatened her. The complainant stated that she was so intimidated by the clients that she did not actually enter the shelter for her bed.
- In the response, Next Door stated that they reviewed the CHANGES system and could not find any record of the complainant having a reservation at the site. The response also stated that she could always speak to security or Next Door staff if an incident like that occurs so it can be addressed immediately.

No Contact – Complaint is closed due to No Contact from the client

- **Client #5:**
- **Complaint submitted: 12/22/16**
- **Response received: 12/23/16**
- The complainant alleged that there are several clients who have verbally threatened and made racially discriminatory comments about another client (Client A) staying at next door.
- In the response, Next Door stated they investigated the allegations and found that Client A had a history of instigating fights and arguing with other clients. The response stated that Client A admitted to threatening another client and that they were able to verify that Client A had hit another client in the face. The response stated that Client A was denied services for his inappropriate behavior and thanked the complainant for bringing these acts of violence to management's attention.

No Contact – Complaint is closed due to No Contact from the client

Total Client Complaints for FY 2016-2017

Site	7/16	8/16	9/16	10/16	11/16	12/16	Total (16-17 FY)
A Woman's Place	0	0	1	0	1	3	5
A Woman's Place Drop In Center	0	3	1	0	0	2	6
Bethel AME	0	0	1	0	0	2	3
Compass	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
First Friendship Family	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
Hamilton Emergency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hamilton Family	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hospitality House	0	2	1	0	1	0	4
Interfaith Winter Shelter	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jazzie's Place	0	0	0	0	3	2	5
Lark Inn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mission Neighborhood Resource Ctr.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MSC South Shelter	3	5	1	0	2	2	13
MSC South Drop In Center	0	2	1	0	0	0	3
Next Door	8	9	7	8	9	7	48
Providence	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Sanctuary	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
Santa Ana	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Santa Marta/Maria	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
St. Joseph's	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
United Council	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	12	26	14	10	17	18	97

Investigations

Clients who are not satisfied with the site's response to their complaint can request a Committee investigation into their complaint. The Committee completed one investigation for a complaint that was submitted in December:

Next Door

The complainant stated in the original complaint that there are only two working laundry machines available at Next Door. The complainant alleged that the number of working laundry machines was insufficient for the number of clients staying at Next Door and suggested that the site extend hours of laundry services. In the response, Next Door stated that they were having issues with their current laundry vendor not coming to the site to make repairs on a timely basis and that they were currently searching for a new vendor. Next Door also stated that they were giving clients additional time to complete their laundry whenever machines were broken.

The complainant requested an investigation because she did not believe that Next Door was providing sufficient laundry services for shelter clients. Shelter Monitoring Committee staff made an unannounced visit to Next Door to investigate the complainant's claims that management was not taking sufficient action to provide laundry services for shelter clients.

Findings

Committee staff inspected the laundry room and confirmed that two out of four laundry machines and two out of four dryers were out of order at the time of the investigation. Committee staff also reviewed Next Door's records and found that they had been contacting their laundry vendor to repair the broken machines on a weekly basis. Committee staff also reviewed the site's expanded laundry room hours policy with shelter management. The site explained that that on the days where more than one machine is out of order, clients that sign up for laundry services are given as much time as they need to wash and dry their clothes.

Based on these findings, Committee staff determined that Next Door was still providing shelter clients access to free laundry services on site. As a result, the site was in compliance with Standard 28 of the Standards of Care.

Committee staff also made the following recommendations for Next Door:

- Current signage in the laundry room only states that machines are broken. Committee staff recommend posting additional signage in the laundry room stating:
 - The difficulties they have had with their current laundry vendor
 - That management is currently searching for a new laundry vendor
 - When repairs are scheduled
- Continue giving clients more time to do laundry when one or more machine breaks down

December Site Visits

The Committee completed a total of ten site visits in the month of December.

Shelter	JULY	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	1st Qtr	2nd Qtr	Total
A Woman's Place	1			1			1	1	2
AWPDI	1			1			1	1	2
Bethel AME		1			1		1	1	2
Compass	1			1			1	1	2
First Friendship			1			1	1	1	2
Hamilton Emergency Shelter	1					1	1	1	2
Hamilton Family Shelter	1					1	1	1	2
Hospitality House			1			1	1	1	2
Interfaith						1	0	1	1
Jazzie's Place			1			1	1	1	2
Lark Inn			1			1	1	1	2
MSC Drop In		1				1	1	1	2
MSC Shelter		1			1		1	1	2
MNRC		1				1	1	1	2
Next Door		1			1		1	1	2
Providence		1			1		1	1	2
Sanctuary	1			1			1	1	2
Santa Ana			1		1		1	1	2
Santa Marta/Santa Maria			1			1	1	1	2
St. Joseph's			1		1		1	1	2
United Council			1		1		1	1	2
		Quarterly Totals					20	21	41
		Assigned Number of Visits					20	21	82
		Percentage of Compliance					100%	100%	50% compliance FY16-17 (Through December Only)

