



City and County of San Francisco

Shelter Monitoring Committee

MEMORANDUM

TO: Shelter Monitoring Committee
FROM: Committee Staff
DATE: July 13, 2018
RE: **June SOC Staff Report**

June Client Complaints

There were a total of ten complaints submitted to the Shelter Monitoring Committee by eight unduplicated clients in June 2018. There is one complaint that is still open pending a response from the site. Sites have responded to the other nine 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.*

Mission Neighborhood Resource Center

- **Client #1**
- **Complaint submitted: 6/14/18**
- **Response received: 6/15/18**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 1:** Treat clients equally, with respect and dignity...;
 - **Standard 15:** Provide...storage inside each shelter...
- The complainant alleged that shelter staff are not giving out on-site lockers based on a lottery and stated his belief that staff are actually giving out lockers to clients that they personally know and like.
- The response states that there are a total of 78 lockers available at the site and that clients may keep lockers for up to 12 months, so there are very few lockers that are available each month. The response also states that clients sign up for the lottery, they are assigned a number and that staff randomly choose a number without knowing which clients have been assigned to those numbers.

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

Next Door

- **Client #1, Complaint #1:**
- **Complaint submitted: 6/18/18**
- **Response received: 6/25/18**

- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 1:** Treat all clients equally, with respect and dignity...
- The complainant stated that another client tried to hug her without her consent. The complainant alleged that when she tried to report the incident to shelter staff, the front desk employee turned his back to her and refused to notify a supervisor about what had happened.
- The response states that shelter management spoke to the other client, who agreed to not hug the complainant in the future without her consent. The response also states that the front desk employee gave the complainant a client complaint form, but the complainant was demanding to speak to a supervisor immediately even though none were available. The response also states that the front desk employee turned around to help other clients who were waiting in line and that the supervisor came out shortly after to meet with the complainant.

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

- **Client #1, Complaint #2:**
- **Complaint submitted: 6/21/18**
- **Response received: 6/25/18**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 1:** Treat all clients equally, with respect and dignity...
- The complainant alleged that security officers would not let her enter the shelter through the ADA ramp and directed her to enter through the regular entrance. The complainant also alleges that shelter staff would not allow her to go upstairs to her bed and that she was given a written warning the next day for missing bed check.
- The response states that on the day of the incident, the complainant was allowed to use the ADA ramp to enter the shelter but was prevented from entering the shelter because she would not allow security officers to check her bags. The response also states that the complainant was arguing with shelter staff and was disturbing clients staying on the 1st floor. The response also states that although the complainant had a late pass until 8:00 PM, on the day of the incident the complainant arrived at Next Door at 9:30 PM so she had already violated her late pass curfew and was already going to be written up.

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

- **Client #1, Complaint #3:**
- **Complaint submitted: 6/25/18**
- **Response received: 7/11/18**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 2:** Provide shelter services in an environment that is safe...
- The complainant alleged that another client grabbed her and prevented her from getting to her bed on three separate occasions. The complainant alleged that when she reported the issue to staff, they did not do anything to address the other client's behavior.
- The response states that shelter staff responded to an argument taking place between the complainant and another client and asked both parties to stand back from each other and de-escalated the situation. The response also states that management spoke to the complainant and the other client separately and explained to the client that she could not prevent other clients from accessing the restroom or the quiet room.

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

- **Client #2**
- **Complaint submitted: 6/26/18**
- **Response received: 7/6/18**
- **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 a shelter employee was rudely waking up clients by kicking their beds and cursing at them. The complainant states that he confronted the employee about his behavior and ended up getting into a fight with him inside the shelter.
- The response acknowledges that a fight did occur between the complainant and a shelter employee and that a hearing is being scheduled so they can complete the grievance process. The response also states that reports from the on-duty supervisor indicated that the complainant was pursuing the employee during the altercation and that that clients should bring concerns to shelter management instead of confronting staff on their own.
- **HSH was notified of this complaint because it contains allegations of acts of violence**

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

- **Client #3**
- **Complaint submitted: 6/28/18**
- **Response received: 7/6/18**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 1:** Treat all clients equally, with respect and dignity...
 - **Standard 3:** Provide...liquid soap...in the restrooms...
- The complainant alleged that shelter staff threatened to write her up for getting soap from the vanity room even though there was no soap available in the women's restroom.
- The response states that management interviewed the staff that were involved in the incident and acknowledged that it was possible that not all staff were consistent in allowing the use of the vanity room after a certain time because they believed light and noise was keep other clients awake. The response also states that management replaced a broken soap dispenser in the restroom and advised staff to be more thorough in evaluating and replacing damaged soap dispensers 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: 6/28/18**
- **Response received: 7/7/18**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 1:** Treat all clients equally, with respect and dignity...
- The complainant stated that when she came back to the shelter after she got off work at 2 AM, she found another client sleeping in her bed. The complainant alleges that when she brought this issue to the attention of staff, she was told to just find another empty bed and to sleep in it.
- The response states that shelter management interviewed the staff that were involved in the incident and that staff reported that on occasion, supervisors will attempt to accommodate someone who has a reservation but missed curfew, and therefore may not have their bed for the night. The response also states that this action will be reviewed and discussed with shift supervisors in order to avoid such conflicts in the future and that under no circumstances should clients find themselves vacant beds.

