



City and County of San Francisco

Shelter Monitoring Committee

MEMORANDUM

TO: Shelter Monitoring Committee
FROM: Committee Staff
DATE: October 19, 2016
RE: September 2016 SOC Staff Report

Standards of Care Staff Report

September Client Complaints

There were a total of fourteen complaints submitted to the Shelter Monitoring Committee by nine different clients in September 2016. Of those fourteen client complaints, twelve are pending client responses and one resulted in a site response that satisfied the client. There is still one complaint that is pending a response from the site.

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

- **Complaint #1**
- **Submitted: 9/30/16**
- **Response received: 10/11/16**
- The complainant alleged that a shelter employee was making inappropriate comments about clients and would deny services to clients without following the site's procedures.
- In the response, the site stated that they investigated the allegations and found that the situation warranted disciplinary action. The response also stated that they met with clients to address their concerns about witnessing these sorts of actions from staff.

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

A Woman's Place Drop-In

- **Complaint #1**
- **Submitted: 9/12/16**
- **Response received: 9/19/16**
- The complainant alleged that a shelter employee attempted to instigate fights with the complainant as well as referring to the complainant using incorrect gender pronouns.
- In the response, the site stated that they investigated the allegations and found that both the complainant and the shelter employee had behaved inappropriately and that both were disciplined for their actions.

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

Bethel AME

- **Client #1:**
- **Submitted: 9/20/16**
- **Response received: Pending, reminders sent on 10/3/16 and 10/14/16**
- The complainant alleged that shelter employees are not fairly managing the check-in process because certain clients are allowed to cut in front of others in line. The complainant also alleged that the site has been out of feminine hygiene products for over three weeks and that staff disappear from 9:00-10:00 PM. The complainant also alleged that breakfast is consistently being served late, which does not give clients enough time to eat.
- The site has yet to respond to this complaint.

Open – Site has yet to respond to this complaint

Hospitality House

- **Complaint #1:**
- **Submitted: 9/19/16**
- **Response received: 9/26/16**
- The complainant alleged that Hospitality House is serving expired juice to clients during meal times.
- In the response, the Shelter Health Team Dietitian stated that she investigated the claims and that the manager of Hospitality House who admitted that they received a shipment of expired juice, but that it was not served to clients. The Dietitian also stated in the response that she revised the food delivery form to identify actual items delivered/received and that a donation checklist had been implemented to monitor donations to ensure that products are used before their expiration date.

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

MSC South

- **Complaint #1**
- **Submitted: 9/6/16**
- **Response received: 9/14/16**
- In the complaint, the complainant alleged that she obtained a one-night reservation from MSC South. The complainant alleged that a shelter employee attempted to move her from her one-night bed to a “permanent” bed even though she was not on a list for a “permanent” bed. The complainant also stated that the bed the employee wanted to move her to appeared to be occupied by another client.
- In the response, MSC South stated that they attempted to meet with the complainant to investigate the allegations but that they were unable to do so because she had not returned to MSC South since filing the complaint. The site also stated that they spoke to the Swing Shift Supervisor on duty at the time of the alleged incident but that neither he or any of his staff reported having any knowledge of the supposed bed change. The site stated that there was not enough information in the complaint to identify the exact employee that was referred to in the complaint so they were unable to investigate any further.

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

MSC South Drop In

- **Complaint #1:**

- **Complaint submitted: 9/29/16**
- **Response received: 10/6/16**
- The complainant alleged that a client brought their dog into the dining area who defecated on the floor. The complainant alleged that the client refused to clean up the mess and shelter staff did not clean it up when it was reported to them. He also alleged that the restrooms had not been cleaned for several weeks.
- In the response, the site stated that they followed up with the complainant to address his concerns. The response states that the complainant was asked to bring these types of incidents to the attention of shelter staff, who would write up clients for repeatedly failing to clean up the mess of their pets. The response also stated that the bathroom facilities are cleaned up on a daily basis, but that if major cleaning is required that clients should notify maintenance staff. The response stated that the complainant was understanding about the fact that many clients use the restroom and that sometimes the restrooms will need additional cleaning.

