



City and County of San Francisco

# Shelter Monitoring Committee

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Shelter Monitoring Committee  
**FROM:** Committee Staff  
**DATE:** March 16, 2018  
**RE:** February SOC Staff Report

---

### February Client Complaints

There were a total of nineteen complaints submitted to the Shelter Monitoring Committee by fifteen unduplicated clients in February 2018. Of those sixteen complaints, five are still open pending a response from the site. Sites have responded to the remaining eleven 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.

#### Bethel AME

- **Client #1**
- **Complaint submitted: 2/9/18**
- **Response received: 2/21/18**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
  - **Standard 1:** Treat clients equally, with respect and dignity, including in the application of shelter rules and grievance process
  - **Standard 2:** Provide shelter services in an environment that is safe...
  - **Standard 13:** Make shelters available for sleeping at least 8 hours per night...
- The complainants alleged that shelter staff were leaving the shelter during the graveyard shift, that two employees got into a fight while on duty and that certain clients were getting preferential treatment.
- The response states that after investigating the allegations, shelter management made some staffing changes and met with the entire Bethel AME staff about leaving the shelter while on duty. The response acknowledges that two staff were involved in a fight and states that both staff were removed from the schedule pending an investigation. The response denied that allegations that any clients were getting preferential treatment.

*Not Satisfied – Clients were not satisfied with the response and requested an investigation. This investigation is currently pending.*

#### Hamilton Emergency Shelter

- **Client #1**
- **Complaint submitted: 2/6/18**

1380 Howard Street, First Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
[www.sfgov.org/sheltermonitoring](http://www.sfgov.org/sheltermonitoring)

(415) 255-3642 (phone)  
(415) 255-3629 (fax)  
[shelter.monitoring@sfgov.org](mailto:shelter.monitoring@sfgov.org)

- **Response received: 2/16/18**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
  - **Standard 2:** Provide shelter services in an environment that is safe...
- The complainants alleged that shelter staff would not intervene when they asked for their help with another client harassing them. The complainant's alleged that the other client eventually threatened to hit their child, at which point they got into a verbal altercation and all parties were DOS'd.
- The response states that staff initially advised the complainant's to ignore the other client, but acknowledges that staff could have taken additional steps to de-escalate the situation. The response also states that management would be reviewing the importance of de-escalation techniques with staff.

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

- **Client #2**
- **Complaint submitted: 2/6/18**
- **Response received: 2/13/18**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
  - **Standard 1:** Treat clients equally, with respect and dignity...
  - **Standard 2:** Provide shelter services in an environment that is safe...
  - **Standard 3:** ...and clean shelters on a daily basis...
- The complainant alleged that bed areas need additional cleaning and that she was DOS'd for threatening to spank another client's child even though the child had been hitting her.
- The response states that shelter rooms are cleaned every day and every time a family exits the shelter. The response also states that they met with the complainant and gave her a second chance after she said that she understood the seriousness of the matter and that it wouldn't happen again.

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

### MSC South

- **Client #1**
- **Complaint submitted: 2/2/18**
- **Response received: 2/20/18**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
  - **Standard 1:** Treat all clients equally, with respect and dignity...
- The complainant alleged that shelter staff told clients that had to leave the dining room at 7:45 AM when breakfast is scheduled to go until 8:00 AM.
- The response states that breakfast at MSC South only runs until 7:30 AM, which was why they could not serve the complainant breakfast on the day of the incident.

*No Contact – Client's phone number has been disconnected*

- **Client #2**
- **Complaint submitted: 2/13/18**
- **Response received: 3/2/18**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
  - **Standard 1:** Treat all clients equally, with respect and dignity...

- The complainant alleged that that shelter staff would not unlock the first floor restroom so he and another client could use it. The complainant alleged that he was eventually given an unjustified DOS for causing a disturbance.
- In the response, shelter management alleged that the complainant became extremely upset at staff after they told him that the bathrooms were closed for cleaning. The response also states that the complainant was given the DOS for yelling and disrespecting staff.

