



City and County of San Francisco

Shelter Monitoring Committee

MEMORANDUM

TO: Shelter Monitoring Committee
FROM: Committee Staff
DATE: August 17, 2016
RE: July 2016 SOC and Staff Report

Standards of Care and Staff Report

Executive Summary

There were a total of twelve client complaints submitted to the Shelter Monitoring Committee in July 2016. Of those twelve client complaints, seven are pending client responses, four resulted in site responses that satisfied the client and one resulted in a site response that the client was not satisfied. The client that was not satisfied with the site's response and requested an investigation into his complaint, but has asked that Committee staff wait on the investigation until he can come discuss the site's response in person.

The Committee completed a total of six unannounced site visits in the month of July.

Types of Complaints

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.

July Client Complaints

MSC South Shelter

- **Client #1**
- **Submitted: 7/11/16**
- **Response received: 7/19/16**
- In his complaint, the complainant stated that his employer had mailed a pre-loaded debit card to MSC South Shelter. The complainant alleged that MSC South mishandled his mail and allowed someone to steal his debit card and withdraw money from his account. The complainant states that he could not have been the one who picked up his mail because he was denied services from the site when the debit card was delivered to the site.
- In the response, MSC South stated that there was no record of them ever receiving the debit card from the complainant's employer. They also stated that their policy allows clients staying at MSC South to have their mail delivered to the site, but that mail for clients no longer staying at the site are returned to sender.

Not Satisfied – Client has requested investigation into this complaint. The client has requested that the investigation be put on hold until he can come in and discuss the site's response with Committee staff in person.

- **Client #2**
- **Submitted: 7/28/16**
- **Response Received: 8/8/16**
- In his complaint, the complainant alleged that shelter staff dropped his bed and cut his lock while he was in the hospital. The complainant stated that this gave other clients the opportunity to steal his possessions. The complainant stated that when he tried to talk to shelter staff about his belongings, they responded using disrespectful language and accused him of breaking shelter rules by entering the shelter through the Drop-In Center door. The complainant also alleged that he woke up one night covered in bed bugs although he commended a shelter employee for handling the situation well.
- In the response, MSC South stated that the complainant did enter the shelter through the Drop-In Center entrance, which is a violation of shelter policy. Shelter staff stated that the complainant was very aggressive and demanding towards them when he was trying to discuss the issue of his property. Shelter staff stated that they conducted a search of the property room but could not find anything belonging to the complainant, but that they checked the CHANGES system and found no record of his bed being dropped or a lock cut request.

Pending – Client has not responded to the site's response

- **Client #3:**
- **Submitted: 7/29/16**
- **Response received: 8/8/16**
- In the original complaint, the client stated that he was speaking to a shelter employee outside of MSC South when the shelter employee allegedly grabbed the client by the neck and pushed him down to the ground. The client stated that when he got up, the shelter employee was falsely accusing the client of having attacked him first. The client alleged that this specific shelter employee is known to falsely accuse clients of attacking him in order to have an excuse to write them up. HSA was notified about the complaint when it was submitted to Committee staff because it contained allegations of physical violence.
- In the response, the site stated that they spoke to the shelter employee about the incident. The shelter employee stated that the client asked him for some money and a cigarette and that he became very aggressive after the employee denied his requests and tried to fight him. The shelter employee stated that when he returned to the shelter, a security guard had to prevent the client from entering the site because the client was still trying to fight the shelter employee. Shelter management at MSC South reviewed security video footage of the incident and noted in the response that it shows the client acting aggressively towards the shelter employee but that it does not show the shelter employee pushing the client down.