Closed – Client was satisfied with the site's response

Next Door

- **Client #1, Complaint #1:**
- **Complaint submitted: 9/19/16**
- **Response received: Registered Dietitian responded 9/23/16, Site responded 10/2/16**
- The complainant alleged that the meals being served at Next Door are not nutritious and there is no variety in the food. He also alleged that two clients were involved in an verbal argument and threatened each other but that shelter staff did not step in and effectively de-escalate the situation. He also alleged that shelter staff did not enforce their Grievance Policy because the clients should have been denied services for verbally threatening each other.
- In Next Door's response, the site stated that the service coordinator on duty on the night of the incident reported that two clients were arguing but that it did not rise to the level where they needed to be denied services under the Grievance Policy.
- In the Registered Dietitian's response, she stated that she contacted the co-kitchen managers and reviewed menus and complaints from the month of August and September. The response stated that there is an appropriate amount of variety for protein sources and that the meals conform to the Standards of Care.

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

- **Client #1 Complaint #2:**
- **Complaint submitted: 9/22/16**
- **Response received: 9/29/16**
- The complainant alleged that the elevator doors do not close all the way, which poses a safety hazard for clients. He also stated that there were no service coordinators to assist disabled clients during meal times for two days.
- In the response, the site stated that elevator repairs had been completed and the doors now close properly. The site also stated that there were no service coordinators present to help disabled clients on one of the days listed in the complaint due to a staff shortage, but that there was a service coordinator present on the second day listed in the complaint.

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

- **Client #2**
- **Complaint submitted: 9/2/16**
- **Response received: 9/8/16**

- The complainant alleged that she had fallen out of her wheelchair and onto the floor when a male shelter employee came from behind her, picked her up and threw her violently back into her wheelchair. The complainant alleged that the male staff member would not identify himself and that other shelter staff refused to give the complainant his name.
- In the response, the site stated that they investigated the allegations by interviewing two on-duty service coordinators and clients who were in the immediate area near the complainant at the time of the incident. The response stated that staff reported that the complainant had fallen several times that day and that male staff member in question denied being rough with the complainant and claimed that he had his identification badge on during the incident. The response also stated that the clients that were interviewed reported that staff were trying to help the complainant into her wheelchair but that complainant was uncooperative with staff while they were trying to help.

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

- **Client #3**
- **Complaint submitted: 9/22/16**
- **Response received: 9/29/16**
- The complainant alleged that staff bagged up her belongings after she was denied services, but a Louis Vitton purse was not returned to her when she returned to the site to pick up her belongings. She also alleged that staff did not follow procedures when she was denied services. She states that shelter staff told her to “take a walk” and that she was only informed she was being denied services after she returned.
- In the response, Next Door stated that while staff did assist the complainant in bagging up some of her belongings, the vast majority of her property had already been bagged by the complainant before staff arrived to assist her. The site also stated that all clients are informed that the site is not responsible for lost or stolen property.

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

- **Client #4:**
- **Complaint submitted: 9/23/16**
- **Response received: 9/30/16**
- The complainant alleged she reported a missing notebook with a gift card inside to shelter staff. The complainant states that the next day, she was told that her notebook was found. Upon retrieving her notebook the complainant states that she saw her gift card was missing. The complainant states that she asked a shelter employee about who found the gift card and for the name of the shelter employee but that they would not provide that information.
- In the response, shelter management stated they interviewed the employee described in the complaint. The response states that the employee told the complainant that she didn't know who turned in the lost notebook and that she did show the complainant her name badge. The employee did admit that she told the complainant that she would no longer be speaking to her because the complainant was being rude and yelling at her.

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

- **Client #5:**
- **Complaint submitted: 9/26/16**
- **Response received: 10/7/16**
- The complainant alleged that another client verbally threatened him and attempted to punch him while shelter staff stood by and did not intervene.

- In the response, Next Door stated that they spoke with the staff that were on duty at the time of the incident. The response states that shelter staff saw a possible verbal altercation take place between the complainant and the other client but that they did not see it escalate to physical attacks. The response also states that shelter staff spoke to the other client listed in the complaint and that the client claimed that the complainant approached him first, said something that the client couldn't understand and then walked away.