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

- **Client #3**
- **Complaint submitted: 2/14/18**
- **Response received: 3/1/18**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
  - **Standard 1:** Treat all clients equally, with respect and dignity...
- The complainant alleged that hot coffee was accidentally spilled on him during breakfast, which resulted in him receiving serious burns. The complainant alleged that shelter staff harassed him about checking on the burn and was discriminating against him based on race. The complainant also alleged that the kitchens were unclean.
- In the response, shelter management stated that staff denied harassing the complainant and that they had only encouraged him to check his burn in the restroom. The response from the Registered Dietician stated that she had reviewed the shelters Sanitation Logs and confirmed that food temperature and sanitation procedures were being maintained.

*Not Satisfied – Clients were not satisfied with the response and requested an investigation. This investigation is currently pending.*

- **Client #4**
- **Complaint submitted: 2/21/18**
- **Response received: 3/9/18**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
  - **Standard 1:** Treat clients equally, with respect and dignity...
- The complainant alleges that on several occasions, shelter staff filled his bed with another client even though he was present for bed check and has a late pass.
- In the response, shelter management stated the complainant has only had his late pass since 2/12/18 and that the complainant had 6 “no shows” before his late pass was given to him. The response states that on occasions where a client is not present during bed check and they do not have a late pass, beds will be given away to other clients.

*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: 2/16/18**
- **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...
  - **Standard 8:** Provide shelter services in compliance with ADA...

- The complainant alleged that shelter staff are rude and sleep while on duty, that staff are not bringing meals to ADA clients like they are supposed to and that several lights in the shelter have gone out.

*Open – Site has yet to respond to this complaint*

- **Client #2, Complaint #1:**
- **Complaint submitted: 2/2/18**
- **Response received: 2/23/18**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
  - **Standard 1:** Treat clients equally, with respect and dignity...
  - **Standard 8:** Provide...reasonable modifications to shelter policies...
- The complainant alleged that shelter staff are rude, unprofessional and not allowing her to use the disabled ramp/door even though she has a medical condition.
- The response denies the allegations that staff are unprofessional and states that the complainant is not restricted or prohibited from using the disabled ramp/door.

*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: 2/13/18**
- **Response received: 2/23/18**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
  - **Standard 1:** Treat clients equally, with respect and dignity...
  - **Standard 2:** Provide shelter services in an environment that is safe...
- The complainant alleged that there have been ongoing issues with another client verbally and physically threatening her. The complainant states that when she reports the issue to shelter staff, they do not address the behavior with the other client.
- The response states that management tried to meet with the complainant multiple times to investigate the allegations and that the complainant refused to meet with them. The response also states that management has investigated the allegations, including reviewing security footage, but couldn't verify the complainant's allegations against the other client.

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

- **Client #2, Complaint #3:**
- **Complaint submitted: 2/20/18**
- **Response received: 2/23/18**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
  - **Standard 1:** Treat clients equally, with respect and dignity...
- The complainant alleged that she called the police after being threatened by another client. The complainant alleges that when the police arrived, shelter staff lied to them about what had happened.
- The response states that staff did not witness the other client threatening her, but that they did give the client a warning that if she was harassing the complainant that she would be DOS'd. The response states that the complainant called the police three times after she was not satisfied with the response from staff but denies the allegations that staff lied to the police.

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

- **Client #2, Complaint #4:**
- **Complaint submitted: 2/22/18**
- **Response received: Pending**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
  - **Standard 1:** Treat clients equally, with respect and dignity...
- The complainant alleged that a shelter employee spoke to her using unprofessional language.

*Open – Site has yet to respond to this complaint*

- **Client #3:**
- **Complaint submitted: 2/5/18**
- **Response received: 2/23/18**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
  - **Standard 1:** Treat clients equally, with respect and dignity...
- The complainant alleged that shelter staff were rude to her when she asked them questions about a meal and that staff haven't properly addressed a bed bug infestation.
- The response alleged that the complainant went to the front of the line and demanded that staff serve her first because she was an ADA client. The response states that staff told the complainant that she could not cut the line and that she should sit down so staff could bring a tray to her. The response also states that staff treated the complainant's bed for bedbugs several times. The response denies the allegations that staff were rude to the complainant.

