



City and County of San Francisco

Shelter Monitoring Committee

MEMORANDUM

TO: Shelter Monitoring Committee
FROM: Committee Staff
DATE: May 11, 2018
RE: April SOC Staff Report

April Client Complaints

There were a total of seventeen complaints submitted to the Shelter Monitoring Committee by fourteen unduplicated clients in April 2018. Of those seventeen complaints, eight are still open pending a response from the site. One complaint at Mission Neighborhood Resource Center received a response that did not satisfy the client; that complaint is currently under investigation. There was one complaint at Compass that received a response that satisfied the client. Sites have responded to the remaining seven complaints but they are still open 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.

Compass

- **Client #1**
- **Complaint submitted: 4/30/18**
- **Response received: 5/1/18**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 2:** Provide shelter services in an environment that is safe...;
 - **Standard 15:** Provide shelter clients with pest-free, secure property storage...;
- The complainant alleged that someone had been coming into her room to steal her belongings and that people are smoking in the hallways.
- The response states that shelter staff checked security footage of the dates and times specified by the complainant but did not see anyone entering her unit. The response also states that “No Smoking” signs are posted throughout the shelter but that staff were unable to verify that smoke was present in the hallways on the dates specified in the complaint.

Satisfied – The client was satisfied with the response to this complaint.

Hamilton Family

- **Client #1**
- **Complaint submitted: 4/12/18**
- **Response received: Pending**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**

- **Standard 1:** Treat clients equally, with respect and dignity, including in the application of shelter rules and grievance process

- The complainant alleged that a shelter employee were rude and unprofessional.

Open – The site has not responded to this complaint

Mission Neighborhood Resource Center

- **Client #1**
- **Complaint submitted: 4/9/18**
- **Response received: 4/18/18**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 1:** Treat all clients equally, with respect and dignity...
 - **Standard 16:** Provide shelter clients with access to electricity for charging cell phones; and other durable medical equipment for clients with disabilities
- The complainant alleged that shelter staff were rude and unprofessional when there was a disagreement between himself and another client about who could sit in a chair that was reserved for wheelchair bound clients.
- The response stated that shelter staff responded to an argument that was taking place between the complainant and another client about who could sit at a seat reserved for charging wheelchairs. The response alleges that the complainant was causing a loud disturbance inside the site, so he was asked to leave.

Not Satisfied – The complainant was not satisfied with the site's response and has requested an investigation into the complaint. The investigation is currently pending.

- **Client #2**
- **Complaint submitted: 4/19/18**
- **Response received: 5/10/18**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 1:** Treat all clients equally, with respect and dignity...
- The complainant alleged that staff were unwilling to update her CHANGES profile and falsely accused her of a causing a disturbance so they could deny her services. The complainant also alleges that she had a scheduling hearing with the site manager to appeal the DOS, but when she arrived at the site staff wouldn't let her into the building and the DOS was upheld without any discussion.
- The response stated that the complainant was denied services after she started verbally abusing staff. The response also states that shelter staff attempted to update the complainant's CHANGES profile multiple times but were unable to do so. The response also stated that the complainant was able to update her profile at another location.

Pending – The site has responded to this complaint but it is still opening pending a response from the client.

- **Client #3**
- **Complaint submitted: 4/19/18**
- **Response received: 4/23/18**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 1:** Treat all clients equally, with respect and dignity...
- The complainant alleged that a shelter employee offered to move him up on the waiting list for a shelter reservation in exchange for sexual favors.
- Shelter management stated that they met with the complainant in order to learn more about allegations. The response states that management interviewed the employee in question, who

denied the allegations. The response concluded by stating that the employee in question was not responsible for managing the shelter reservation waiting list when the incident allegedly took place. The response concluded by stating that there was not enough evidence to confirm or deny the allegations.

- **This complaint was forwarded to HSH due to the nature of the allegations.**

Pending – The site has responded to this complaint but it is still opening pending a response from the client.

Next Door

- **Client #1**
- **Complaint submitted: 4/2/18**
- **Response received: Pending**
- **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 shelter staff are rude, unprofessional and not addressing conflicts between clients.

Open – Site has yet to respond to this complaint

- **Client #2, Complaint #1**
- **Complaint submitted: 4/3/18**
- **Response received: 5/10/18**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 1:** Treat all clients equally, with respect and dignity...
- The complainant alleged that another client has a dog that is aggressive and not house trained, which she alleges is a health hazard. The client alleges that staff are giving preferential treatment to this client because they do not enforce shelter rules with this client's dog.
- The response stats that shelter management had received multiple complaints about dogs and responded by providing dog owners with extra copies of the site's pet policy and by instructing staff to do rounds near pet owners. The response also denied the allegations that client described in the complaint was receiving preferential treatment.