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

- **Client #6:**
- **Complaint submitted: 9/30/16**
- **Response received: 10/5/16**
- The complainant alleged that she was attacked by another client staying at Next Door while she was outside of the shelter. The complainant alleged that she filed a police report and was given a letter by the police requesting that shelter management call the police if the clients alleged attacker returned to Next Door. The complainant stated that her alleged attacker was seen inside of the shelter after she gave the letter from the police to shelter staff. The complainant also alleged that the site failed to remove a previous DOS from her record even after the site agreed to do so after a grievance hearing, which caused the client to be unable to get a new shelter reservation for two weeks (DOS unrelated to the alleged attack listed in the complaint). The complainant also alleged that since she has been staying in Next Door, shelter staff almost exclusively speak to her in English even though she is mono-lingual Chinese speaking.
- In the response, shelter staff stated that since the attack took place outside of the shelter and both the complainant and her alleged attacker claimed the other party was the aggressor that Next Door could not take sides in the matter. The site stated that they spoke to both parties and both of them agreed to keep the peace inside the shelter. The site stated that they spoke to the complainant and explained that she could use the phone to call the police at any time, but that they were unaware that the police were actively searching for the complainant's alleged attacker. The site apologized to the complainant for failing to remove the DOS from her records and admitted that they should have updated CHANGES. The response also stated that the site had used Language Link to work with the complainant in the past and that a Chinese speaking supervisor has worked with her as well.
- **This complaint was forwarded to HSH because it contained allegations of physical violence**

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

Santa Ana

- **Complaint #1:**
- **Complaint submitted: 9/20/16**
- **Response received: 9/27/16**
- The complainant alleged that a shelter employee threatened to physically pull clients out of bed if they didn't get up at "Lights On". The complainant also alleged that the shelter employee made disrespectful remarks to clients and that there were no bilingual staff on duty during a graveyard shift.
- In the response, Santa Ana stated that they interviewed the employee listed in the complaint but that she denied all of the allegations. The site stated that they reviewed the employee's training records and that she has been present for internal trainings conducted by Santa Ana. The site also responded by saying that because they operate two sites, if there are no bilingual staff at one site they can also call the other site where there will be a bilingual staff on duty. The site also stated that they have access to Language Link for clients in the response.

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

Table: Total Client Complaints for FY 2016-2017

Site	7/16	8/16	9/16	Total (16-17 FY)
A Woman’s Place	0	0	1	1
A Woman’s Place Drop In Center	0	3	1	4
Bethel AME	0	0	1	1
Compass	0	0	0	0
First Friendship Family	0	1	0	1
Hamilton Emergency	0	0	0	0
Hamilton Family	0	0	0	0
Hospitality House	0	2	1	3
Interfaith Winter Shelter	0	0	0	0
Jazzie’s Place	0	0	0	0
Lark Inn	0	0	0	0
Mission Neighborhood Resource Ctr.	0	0	0	0
MSC South Shelter	3	5	1	9
MSC Drop In Center	0	2	1	3
Next Door	8	9	7	24
Providence	0	3	0	3
Sanctuary	1	0	0	1
Santa Ana	0	0	1	1
Santa Marta/Maria	0	1	0	1
St. Joseph’s	0	0	0	0
United Council	0	0	0	0
Total	12	26	14	52

Investigations

There were three complaints that received responses that did not satisfy the client and required investigations, all involving incidents that took place at Next Door:

Investigation #1

Alleged SOC Violations:

Standard 1: Treat all clients equally, with respect and dignity...

The complainant alleged that kitchen staff were rude and unprofessional when speaking to shelter clients and that they were not fair when giving out second servings at meal times. In order to investigate these claims, the Committee went to Next Door to survey clients about their experiences with kitchen staff.

In order to determine compliance with Standard 1, the Committee needed to receive responses from 10% of the total client capacity (33 clients) indicating that they:

1. Do/Do not think that kitchen staff treat them with respect and spoke to them in a professional manner
2. Do/Do not think that kitchen staff are fair when giving out second servings at meal times

Question 1: 45 clients were asked, “Do kitchen staff treat you with respect and speak to you in a professional manner?”

- * 27 clients said “Yes”
- * 9 clients said “No”
- * 6 clients said “Sometimes”
- * 3 clients did not answer this question

Question 2: 45 clients were asked, “Do you feel like kitchen staff are fair when giving out second servings at meal times?”

- * 21 clients said “Yes”
- * 13 clients said “No”
- * 5 clients said “Sometimes”
- * 6 clients did not answer this question

Client responses to Questions 1 and 2 were split, with neither question receiving responses from 10% of the total client capacity that would allow the Committee to determine the site’s compliance with Standard 1. As a result, the Committee is unable to make a determination on Next Door’s compliance with Standard 1. The investigation reported noted that a majority of clients indicated in their responses to Question 1 that they were treated with respect and spoken to in a professional manner by kitchen staff (27 clients).