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

- **Client #4, Complaint #1:**
- **Complaint submitted: 2/12/18**
- **Response received: Pending**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
  - **Standard 1:** Treat clients equally, with respect and dignity...
  - **Standard 2:** Provide shelter services in an environment that is safe...
- The complainant alleges that another client has repeatedly screamed and waved her hands aggressively in the complainant's face and that staff have not stepped in to address the behavior.

*Open – Site has yet to respond to this complaint*

- **Client #4, Complaint #2:**
- **Complaint submitted: 2/16/18**
- **Response received: 2/23/18**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
  - **Standard 1:** Treat clients equally, with respect and dignity...
- The complainant alleges that there have been issues with other clients reaching over/moving her bed to access the electrical outlet that is behind it. The complainant states that she has reported this issue to staff, who have been giving different information to clients about who is allowed to use the outlet.
- The response states that shelter staff placed a surge protector in the outlet behind the complainant's bed so other clients could charge their devices without disturbing the complainant.

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

- **Client #5:**
- **Complaint submitted: 2/20/18**
- **Response received: Pending**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
  - **Standard 2:** Provide shelter services in an environment that is safe...
- The complainant alleges that that a client verbally threatened her in front of a shelter employee. The complainant alleged that the employee confirmed that she heard the threat but did not speak to the other client about it.

*Open – Site has yet to respond to this complaint*

- **Client #6:**
- **Complaint submitted: 2/21/18**
- **Response received: Pending**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
  - **Standard 1:** Treat clients equally, with respect and dignity...
- The complainant alleges that that that shelter staff use unprofessional language when speaking to clients.

*Open – Site has yet to respond to this complaint*

- **Client #7:**
- **Complaint submitted: 2/26/18**
- **Response received: Pending**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
  - **Standard 1:** Treat clients equally, with respect and dignity...
- The complainant alleges that that dishwashers are disturbing clients while they collect dishes during mealtimes by using inappropriate language, slamming down trays and cups while cleaning and loudly playing personal music.

*Open – Site has yet to respond to this complaint*

- **Client #8:**
- **Complaint submitted: 2/27/18**
- **Response received: Pending**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
  - **Standard 1:** Treat clients equally, with respect and dignity...
- The complainant alleged that bathrooms are unsanitary in the mornings and that staff are not addressing the reports about bedbugs.

*Open – Site has yet to respond to this complaint*

**February 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...	18
Standard 2: Provide shelter services in an environment that is safe and free from physical violence	7
Standard 3: Provide...soap...paper/hand towels...and clean shelters...	1
Standard 8: Provide...reasonable modifications to shelter policies, practices and procedures...	2
Standard 13: Make the shelter facility available for sleeping at least 8 hours per night	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	Total (17-18 FY)
A Woman's Place	11 mats	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
A Woman's Place Drop In Center	63 chairs	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
Bethel AME	30 mats	2	6	2	4	1	1	2	1	19
Compass	22 families	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
First Friendship	25 families	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	0	5
Hamilton Emergency	46 beds, 8 cribs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Hamilton Family	27 families	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Hospitality House	30 beds/mats	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	1
Jazzie's Place	24 beds	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Lark Inn	40 beds	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mission Neighborhood Resource Ctr.	70 chairs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MSC South Shelter	340 beds	3	3	1	4	1	1	4	4	21
MSC South Drop In Center	75 chairs	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Next Door	334 beds	4	5	6	4	2	7	2	12	42
Providence	110 mats	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Sanctuary	200 beds	2	3	1	4	3	5	4	0	22
Santa Ana	28 beds	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
Santa Marta/Maria	56 beds	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Joseph's	10 families	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
United Council	48 chairs	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>Single adult: 1203 beds/mats Interfaith: 60-100 mats Resource Centers: 256 chairs Family: 84 family rooms, 46 beds and 8 cribs</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>97</b>



## February 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 seven investigations in February:

### Bethel AME

**Client #1:**

**Complaint filed: 12/19/17**

**Response received: 12/27/18**

**Investigation requested: 1/15/18**

**Investigation completed: 2/28/18**

**Alleged SOC violation:**

- **Standard 2)** Provide shelter services in an environment that is safe and free from physical violence...
- **Standard 3)** ...shelters shall provide toilet paper in each bathroom...
- **Standard 26)** Ensure all clients receive appropriate and ADA-compliant transportation...