Pending – Client has not responded to the site's response

Next Door

- **Client #1:**
- **Submitted: 7/11/16**
- **Response received: 7/18/16**

- The complainant stated that she was unfairly written up by a service coordinator (shelter staff) for arguing with another client. The complainant stated that she may have yelled because she was scared, but stated that she only did so because she was afraid of the other client who was bullying her. The complainant also alleged that a shelter supervisor is refusing to write up other clients that are bullying the complainant as retaliation against her.
- In the response, Next Door stated that on the day of the incident a service coordinator (shelter staff) came to investigate when she heard the complainant and the other client yelling at each other. The service coordinator stated that when she tried to investigate, the complainant demanded that the other client receive a write up and ran away without giving the service coordinator a chance to respond. The service coordinator did state that she wrote up both the complainant and the other client for arguing. Shelter management stated that they tried to set up a meeting between the complainant and the shelter supervisor listed in the complaint with Shelter Advocates as mediators but that the complainant refused the meeting.

Pending – Client has not responded to the site's response

- **Client #2:**
- **Submitted: 7/11/16**
- **Response received: 7/13/16**
- The complainant alleged that she was attacked in the laundry room by another client who wanted to use the dryer that she was using. The complainant stated that her attacker hit her on the arm, threw her laundry in the trash and attempted to throw hot water at the complainant. The complainant stated that she reported the incident to shelter staff but that her attacker has not faced any consequences and is still staying at the shelter. HSA was notified about the complaint when it was submitted to Committee staff because it contained allegations of physical violence.
- In the response, the site stated that shelter staff attempted to investigate the incident but the other client stated that she was actually attacked by the complainant first. The site stated that because there were no security cameras in the laundry room and there were no other witnesses, they couldn't deny services to the complainant's alleged attacker. The site concluded their response by saying that they would follow up on all of the client's concerns according to shelter policy and welcomed any additional concerns that she may have.
- Committee staff asked the complainant to let them know if she continued to have issues with the other client and advised her that she can also call the police if she ever feels unsafe at the shelter.

Closed – Client was satisfied with the site response

- **Client #3:**
- **Submitted: 7/14/16**
- **Response received: 7/15/16**
- In her complaint, the client alleged that the women's restrooms were extremely dirty and that there was a used diaper that was left on the bathroom floor for over 24 hours.
- In the response, Next Door stated that they have their Facilities Department clean every floor on a daily basis. The response also stated that shelter staff immediately called facilities to clean up the diaper as soon as it was brought to their attention. The response concluded by stating that Next Door is in the process of hiring additional Facilities staff so they can expand their cleaning schedule.

Closed – Client was satisfied with the site response

- **Client #4, Complaint #1:**
- **Submitted: 7/14/16**
- **Response received: 7/15/16**
- In the complaint, the complainant alleged that another client has been calling her racial slurs and other disrespectful names. Shelter Monitoring Committee staff advised the complainant to report these threats to the Supervisor on duty and also reminded her that she can also report threats of violence to the police if she does not feel safe.
- In the response, Next Door stated that they met with the complainant and reminded her to inform shelter staff if she feels threatened in any way and that she can file a police report. Shelter staff stated that they also followed up with the other client listed in the complaint, but that the other client denied calling the complainant racial slurs or disrespectful names. However, shelter staff still reminded the other client about the rules and consequences for violating shelter policy.

Closed – Client was satisfied with the site response

- **Client #4, Complaint #2:**
- **Submitted: 7/27/16**
- **Response received: 7/29/16**
- The complainant alleged that meals at Next Door are inadequate in size and proportion and that kitchen staff give other people seconds but refuse to give her seconds. The complaint also alleged that she was physically assaulted by a client outside of the shelter (Client #A) and another client (Client #B) has been calling her rude names. HSA was notified of this complaint when it was submitted to Committee staff because it contained allegations of physical violence.
- In their response, Next Door stated that all meal portions are served using utensils that are 2, 4, 6 and 8 oz to ensure that proportions of food are appropriate and that the site works with a registered dietician to ensure that meals comply with dietary standards. Next Door attempted to pull camera footage from the alleged attack that took place outside of the shelter but were unable to find any footage that shows the alleged attack taking place. Next Door met with both of the clients that the complainant listed in her complaint separately and both stated that while they had cursed at the complainant, it was in retaliation to the complainant's verbal threats and verbal abuse towards them. Next Door stated that they could not determine who was instigating the incidents but that they would be moving the complainant to another floor to diffuse the situation.