Recommendations for Next Door:

- Request that shelter management review all client comments from surveys
- Request that kitchen staff review Ch. 2 of the Shelter Training Manual: “Customer Service and Professionalism”

Investigation #2

Alleged SOC Violations:

Standard 1: Treat all clients equally, with respect and dignity...

Standard 2: Provide shelter services in an environment that is safe and free from physical violence...

The complainant alleged that she was unfairly written up for arguing with another client because the other client initiated the conflict by yelling at the complainant and making violent gestures in the complainant's face while the complainant's only response was to run away from the area. The complainant also alleged that staff were retaliating against her and that certain clients do not get written up for harassing or threatening other clients. The Committee investigated these complaints by surveying shelter clients about their experiences with shelter staff.

Standard 1

In order to determine Next Door's compliance with Standard 1, the Committee needed to receive responses from 10% of the total client capacity (33 clients) indicating that they either:

1. See/Do not see shelter staff not following shelter policies when writing up/denying services to clients for arguing, making threats or fighting
2. See/Do not see shelter staff showing favoritism towards or retaliating against certain clients

Question 1: 45 clients were asked, "Do you feel that staff follow shelter policies when writing up or denying services to clients for arguing, making threats or fighting?"

- * 17 clients said "Yes"
- * 18 clients said "No"
- * 9 clients said "Sometimes"
- * 1 client did not answer this question

Question 2: 45 clients were asked, "Do you feel like staff show favoritism towards or retaliate against certain clients?"

- * 33 clients said "Yes"
- * 9 clients said "No"
- * 3 clients said "Sometimes"

While responses to Question 1 were closely split between "Yes" and "No", 10% of the total client capacity at Next Door (33 clients) indicated in their responses to Question 2 that they have seen shelter staff showing favoritism towards or retaliating against certain clients. As a result, Next Door was found to be not in compliance with Standard 1 of the Standards of Care.

Standard 2

In order to determine with Standard 2, the Committee needed to receive responses from 10% of the total client capacity (33 clients) indicating they either:

3. Do/Do not feel safe at the shelter
4. Do/Do not see shelter staff de-escalating arguments and helping to break up verbal fights between clients.

Question 3: 45 clients were asked, "Do you feel safe at the shelter?"

- * 18 clients said "Yes"
- * 12 clients said "No"
- * 11 clients said "Sometimes"
- * 4 clients did not answer this question

Question 4: 45 clients were asked, “Do staff de-escalate arguments and help break up verbal fights between clients?”

- * 24 clients said “Yes”
- * 11 clients said “No”
- * 7 clients said “Sometimes”
- * 3 clients did not answer this question

Client responses to Questions 3 and 4 were split, with neither question receiving responses from 10% of the total client capacity indicating full compliance or non-compliance with Standard 2. As a result, the Committee was unable to make a determination on Next Door’s compliance with Standard 2.

Recommendations for Next Door:

- Requested that all shelter staff review Chapter 1 of the Shelter Training Manual: “Ethics and Boundaries”
- Requested that management remind all staff of the importance of treating all clients equally and that giving clients preferential treatment or retaliating against clients is prohibited

Investigation #3

Alleged SOC Violations:

Standard 15: Provide shelter clients with pest-free, secure property storage inside each shelter...

The complainant alleged that shelter staff agreed to store his property for a few days while he accompanied his wife at the hospital. The complainant alleged that when he returned to Next Door a few days later, staff informed him that his belongings had been discarded.

In the response, Next Door stated that their policy is to store property for clients for 72 hours before disposal. Next Door also stated that staff never agreed to hold on to the complainant’s property for over 72 hours and that his property was disposed of 5 days after his bed was dropped.

To investigate this complaint, members of the Shelter Monitoring Committee and Committee staff visited Next Door in order to inspect the site’s property storage room to check if client property was properly logged and not disposed of prior to the 72 hour deadline. Committee staff selected three random entries from the property storage log and attempted to locate those bags of client property in the storage room. All three bags of client property were close to or past the 72 hour disposal deadline but not disposed of yet according to property storage records.

Committee staff were able to locate all three bags of client property inside the storage room. As a result, the site is in compliance with Standard 15 of the Standards of Care. During the course of the investigation, Committee staff did find two bags of client property that did not contain any tags or other information identifying which client the property belonged to.

Recommendations for Next Door:

- Requested that Next Door review their policies and procedures for bagging and tagging client property with shelter staff.

August Site Visits

The Committee completed a total of eight unannounced site visits in the month of August.