**The complainant made the following allegations:**

- **Standard 2:** The complainant alleged after that she informed shelter staff that another client at Bethel AME had attacked her in the past, shelter staff moved the client to a mat that was closer to the complainant instead of separating the two of them.
- **Standard 3:** The complainant alleged that the shelter frequently runs out of toilet paper in the mornings.
- **Standard 26:** The complainant alleged that the shelter did not provide her with MUNI tokens on 5 separate days in January.

### **Investigation:**

Committee staff interviewed shelter staff, inspected shelter facilities and reviewed MUNI token distribution logs and determined the following:

- Shelter staff reported that on the first night the complainant reported having a conflict with another client, both parties were separated on different mats. Shelter staff stated that the complainant informed shelter staff of the conflict late in the evening, so there were only a limited number of spaces where the clients could be moved to.
- Shelter staff provided Committee staff with an overview of restocking procedures for hygiene supplies at Bethel AME and explained that staff replaced supplies at 4:00 PM and 12:30 AM every day. Shelter staff also showed Committee staff the extra supply of toilet paper that is stored in the garage in case supplies ever run out upstairs in the shelter.
- Committee staff reviewed MUNI token logs, which track every instance where clients receive tokens from the site. The logs indicated that the complainant had been receiving tokens for several weeks, including 2 of the 5 days that were listed in the complaint. Shelter staff stated that they had procedures in place to replace tokens when they run out and that the complainant did not request tokens on the other 3 days listed on the complaint.

There was insufficient evidence to confirm the complainant's allegations that shelter staff had failed to address safety concerns with another client, allowed toilet paper to run out and did not provide her with MUNI tokens.

**Findings: Inconclusive**

## **First Friendship**

**Client #1:**

**Complaint filed: 1/19/18**

**Response received: 2/21/18**

**Investigation completed: 3/7/18**

**Alleged SOC violation:**

- **Standard 2)** Treat clients equally, with respect and dignity, including in the application of shelter policies and grievance process

**The complainant made the following allegations:**

- **Standard 2:** The complainants alleged that an unknown female claiming to be the girlfriend of a shelter employee was banging on the door of the shelter entrance, making threatening comments and demanding to be let in after “Lights Out”. The complainant’s stated that the unknown female later snuck into First Friendship through the back door and initiated a physical altercation with a male employee while holding a knife. The complainants alleged that clients separated the unknown female from the shelter employee while the other staff person called the police. The complainants alleged that the unknown female fled the site before the police arrived.

**Investigation:**

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

- Shelter management stated that they reviewed security footage of the incident confirmed that an unknown female had snuck into First Friendship through the back door and initiated a physical confrontation with a shelter employee inside the staff lounge. Shelter management also confirmed that several clients stepped in and separated the female from the employee while shelter staff called the police. Shelter management stated that no knife was visible on the security footage but stated that the unknown female was holding a cell phone during the incident.
- Shelter management stated that there were no security staff available to provide assistance during the incident because security staff end their shift at midnight. Shelter management stated that they are unable to provide 24 hour security staff at First Friendship due to staffing issues.

Based on this investigation, Committee staff confirmed that an individual was able to sneak into First Friendship to initiate a physical altercation with a shelter employee. As a result, Bethel AME is out of compliance with Standard 2.

**Findings: Out of Compliance**

**Client #2:**

**Complaint filed: 1/23/18**

**Response received: 1/31/18**

**Investigation completed: 3/7/18**

**Alleged SOC violation:**

- **Standard 2)** Treat clients equally, with respect and dignity, including in the application of shelter policies and grievance process

**The complainant made the following allegations:**

- **Standard 2:** The complainant alleged that a male shelter employee brought her into the kitchen to discuss comment that another client had made about breakfast. The complainant alleged that the employee made her feel unsafe because he was upset about the comment and the two of them were alone in the kitchen.

- **Standard 2:** The complainant alleged that she heard a female shelter employee make a threatening comment about clients.
- **Standard 2:** The complainant alleged that a female employee initiated a physical altercation with a female client after the two individuals bumped shoulders. The complainant alleged that a third client's child had a bruised cheek as a result of the altercation.