December Site Visit Infractions

The Committee completed ten site visits in the month of December and noted Standard of Care infractions at the following three sites:

First Friendship

- **Site Visit Date:** 12/12/16
- **Date infractions submitted to site:** 12/21/16
- **Response received:** 1/9/17
- The Committee visited the site once during the reporting period and noted the following SOC infractions:
 - Standard 12: No sheets or pillowcases – **Ongoing issue related to laundering of bedding at emergency shelters**
 - Standard 21: No Language Link or other professional translation service – **Ongoing issue due to lack of funding**

Interfaith Winter Shelter

- **Site Visit Date:** 12/21/16
- **Date infractions submitted to site:** 1/9/16
- **Response received:** 1/16/17
- The Committee visited the site once during the reporting period and noted the following SOC infractions:
 - Standard 3: No hand sanitizer provided – **Resolved**
 - Standard 8: Reasonable accommodation forms not available in English/Spanish – **Resolved**
 - Standard 9: No menus posted in English and Spanish (Breakfast only, dinner not provided by Interfaith staff) – **Resolved**
 - Standard 12: Two sheets and pillowcases not provided to clients – **Ongoing issue related to laundering of bedding at emergency shelters**
 - Standard 15: No storage provided to shelter clients (no plastic bags for clients to store belongings) – **Resolved**
 - Standard 19: Less than 22 inches between sleeping mats – **Resolved**
 - Standard 22: No bilingual English/Spanish speaking staff on duty – **Resolved**
 - Standard 23: No Emergency Exit plans posted throughout shelter – **Resolved**

Lark Inn

- **Site Visit Date:** 12/5/16
- **Date infractions submitted to site:** 1/11/17
- **Response received:** 2/8/17
- The Committee conducted one visit to this site during this reporting period and noted the following SOC infractions:
 - Standard 3: Large puddle of standing water in men's restroom; ADA handheld showerhead and showerhead holder/wall mount broken (men's restroom) – **Pending, under renovation**
 - Standard 6: No antibiotic ointment in first aid kit - **Resolved**
 - Standard 8: No signage posted about shower times - **Resolved**

- Standard 9: Menus not posted in English and Spanish – **Resolved**
- Standard 17: No signage posted noting facility issues (bathroom issues) – **Resolved**
- Standard 21: No Language Link or other professional translation service – **Resolved, site has Language Link and staff has been trained**

Committee Membership and Staff Update

Vacancies

Please note that all seats expire on December 31, 2016 even for those who were recently appointed. If you wish to continue serving on the Committee, you must reapply for your seat. Here is a description of all seats:

If you do not plan on seeking reappointment, please submit a letter of resignation to the Chair and Committee staff.

Local Homeless Coordinating Board appointments:

All four seats appointed by LHCB have been appointed for term 2016-2018.

Mayor's Office, Seat 1, candidates must be currently or formerly homeless. Interested parties should contact the Mayor's Office through:

Nicole Wheaton, Mayor's Appointments Secretary

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place

City Hall, Room 200

San Francisco, CA 94102

Phone: (415) 554-7940

Nicole.Wheaton@sfgov.org

Board of Supervisor appointments

* Seat 1-Must be homeless or formerly homeless within the 3 years period to appointment and living with their homeless child under age 18

* Seat 2-Must be homeless or formerly homeless within the 3 years prior to appointment with a disability

*Seat 3-Must have experience providing direct services to the homeless through a community setting. Please attach a letter from the provider you currently work with or have worked with in the past with your application verifying your experience.

*Seat 4-Must be selected from a list of candidates that are nominated by community agencies that provide behavioral health, housing placement, or other services to the homeless. Please attach a letter of support from the community agency nominating you for this seat.

*Seat 5-Must be selected from a list of candidates that are nominated by nonprofit agencies that provide advocacy or organizing services to homeless people and be homeless or formerly homeless. Please attach a letter of support from the community agency nominating you for this seat.

*Seat 6-Must be selected from a list of candidates that are nominated by nonprofit agencies that provide advocacy or organizing services to homeless people. Please attach a letter of support from the community agency nominating you for this seat.

Please complete the on-line application and forward your completed application with the appropriate documents.

<http://www.sfbos.org/index.aspx?page=3067>

Please contact Jeff Simbe for assistance at 415-255-3647.

Staff

Christmas Holiday – December 26th

2017 Meeting Calendar

January 18

February 15

March 15

April 19

May 17

June 21

July 19

August 16

September 20

October 18

November 15

December 20