Pending – The site has responded to this complaint but it is still opening pending a response from the client.

- **Client #2, Complaint #2**
- **Complaint submitted: 4/17/18**
- **Response received: Pending**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 1:** Treat all clients equally, with respect and dignity...
- The complainant alleged that shelter staff are rude to her and do not address other clients who verbally harass the complainant.

Open – Site has yet to respond to this complaint

- **Client #2, Complaint #3**
- **Complaint submitted: 4/30/18**
- **Response received: Pending**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**

- **Standard 1:** Treat all clients equally, with respect and dignity...
- The complainant stated that she accidentally dropped and broke a glass bottle of water. The complainant alleged that staff responded by confiscating all of her water bottles, including the ones made of plastic, even though she told them that she needed water at night due to a medical condition.

Open – Site has yet to respond to this complaint

- **Client #3**
- **Complaint submitted: 4/3/18**
- **Response received: Pending**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 1:** Treat all clients equally, with respect and dignity...
- The complainant alleged that he has had an issue with bedbugs in his bed since he started his reservation. The complainant stated that he has washed his bedding and cleaned his bed with alcohol spray but he is still being bitten at night.

Open – Site has yet to respond to this complaint

- **Client #4**
- **Complaint submitted: 4/16/18**
- **Response received: Pending**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 1:** Treat all clients equally, with respect and dignity...
- The complainant alleged that shelter staff have been giving her conflicting information about her shelter reservation, including which bed she is in, whether or not she will receive an extension on her reservation and the date when her reservation will end.

Open – Site has yet to respond to this complaint

- **Client #5**
- **Complaint submitted: 4/19/18**
- **Response received: Pending**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 1:** Treat all clients equally, with respect and dignity...
- The complainant alleged that shelter staff were rude and accused her of taking photos inside of the shelter. The complainant also alleged that some of her personal photos were missing from her phone, which she believes shelter staff deleted.

Open – Site has yet to respond to this complaint

- **Client #6**
- **Complaint submitted: 4/24/18**
- **Response received: Pending**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 15:** Provide shelter clients with pest-free, secure property storage...
- The complainant alleges that shelter staff mistakenly cut off a new lock that she had placed on the drawer underneath her bed and left her property unsecured for several hours.

Open – Site has yet to respond to this complaint

Sanctuary

- **Client #1**

- **Complaint submitted: 4/9/18**
- **Response received: 4/20/18**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 1:** Treat all clients equally, with respect and dignity...
 - **Standard 2:** Provide shelter services in an environment that is safe...
- The complainant alleged that woke up after feeling someone scratching him in his sleep. The complainant stated that when he reported the incident to staff, they kept referring to him using condescending names like “baby”.
- The response states that shelter staff investigated the allegation but couldn’t identify the individual who allegedly scratched the complainant. The response also states that they spoke to the employee listed in the complaint, who admitted to referring to the complainant as “baby” because she didn’t know his name. The response states that the employee apologized and promised to ask all residents for their names moving forward.

Pending – The site has responded to this complaint but it is still opening pending a response from the client.

- **Client #2**
- **Complaint submitted: 4/20/18**
- **Response received: 5/7/18**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 2:** Provide shelter services in an environment that is safe...
- The complainant alleged that two clients were involved in a fight. The complainant alleges that when the police arrived, shelter staff directed them towards one client when it was actually the other client who initiated the fight. The complainant also alleged that security officers were intimidating clients so they wouldn’t speak to the police.
- The response denies the allegations that shelter staff took the side of one client over the other and stated that both clients were denied services and escorted out of the building by police. The response also denies the allegations that staff intimidated clients, only that they attempted to stop hecklers who were disrupting SFPD.

Pending – The site has responded to this complaint but it is still opening pending a response from the client.

- **Client #3**
- **Complaint submitted: 4/17/18**
- **Response received: 5/1/18**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 1:** Treat clients equally, with respect and dignity...
- The complainant alleged that that when shelter staff ignored and avoided her when she wanted to speak to them about her bed.
- The response states that staff have been trying to work with the complainant, but she was confusing staff by staying in beds that she was not assigned to and did not complete a Reasonable Accommodation form requesting that she be allowed to stay in a specific bed. The response states that staff informed the complainant about the proper procedure for requesting changes to her shelter bed and that she agreed to follow the right protocol in the future.

Pending – The site has responded to this complaint but it is still opening pending a response from the client.