Shelter	JULY	AUG	SEPT	1st Qtr	Total
A Woman's Place	1			1	1
AWPDI	1			1	1
Bethel AME		1		1	1
Compass	1			1	1
First Friendship			1	1	1
Hamilton Emergency Shelter	1			1	1
Hamilton Family Shelter	1			1	1
Hospitality House			1	1	1
Interfaith				0	0
Jazzie's Place			1	1	1
Lark Inn			1	1	1
MSC Drop In		1		1	1
MSC Shelter		1		1	1
MNRC		1		1	1
Next Door		1		1	1
Providence		1		1	1
Sanctuary	1			1	1
Santa Ana			1	1	1
Santa Marta/Santa Maria			1	1	1
St. Joseph's			1	1	1
United Council			1	1	1
		Quarterly Totals		20	20
		Assigned Number of Visits		20	82
		Percentage of Compliance		100%	24% compliance FY16-17 (Through 1st Quarter Only)

September Site Visit Infractions

The Committee completed eight site visits in the month of August and noted the following Standard of Care infractions:

First Friendship

- **Site Visit Date:** 9/12/16
- **Date infractions submitted to site:** 9/20/16
- **Response received:** Pending, reminder sent 9/26/16
- The Committee visited the site once during the reporting period and noted the following SOC infractions:
 - Standard 12: No pillowcases - **Pending**
 - Standard 21: No Language Link or other professional translation service - **Pending**

Hospitality House

- **Site Visit Date:** 9/14/16
- **Date infractions submitted to site:** 9/19/16
- **Response received:** 9/21/16
- The Committee visited the site once during the reporting period and noted the following SOC infractions:
 - Standard 25: Staff not wearing ID badges – **Resolved, but repeat infraction from Q4 FY15-16 site visit**

Lark Inn

- **Site Visit Date:** 9/12/16
- **Date infractions submitted to site:** 9/2/16
- **Response received:** Pending, reminder sent 10/15/16
- The Committee conducted one visit to this site during this reporting period and noted the following SOC infractions:
 - Standard 3: Men's restroom needed cleaning (trash and toilet paper on floor), broken urinal and showerhead holder (men's restroom) – **Pending**
 - Standard 4: No incontinence supplies – **Pending**
 - Standard 17: No signage noting status of repairs for broken urinal and showerhead holder in men's restroom – **Pending**
 - Standard 25: Staff not wearing ID badges – **Pending**

Santa Ana

- **Site Visit Date:** 9/26/16
- **Date infractions submitted to site:** 10/15/16
- **Response received:** Pending
- The Committee conducted one visit to this site during this reporting period and noted the following SOC infractions:
 - Standard 6: First aid kit was missing antibiotic ointment – **Pending**

Santa Marta

- **Site Visit Date:** 9/26/16
- **Date infractions submitted to site:** 10/15/16
- **Response received:** Pending
- The Committee conducted one visit to this site during this reporting period and noted the following SOC infractions:
 - Standard 3: Vents needed cleaning – **Pending**

St. Joseph's

- **Site Visit Date:** 9/19/16
- **Date infractions submitted to site:** 10/15/16
- **Response received:** Pending
- The Committee conducted one visit to this site during this reporting period and noted the following SOC infractions:
 - Standard 25: Not all staff wearing identification badges – **Pending**

United Council

- **Site Visit Date:** 9/21/16
- **Date infractions submitted to site:** 10/15/16
- **Response received:** Pending
- The Committee conducted one visit to this site during this reporting period and noted the following SOC infractions:
 - Standard 3: No hand dryer or paper towels in restrooms, toilet paper not provided in each stall – **Pending, repeat infraction from Q4 FY15-16 site visit**
 - Standard 6: AED battery needed to be changed – **Pending, repeat infraction from Q4 FY15-16 site visit**
 - Standard 8: No signage indicating case management availability and accessibility – **Pending**
 - Standard 11: "Smoking Prohibited" signs not posted in Spanish – **Pending**
 - Standard 17: No signage noting facility problem and when they would be repaired (all outlets in A Place of Grace room out of order) – **Pending**
 - Standard 18: No TTY or signage with information on where clients can access TTY – **Pending**
 - Standard 21: No Language Link or other professional translation service available – **Pending**
 - Standard 22: No bilingual English/Spanish speaking staff on duty – **Pending**
 - Standard 27: No signage indicating when the next community meeting will be - **Pending**

Committee Membership and Staff Update

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.

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

Veteran's Day Holiday – November 11, 2016

2016 Meeting Calendar

November 16

December 21