### **Investigation:**

Committee staff viewed security camera footage of the incident, interviewed shelter management and shelter staff about the allegations and determined the following:

- The male shelter employee denied the allegations that he brought the client into the kitchen and spoken to her without anyone else present. The employee stated that he spoke to the client while she was standing in the doorway into the kitchen and that he was only explaining that he was still preparing additional food for breakfast.
- The male shelter employee stated that the female employee did not make threatening comments about staff and that she was actually referring to her social media page. The female employee could not be interviewed because she was currently on leave.
- Security footage showed that the shelter employee and the female client bumped into each other while they were each walking across the room. The footage shows the employee and the client speaking for a bit before the employee turns around and begins to walk away. The footage then shows the client initiating the altercation by lunging and grabbing the employee from behind.
- Footage did not record the actual altercation, as the client and the female employee were in an area of the shelter that was blocked off from the cameras. The client is shown throwing several punches at an individual who is blocked off from the cameras before several other clients are shown rushing into the area.
- Security footage then showed the female shelter employee being helped off of the ground and lead into the staff office. Footage showed clients attempting to get into the office, but that they were blocked by other clients and a male employee.
- Shelter management reported that the following steps had been taken after the incident:
  - Shelter management met with staff from First Friendship and other Providence Foundation programs to review security protocols
  - 3 additional security cameras were installed at First Friendship to cover blind spots that were not being recorded before.
  - Clients were given the opportunity to be transferred to the Providence family shelter.

Based on this investigation, Committee staff confirmed that a physical altercation took place between a shelter employee and a shelter client. As a result, First Friendship is out of compliance with Standard 2.

### **Findings: Out of Compliance**

#### **Next Door**

**Client #1:**

**Complaint filed: 12/1/17**

**Response received: 12/8/18**

**Investigation requested: 2/8/18**

**Investigation completed: 2/28/18**

**Alleged SOC violation:**

- **Standard 3)** Treat clients equally, with respect and dignity, including in the application of shelter policies and grievance process

- **Standard 17)** Note in writing and post in a common area in the shelter when a maintenance problem will be repaired

**The complainant made the following allegations:**

- **Standard 3:** The complainant alleged that there were several issues in the 4<sup>th</sup> floor women's restrooms:
  - Facilities were unhygienic and not being regularly cleaned, no water was coming from sinks and that toilet paper, paper towels and toilet seat covers weren't available. The complainant alleged that when available, these items were placed on the ground instead of inside appropriate dispensers.
  - Extremely low water pressure and no hot water in the showers
- **Standard 17:**
  - In the response to the complaint, Next Door stated that feminine hygiene disposal would be installed on 1/3/18. The complainant alleged that the disposal had not been installed on that date.
  - The complainant alleged that one of the elevators was not working and that there was no sign posted with a repair date.
  - The complainant alleged that no signs were posted regarding broken restroom amenities with a repair date.

**Investigation:**

The investigation team visited Next Door to inspect shelter facilities and determined the following:

The investigation team could not confirm or deny the complainant's allegations of bathrooms not being regularly cleaned and that amenities were not working. At the time of the investigation, all sinks and toilets worked and the restrooms were stocked with hygiene supplies. However, a significant amount of trash was present in the restroom and one toilet that was unusable due to feces spread around the top. This indicates a need for a cleaning in addition to the daily scheduled cleaning from 2:30-4:30 PM.

**Findings: Standard 3 - Inconclusive**

Based on the investigation, Committee staff confirmed that there was still not feminine hygiene product disposal installed in the restroom. As a result, Next Door is out of compliance with Standard 17.

**Findings: Standard 17 - Out of compliance**

**Recommendations:**

- Remind facilities staff to place toilet seat covers and paper towels in appropriate dispensers
- Provide an estimated installation date for the feminine hygiene product disposal and follow-up with Committee staff once installation has been completed
- Remind Service Coordinators to check the 4th floor restrooms in the mornings and notify facilities staff if restrooms need to be restocked or if there is a need for emergency pickup.