- **Client #4**
- **Complaint submitted: 4/27/18**

- **Response received: 5/11/18**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 3:** ...and hire janitorial staff to clean shelters on a daily basis...;
 - **Standard 8:** Provide shelter services in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act...
- The complainant alleged that there are several issues in the women’s restroom that need o be repaired and that shelter staff are having inappropriate conversations about clients.
- The response states that shelter staff have addressed the issues in the women’s restroom. The response also denies the allegations that shelter staff were having inappropriate conversations about clients.

Pending – The site has responded to this complaint but it is still opening pending a response from the client.

April Client Complaints by Standard

Standard of Care	Number of complaints alleging violations of this Standard
Standard 1: Treat all clients equally, with respect and dignity, including in the application of shelter policies...	13
Standard 2: Provide shelter services in an environment that is safe and free from physical violence	4
Standard 3: ...and hire janitorial staff to clean shelters on a daily basis	1
Standard 8: Provide shelters services in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act...	1
Standard 15: Provide shelter clients with pest-free, secure property storage...	2
Standard 16: Provide shelter clients with access to electricity for charging cell phones; and other durable medical equipment for clients with disabilities	1

Please note that each complaint can include alleged violations of more than one Standard of Care

Total Client Complaints FY 2017-2018

Site	Site Capacity	7/17	8/17	9/17	10/17	11/17	12/17	1/18	2/18	3/18	4/18	Total (17-18 FY)
A Woman's Place	11 mats	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
A Woman's Place Drop In Center	63 chairs	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	3
Bethel AME	30 mats	2	6	2	4	1	1	2	1	2	0	21
Compass	22 families	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
First Friendship	25 families	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	5
Hamilton Emergency	46 beds, 8 cribs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
Hamilton Family	27 families	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
Hospitality House	30 beds/mats	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Interfaith Winter Shelter	60-100 mats depending on the site	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Jazzie's Place	24 beds	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Lark Inn	40 beds	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mission Neighborhood Resource Ctr.	70 chairs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
MSC South Shelter	340 beds	3	3	1	4	1	1	4	4	2	0	23
MSC South Drop In Center	75 chairs	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Next Door	334 beds	4	5	6	4	2	7	2	12	4	8	54
Providence	110 mats	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Sanctuary	200 beds	2	3	1	4	3	5	4	0	2	4	28
Santa Ana	28 beds	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Santa Marta/Maria	56 beds	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Joseph's	10 families	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
United Council	48 chairs	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total	Single adult: 1203 beds/mats Interfaith: 60-100 mats Resource Centers: 256 chairs Family: 84 family rooms, 46 beds and 8 cribs	12	21	13	18	8	17	16	19	11	17	152

April SOC 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 in April at MSC South Shelter:

MSC South

Client #1:

Complaint filed: 2/13/18

Response received: 3/1/18

Investigation requested: 3/22/18

Investigation completed: 4/12/18

Alleged SOC violation:

- **Standard 1)** Treat all clients equally...including in the application of shelter policies...

The complainants made the following allegations:

- **Standard 1:** The complainant's alleged that he and another client attempted to use the restroom but found that it was locked. The complaint alleged that when he asked a shelter monitor to unlock the door, she allegedly told him that her supervisor had the key and proceeded to ignore him and the other client. The complainant also alleges that a shelter monitor and a supervisor falsely accused him of causing a disturbance inside the shelter and denied him services from the site when he was only asking to use the restroom.

Investigation:

Committee staff interviewed shelter staff and shelter management about the allegations and determined the following:

- The shelter monitor denied the allegations that she had ignored the complainant and the other client. The shelter monitor stated that at the time of the incident, the men's restroom was closed for a scheduled cleaning. The monitor also stated that male clients would normally be allowed to use the female restroom in this situation, but that at the time of the incident there was a female client showering so the monitor couldn't let the male clients use the female restroom. The monitor alleged that she told this to the complainant, who became agitated and started causing a disturbance inside the site.
- The shelter supervisor stated that on the day of the incident, she working upstairs when she heard a disturbance taking place downstairs. The supervisor stated that when she went downstairs to investigate, she saw the complainant demanding that the shelter monitor let him in the restroom. The supervisor stated that she told the complainant that he was disturbing other guests and asked him lower his voice and to document the incident on a guest input form. The supervisor also stated that although the complainant initially calmed down, he raised his voice and started yelling at staff a few minutes later. The supervisor stated that she denied services to the complainant after he continued to cause a disturbance inside the shelter despite multiple warnings.

After interviewing the complainant, the shelter monitor and the shelter supervisor that were involved in the incident, Committee staff were unable to confirm or deny the complainant's allegations that staff ignored his request to use the restroom and gave him an unjustified denial of service. As a result, this investigation is inconclusive.