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

Sanctuary

- **Client #1**
- **Complaint submitted: 6/26/18**
- **Response received: Pending – Extension requested until 7/21/18**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 2:** Provide shelter services in an environment that is safe...
- The complainant alleged that a shelter employee followed her outside of the shelter and pushed the complainant with his forearm. The complainant alleged that she was DOS'd for assaulting the employee when in reality it was the shelter employee that assaulted her.

Open – Site has not responded to this complaint

- **Client #2**
- **Complaint submitted: 7/5/18**
- **Response received: 7/10/18**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 2:** Provide shelter services in an environment that is safe...
- The complainant alleged that he was standing right outside of the shelter when a former client came by and verbally threatened him. The complainant alleged that shelter staff would not take action against the other client because she was not currently staying at the shelter even though she regularly returns to the shelter to pick up her mail.
- The response states that management has investigated the allegations and instructed staff to inform the former client that she would have to get an immediate change of address for her mail delivery, that she will need to call before coming to the facility and that she will be expected to conduct herself in accordance with all shelter rules while she is inside of the Sanctuary shelter.

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

Santa Ana

- **Client #1**
- **Complaint submitted: 6/28/18**
- **Response received: 7/11/18**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 1:** Treat all clients equally, with respect and dignity...
- The complainant alleged that shelter staff were rude to him and gave him an unjustified denial of service for causing a disruption in the shelter.
- The response denies the allegations that staff were rude to the complainant and states that the complainant was denied services for trying to record video inside the shelter and for repeatedly causing a disturbances after lights out.

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

June 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...	7
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 15: Provide shelter clients with pest-free, secure property storage...	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	5/18	6/18	Total (17-18 FY)
A Woman's Place	11 mats	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
A Woman's Place Drop In Center	63 chairs	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	4
Bethel AME	30 mats	2	6	2	4	1	1	2	1	2	0	0	0	21
Compass	22 families	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
First Friendship	25 families	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	5
Hamilton Emergency	46 beds, 8 cribs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Hamilton Family	27 families	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
Hospitality House	30 beds/mats	0	0	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	0	0	1
Jazzie's Place	24 beds	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Lark Inn	40 beds	0	0	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	0	1	4
MSC South Shelter	340 beds	3	3	1	4	1	1	4	4	2	0	1	0	24
MSC South Drop In Center	75 chairs	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Next Door	334 beds	4	5	6	4	2	7	2	12	4	8	8	6	68
Providence	110 mats	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Sanctuary	200 beds	2	3	1	4	3	5	4	0	2	4	0	2	30
Santa Ana	28 beds	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	3
Santa Marta/Maria	56 beds	0	0	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	0	0
United Council	48 chairs	0	0	0	1	0	0	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	11	10	173

June 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 three investigations in the month of May:

Mission Neighborhood Resource Center (MNRC)

Complaint filed: 4/19/18

Response received: 5/10/18

Investigation requested: 5/18/18

Investigation completed: 6/19/18

Alleged SOC violation:

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

The complainants made the following allegations:

Standard 1:

- Shelter staff spoke her using disrespectful language and falsely accused her of verbally abusing staff in order to deny her services (DOS)
- The complainant set up an appointment to meet with the site manager to discuss her DOS, but when she arrived at the facility shelter staff refused to let her in and threatened to call the police.
- When the complainant met with the site manager, her DOS was upheld without any discussion. The complainant also alleged that the site manager kept referring to her using condescending terms like "sweetie" and "señora" during their meeting.

Investigation:

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

- Shelter staff denied the allegations that she spoke to the complainant using disrespectful language. Shelter staff stated that the complainant became verbally abusive when she was told that MNRC staff were unable to remove a DOS from another shelter from her profile. However, they confirmed that they asked the complainant to leave the site without providing her with her DOS paperwork because the priority at the time was to de-escalate the situation and to get the complainant out of the facility so she would stop disturbing staff and other clients.
- The shelter employee stated that on the day of the complainant's appointment, he tried to give the complainant her DOS paperwork when she entered the facility. The employee stated that the complainant started verbally abusing him, so as soon as she took the paperwork he left the floor. The employee denied the allegation that he threatened to call the police on the complainant.
- The site manager stated that the purpose of her meeting with the complainant was to discuss the services the complainant had been receiving at MNRC, not her DOS. The site manager stated that she explained the process for requesting a hearing to appeal her DOS. The site manager also stated that she did not intend to be condescending towards the complainant and that she immediately apologized

Committee staff were unable to verify the complainant's allegations that MNRC staff were disrespectful, unprofessional and gave her an unwarranted DOS. As a result, this investigation is inconclusive.

Findings: Inconclusive

Next Door

Investigation #1

Complaint filed: 5/1/18

Response received: 5/10

Investigation requested: 5/22/18

Investigation completed: 6/18/18

Alleged SOC violation:

- **Standard 3)** ...clean shelters on a daily basis...