Pending – Client has not responded to the site's response

- **Client #5:**
- **Submitted: 7/14/16**
- **Response received: 7/21/16**
- In the complaint, the client alleged that a shelter employee pushed her down to the floor in front of two witnesses. The client could not remember any additional details about the incident. HSA was notified about the complaint when it was submitted to Committee staff because it contained allegations of physical violence.
- In the response, Next Door stated that shelter management investigated the complaint and was able to confirm the client's allegation that a staff member acted in an inappropriate manner. As a result, the shelter employee will be addressed by ECS Human Services.

Pending – Client has not responded to the site's response

- **Client #6, Complaint #1:**
- **Submitted: 7/21/16**
- **Response received: 7/22/16**
- The client alleged that while he was away from his bed, a shelter employee cut his lock and stripped his bedding even though he had a 90-day reservation and not a 1-night reservation. The client alleged that when he reported the incident to the on duty supervisor, the supervisor did not offer an apology or state that she would address the member of her staff that cut his lock and stripped his bedding. The client stated that he immediately left to go buy a replacement lock and that he wanted to be compensated for the cost.
- In the response, the site stated that shelter staff made a legitimate mistake when cutting the lock because the number stickers on the two beds had been switched without staff being aware. Next Door stated that they were going to offer the client a free lock but the client left the site before they were able to do so. Next Door also stated that the site is considering switching from stickers to permanent markers to number beds in order to avoid these types of issues from occurring.

Closed – Client was satisfied with the site response

- **Client #6, Complaint #2:**
- **Submitted: 7/21/16**
- **Response received: 7/29/16**
- The client alleged that he has had problems with bugs biting him at night so he requested that he be moved to a new bed. The client alleged that a supervisor had approved the bed change earlier in the day, but later had the bed change taken away because the site manager stated that she had not approved the bed change. The client alleged that Next Door was retaliating against him for submitting an earlier complaint.
- In the response, the site stated that shelter staff investigated his claims of bugs in the sleeping area and were able to find bugs in another client's bed area nearby. The site stated that they initiated the site's bed bug policy, which includes laundering client belongings and steaming bedding and client belongings that cannot be washed. The site stated that they requested that the complainant see the nurse for a "Skin Irritation Incident Report" and to submit a reasonable accommodation request for a bed change. The site stated that the supervisor made a mistake when taking away the complainant's approved bed change because she did not check to see if the complainant had already submitted a reasonable accommodation form, which he already did. The response concluded by stating that the site is not trying to retaliate against the complainant and they are willing to work with him to facilitate his request.

Pending – Client has not responded to the site's response

Sanctuary

- **Client #1:**
- **Complaint submitted: 7/21/16**
- **Response received: 7/28/16**
- The complainant alleged that after reporting to staff that Client A had stolen his backpack, shelter staff returned some of his belongings but allowed Client A to keep the complainant's backpack. The complainant stated that he wanted his backpack returned to him.
- In the response, the site stated that they investigated the alleged theft when it was initially reported to them by the complainant and they had determined that the backpack actually belonged to Client A. The site stated that the complainant admitted to having found the backpack in a trash can at Next Door, whereas Client A claimed that he bought the backpack two years ago

and several other clients and a shelter supervisor stated that they had seen Client A wearing the backpack for some time before the complainant claimed the backpack was his.

Pending – Client has not responded to the site's response

Table: Total Client Complaints for FY 2016-2017

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

July Site Visits

There were a total of six site visits conducted in June 2016, all unannounced.