**Sanctuary**

**Client #1:**

**Complaint filed: 12/19/17**

**Response received: 1/5/18**

**Investigation requested: 1/8/18**

**Investigation completed: 2/2/18**

**Alleged SOC violation:**

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

**The complainant made the following allegations:**

- **Standard 1:** The complainant alleged that a shelter employee was taking sides in disputes between clients, called the complainant a “crystal meth-head” and DOS’d the complainant when she asked him for an apology.

**Investigation:**

Committee staff interviewed the shelter employee listed in the complaint and determined the following:

- The shelter employee denied the allegations that he had taken sides in the dispute between the complainant and the other client. The shelter employee stated that he had only intervened in order to de-escalate an argument between the complainant and another client because it had begun to disturb the other guests on the floor. The shelter employee stated that both clients agreed to let go of the disagreement at this time.
- The shelter employee denied ever calling the complainant a “crystal meth-head” or any other names.
- The shelter employee stated that the complainant was DOS’d the morning after the incident for continuously causing a disturbance throughout the night (yelling at staff and other clients, slamming doors open and closed).

Both shelter staff and the complainant reported that the complainant was denied services after being involved in a disagreement with another client. However, there was insufficient evidence to determine if the shelter employee had called the complainant any names, unfairly sided with another client over the complainant, or denied services to the complainant in an act of retaliation.

**Findings: Inconclusive.****Client #2:**

**Complaint filed: 12/4/17**

**Response received: 1/9/18**

**Investigation requested: 1/16/18**

**Investigation completed: 2/2/18**

**Alleged SOC violation:**

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

**The complainant made the following allegations:**

- **Standard 1:** The complainant alleged that shelter staff have not been adhering to the portion of the shelter’s Bed Bug policy that requires staff to inspect and treat all shelter beds in the immediate vicinity. The complainant alleged that shelter staff did not inspect/treat her bed when a client in an adjacent bed had a bed bug outbreak.

**Investigation:**

Committee staff interviewed shelter management and a front line shelter employee and determined the following:

- The shelter employee stated that when Sanctuary received the initial report of an bedbug outbreak near the complainant’s bed area, he was instructed to use a steamer to treat several beds

in the area (including the complainants). The employee stated that that the complainant refused to allow him to treat her bed.

- Shelter management stated that one week later, the complainant requested that she be allowed to set up a tent on top of her bed as an alternative treatment for bed bugs. Shelter management stated that this request was submitted to ECS management, who ended up denying the request.
- Shelter management stated that a week after her request for the tent, the complainant informed staff that she had been bitten by bed bugs. Shelter management stated that when they told the complainant that they would have to inspect her bed, the complainant refused to allow staff to do so.
- Shelter management stated that a week and a half later, shelter staff left flyers on the complainant's bed and the beds in the surrounding area notifying them that shelter staff would be treating all the beds in the area for bedbugs on the following day. Shelter management reported that the complainant cooperated with staff at this point and removed her belongings from the bed so it could be treated.

Shelter staff alleged that they had offered to treat the complainant's bed for bedbugs on several occasions but had those offers declined by the complainant. The complainant alleged that she never told staff that they couldn't treat her bed, only that her belief that a tent on top of the bed was a more effective treatment. The investigation was unable to determine the shelter's or the client's version of events. As a result, this investigation is inconclusive.

**Findings: Inconclusive.**

**Client #3:**

**Complaint filed: 1/22/18**

**Response received: 1/30/18**

**Investigation requested: 2/15/18**

**Investigation completed: 2/26/18**

**Alleged SOC violation:**

- **Standard 2)** Treat clients equally, with respect and dignity, including in the application of shelter policies and grievance process

**The complainant made the following allegations:**

- **Standard 2:** The complainant alleged that he has heard shelter staff making violent threats towards him and planning with other clients to assault him. The complainant also alleged that shelter staff and residents will grab him while he is sleeping to wake him up.

**Investigation:**

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

- Shelter management reported that that they were aware of a conflict between the complainant and another client at the beginning of the complainant's reservation, but stated that staff had de-escalated the situation and both parties were able to resolve their differences. Shelter management stated that staff have not witnessed any verbal or physical threats being directed towards the complainant since the first incident.
- Shelter management also reported that they interviewed the staff that the complainant identified has having threatened him. Shelter management stated that all staff denied ever verbally threatening the complainant, making plans with clients to harass the complainant or waking the complainant up in the middle of the night.