Findings: Inconclusive

April Site Visit Infractions

The Committee completed conducted seven site visits in April 2018. There were two visits where no infractions were noted, these visits were at Compass, MSC South Drop In and St. Joseph's. The infractions from the remaining four visits are listed below:

Bethel AME

Site visit date: 4/3/18

Infractions submitted to site: 5/9/18

Site responded: Pending

SOC Infractions:

Standard 6: First aid kits not fully stocked (no anti-biotic ointment), no CPR masks, no AED – **Pending**

Standard 9: Meal menu only posted in English, not Spanish – **Pending**

Standard 12: No pillows or pillowcases provided to clients – **Pending**

Standard 22: No bilingual English/Spanish speaking staff currently on duty – **Pending**

Standard 23: No emergency disaster plans in place or posted in shelter – **Pending**

Standard 26: No MUNI tokens available at the time of the visit (staff to call management for refill) – **Pending**

Standard 30: No personal protective equipment available for staff (no gloves or protective masks) – **Pending**

Jazzie's Place

Site visit date: 4/3/18

Infractions submitted to site: 5/9/18

Site responded: Pending

SOC Infractions:

Standard 3: No hand sanitizer available at Santa Maria – **Pending**

Next Door

Site visit date: 4/4/18

Infractions submitted to site: 4/9/18

Site responded: Pending

SOC Infractions:

Standard 3: Middle bathroom stall in 1st floor men's restroom is out of order. Urinal in men's restroom on opposite side of sleeping area is also out of order – **Pending**

Standard 17: No signage posted regarding out of order toilet and urinal with status of repairs – **Pending**

Santa Marta/Maria

Site visit date: 4/3/18

Infractions submitted to site: 5/9/18

Site responded: Pending

SOC Infractions:

Standard 3: No hand sanitizer available at Santa Maria – **Pending**

FY2017-2018 Unannounced Site Visit Tally

Site	Q1 July- Sept.	Q2 Oct. – Dec.	Q3 Jan. - March	Q4 April - June	Total (17-18 FY)
A Woman's Place	0	2	1	0	3
A Woman's Place Drop In Center	1	1	1	0	3
Bethel AME	1	1	1	1	4
Compass	1	1	0	1	3
First Friendship Family	0	2	1	0	3
Hamilton Emergency	1	0	3	0	4
Hamilton Family	1	0	3	0	4
Hospitality House	1	0	2	0	3
Interfaith Winter Shelter* seasonal shelter open during winter months	*Closed	0	2	*Closed	2
Jazzie's Place	0	2	1	1	4
Lark Inn	1	1	2	0	4
Mission Neighborhood Resource Ctr.	1	1	2	0	4
MSC South Shelter	1	0	2	0	3
MSC South Drop In Center	1	0	1	1	3
Next Door	1	1	1	1	4
Providence	1	1	1	0	3
Sanctuary	0	1	2	0	3
Santa Ana	1	1	1	0	3
Santa Marta/Maria	0	2	1	1	4
St. Joseph's	1	1	0	1	3
United Council	1	1	1	0	3
Sites Visited	15	19	29	7	70
Assigned Sites	20	21	21	20	82
Compliance	75.0%	90.5%	138.1%	35.0% Compliance for FY17-18 (through April 2018 only)	85.4% compliance for FY17-18 (through April 2018 only)

The Shelter Monitoring Committee is required to complete four unannounced visits to each site on an annual basis.

FY2017-2018 Announced Site Visit Tally

Site	Total (17-18 FY)
A Woman's Place	1
A Woman's Place Drop In Center	1
Bethel AME	1
Compass	1
First Friendship Family	1
Hamilton Emergency	1
Hamilton Family	1
Hospitality House	1
Interfaith Winter Shelter *seasonal shelter open during winter months	0
Jazzie's Place	1
Lark Inn	0
Mission Neighborhood Resource Ctr.	0
MSC South Shelter	0
MSC South Drop In Center	0
Next Door	1
Providence	1
Sanctuary	0
Santa Ana	0
Santa Marta/Maria	1
St. Joseph's	2
United Council	0
Total	21
Required	41
Compliance for FY17-18	51.2% compliance (through April 2018 only)

The Committee is required to make two announced site visits to each site each year to survey clients.

Staff Update and Committee Membership

Membership

The Committee currently has ten members and three vacancies:

Board of Supervisors:

Seat 1-Must be homeless or formerly homeless (within 3 years prior to the appointment) living with their homeless child under the age of 18.

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.

Mayor's Office:

Seat 2-Must be a member from the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing

Contact Jeff Simbe at 415-255-3647 or email jeff.simbe@sfdph.org if you are interested in applying.

Rules Committee Update

FY2017-2018 Meeting Calendar

- June 20