Shelter	JULY	AUG	SEPT	1st Qtr	Total
A Woman's Place	1			1	1
AWPDI	1			1	1
Bethel AME				0	0
Compass	1			1	1
First Friendship				0	0
Hamilton Emergency Shelter	1			1	1
Hamilton Family Shelter	1			1	1
Hospitality House				0	0
Interfaith				0	0
Jazzie's Place				0	0
Lark Inn				0	0
MSC Drop In				0	0
MSC Shelter				0	0
MNRC				0	0
Next Door				0	0
Providence				0	0
Sanctuary	1			1	1
Santa Ana				0	0
Santa Marta/Santa Maria				0	0
St. Joseph's				0	0
United Council				0	0
			Quarterly Totals	6	6
			Assigned number of site visits	20	82
			Percentage of compliance	30%	7% Year to Date (July only)

July Site Visit Infractions

A Woman's Place

- **Site Visit Date:** 7/13/16
- **Date infractions submitted to site:** 8/4/16
- **Response received:** 8/10/16
- The Committee visited the site once during the reporting period and noted the following SOC infractions:
 - Standard 3: Toilet paper missing entirely or placed on ground in restrooms without dispenser in stall (both), no paper towels or hand dryer (basement restroom), no soap or hand sanitizer (basement restroom), bathroom facilities not in working order, vents in Staff restroom need cleaning – **Pending, installation of new toilet paper/soap/paper towel dispensers to be completed by 8/12/16**
 - Standard 9: No menus posted in English or Spanish - **Resolved**
 - Standard 15: Lockers broken so they cannot be secured with a lock - **Resolved**
 - Standard 17: No signs noting bathroom issues or when they would be fixed, no signs noting broken dining tables or when they would be fixed - **Resolved**
 - Standard 18: No TTY or signage on where to access TTY - **Resolved**
 - Standard 21: No Language Link or other professional translation service – **Ongoing due to lack of funding**
 - Standard 22: No bilingual English/Spanish speaking staff on duty - **Resolved**
 - Standard 25: Staff not wearing ID badge - **Resolved**

A Woman's Place Drop In

- **Site Visit Date:** 7/18/16
- **Date infractions submitted to site:** 8/4/16
- **Response received:** 8/9/16
- The Committee visited the site once during the reporting period and noted the following SOC infractions:
 - Standard 3: Back restroom has toilet that is out of order, no signage posted noting the broken toilet and status of repairs, bathroom needed cleaning (wet floor) - **Resolved**
 - Standard 8: No Spanish reasonable accommodation forms - **Resolved**
 - Standard 15: No secure property storage available for clients – **Ongoing due to space restrictions, clients are referred to 350 Jones St.**
 - Standard 17: No signs noting bathroom issues or when they would be fixed - **Resolved**
 - Standard 26: No transportation services available for clients – **Ongoing due to lack of funding**

Compass

- **Site Visit Date:** 7/20/16
- **Date infractions submitted to site:** N/A
- **Response received:** N/A
- The Committee visited the site once during the reporting period and did not note any SOC infractions.

Hamilton Emergency Shelter

- **Site Visit Date:** 7/27/16
- **Date infractions submitted to site:** N/A
- **Response received:** N/A
- The Committee visited the site once during the reporting period and did not note any SOC infractions.

Hamilton Family Shelter

- **Site Visit Date:** 7/27/16
- **Date infractions submitted to site:** 8/11/16
- **Response received:** Pending
- The Committee conducted one visit to this site during this reporting period and noted the following SOC infractions:
 - Standard 6: No CPR masks available

Sanctuary

- **Site Visit Date:** 7/26/16
- **Date infractions submitted to site:** 8/11/16
- **Response received:** Pending
- The Committee visited the site once during the reporting period and noted the following SOC infractions:
 - Standard 3: No hand sanitizer available in kitchen/dining room area

Vacancies

Please note that all seats expire on November 23, 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.

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 submit applications by September 16, 2016. Please contact Jeff Simbe for assistance at 415-255-3647.

Staff

Labor Day - Monday, September 5, 2016 - Staff will be out of the office. No Drop-in hours

Howard Chen will be out of the office from Tuesday, September 6 – Wednesday September 14

2016 Meeting Calendar

September 21

October 19

November 16

December 21