Committee staff were unable to verify the complainant's allegations that shelter staff and clients have been harassing him and planning attacks against him. As a result, the investigation is inconclusive.

**Findings: Inconclusive**

**February Site Visit Infractions**

The Committee completed thirteen total unannounced site visits at nine different sites in February 2018. Four sites were visited twice in February. These four sites were Hamilton Emergency Shelter, Hamilton Family Shelter, Hospitality House and Lark Inn. The remaining four sites were visited once.

Out of those thirteen visits, there were eight where no Standard of Care infractions were noted by the Committee team. These four visits were conducted at A Woman's Place Drop In, Hamilton Family Shelter (x2), Hamilton Emergency Shelter (x2), Lark Inn, Sanctuary and Santa Ana. The infractions that were noted at the remaining five visits are listed below:

**Lark Inn**

Site visit date: 2/1/18

Infractions submitted to site: 2/27/18

Site responded: 3/12/18

**SOC Infractions:**

**Standard 22** - No bilingual English/Spanish speaking staff on duty – **Resolved**

**Standard 26** - No MUNI tokens available – **Resolved**

**Standard 27** - Signs announcing community meetings posted in English but not Spanish – **Resolved**

**MSC South**

Site visit date: 2/6/18

Infractions submitted to site: 3/8/18

Site responded: 3/16/18

**SOC Infractions:**

**Standard 12** - Not all clients given a pillow and pillowcase – **Resolved**

**Standard 25** - Not all staff wearing ID badges – **Resolved**

**Hospitality House (Visit #1)**

Site visit date: 2/1/18

Infractions submitted to site: 2/27/18

Site responded: 3/12/18

**SOC Infractions:**

**Standard 8:** ADA information not posted – **Resolved**

**Hospitality House (Visit #2)**

Site visit date: 2/13/18

Infractions submitted to site: 3/13/18

Site responded: Pending

**SOC Infractions:**

**Standard 8:** ADA information not posted in English and Spanish – **Pending**

**Standard 18:** No TTY machine or signage posted on where to access TTY – **Pending**

**Interfaith Winter Shelter – First Unitarian**

Site visit date: 1/30/18

Infractions submitted to site: 2/15/18

Site responded: Pending

**SOC infractions:**

- **Standard 8:** No signage posted regarding case management availability and accessibility – **Pending**
- **Standard 25:** Not all staff wearing ID badges – **Pending**

*FY2017-2018 Unannounced Site Visit Tally*

Site	Q1 July-Sept.	Q2 Oct. – Dec.	Q3 Jan. - March	Total (17-18 FY)
A Woman's Place	0	2	1	3
A Woman's Place Drop In Center	1	1	1	3
Bethel AME	1	1	0	2
Compass	1	1	0	2
First Friendship Family	0	2	1	3
Hamilton Emergency	1	0	3	4
Hamilton Family	1	0	3	4
Hospitality House	1	0	2	3
Interfaith Winter Shelter* seasonal shelter open during winter months	*Closed	0	2	2
Jazzie's Place	0	2	1	3
Lark Inn	1	1	2	4
Mission Neighborhood Resource Ctr.	1	1	1	3
MSC South Shelter	1	0	1	2
MSC South Drop In Center	1	0	1	2
Next Door	1	1	1	3
Providence	1	1	1	3
Sanctuary	0	1	2	3
Santa Ana	1	1	1	3
Santa Marta/Maria	0	2	1	3
St. Joseph's	1	1	0	2
United Council	1	1	1	3
Sites Visited	<b>15</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>60</b>
Assigned Sites	<b>20</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>Compliance</b>	<b>75.0% compliance</b>	<b>90.5% compliance</b>	<b>123.8% compliance (through Feb. 2018 only)</b>	<b>71.9% compliance for FY17-18 (through Feb. 2018 only)</b>

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	1
United Council	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Required</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Compliance for FY17-18</b>	<b>31.7%</b>

The Committee is required to make two announced site visits to each site each year in order 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](mailto:jeff.simbe@sfdph.org) if you are interested in applying.

**FY2017-2018 Meeting Calendar**

- April 18
- May 16
- June 20