The complainants made the following allegations:

- **Standard 3:** The tops of the dividers in the female dorms on the 4th floor are covered in lint, dust and other debris

Investigation:

- Next Door's response to the complaint stated that they would be cleaning all divider tops, but because the employee's union prohibits janitorial staff from cleaning the dividers the task must be completed by either ECS maintenance staff or the assigned City Engineer.
- Committee staff made two unannounced visits to Next Door on 5/23/18 and 6/18/18. By 6/18/18, all divider tops were free from lint, dust and debris.
- Shelter management also agreed that moving forward, divider tops would be inspected monthly and cleaned quarterly. If monthly inspections indicated that the dividers were dirty, then the site would clean the dividers.

Findings:

Standard 3 – In Compliance

Recommendations:

- Committee site visit teams should note the cleanliness of divider tops on future unannounced site visits to Next Door. Committee staff have updated Next Door's site visit forms to remind members to check the cleanliness divider tops.

Investigation #2

Complaint filed: 2/12/18

Response received: 3/20/18

Investigation requested: 4/10/18

Investigation completed: 6/26/18

The complainants made the following allegations:

- **Standard 2:** Another client (Client A) verbally harassed and lunged at the complainant in front of a shelter employee, who did not address Client A's violent behavior. The complainant also alleged that she later heard Client A making threatening comments to herself and that no action was taken when she reported the comments to staff.
- **Standard 1:** When the complainant reported the Client A's violent behavior to a shelter supervisor, the supervisor allegedly blamed the complainant for the incident.

Investigation:

Committee staff reviewed written statements from shelter staff named in the complaint and determined the following:

- Statements from service coordinators that were on duty during the shift claimed that neither employee was present when the incident began. Both service coordinators stated that when they arrived on the scene, they observed the complainant and the client arguing with each other but did not see Client A lunge at the complainant.

- A statement provided by the on-duty service coordinator confirmed that the complainant made a report that Client A was making threatening comments to herself. The service coordinator reported that the complainant wanted her to take action against Client A for making a threat, which the service coordinator was unable to do because she did not personally witness Client A making the threats.
- The statement from the on-duty supervisor denied the allegation that he blamed the complainant for the incident and stated that he didn't know what happened because neither he nor his staff were present when the incident began. The supervisor also stated that the staff reports he received from staff on the day of the incident stated that staff intervened when they saw the complainant and Client A arguing with each other.

Committee staff were unable to verify the complainant's allegations shelter staff failed to respond appropriately when Client A verbally harassed and lunged at the complainant and blamed the complainant for the incident.

Findings:

Standard 2 –Inconclusive

Recommendation:

- Although shelter staff may not be able to write-up clients based on allegations of verbal threats from other clients, please have shelter staff respond by checking in on the situation to see if any clients require staff support.

June Site Visit Infractions

The Committee completed conducted seven site visits in June 2018. There were two visits where no infractions were noted, these visits were at Compass Family Shelter and MSC South Drop In. The infractions from the visits to the other five sites are listed below:

A Woman's Place Shelter

Site visit date: 6/6/18

Infractions submitted to site: 6/8/18

Site responded: 6/18/18

SOC Infractions:

Standard 8: No case management schedule posted – **Resolved**

MSC South

Site visit date: 6/21/18

Infractions submitted to site: 6/22/18

Site responded: 6/29/18

SOC Infractions:

Standard 4: No incontinence supplies – **Resolved**

Standard 30: No protective gowns available – **Resolved**

Providence

Site visit date: 6/11/18

Infractions submitted to site: 6/22/18

Site responded: Pending

SOC Infractions:

Standard 13: No sheets provided (site provides extra blankets because they do not get sheets from HSH) –
Pending

Standard 21: No Language Link or professional translation services – **Pending**

United Council

Site visit date: 6/11/18

Infractions submitted to site: 6/22/18

Site responded: Pending

SOC Infractions:

Standard 3: No paper towels inside restrooms – **Pending**

Standard 21: No Language Link or professional translation services – **Pending**

Hospitality House

Site visit date: 6/25/18

Infractions submitted to site: **Pending**

Site responded: **Pending**

SOC Infractions:

Standard 26: No MUNI tokens available – **Pending**

FY2017-2018 Unannounced Site Visit Tally

Site	7/17	8/17	9/17	10/17	11/17	12/17	1/18	2/18	3/18	4/18	5/18	6/18	Total (17-18 FY)
A Woman's Place					1	1	1					1	4
A Woman's Place Drop In Center			1		1			1			1		4
Bethel AME			1	1					1	1			4
Compass			1	1						1		1	4
First Friendship				1	1		1				1		4
Hamilton Emergency		1					1	2					4
Hamilton Family		1					1	2					4
Hospitality House			1					2				1	4
Interfaith Winter Shelter							1	1					2
Jazzie's Place				2			1			1			4
Lark Inn			1		1			2					4
Mission Neighborhood Resource Ctr.			1				1			1		1	4
MSC South Shelter			1					1	1			1	4
MSC South Drop In Center		1			1		1		1				4
Next Door		1		1			1			1			4
Providence			1		1		1					1	4
Sanctuary					1		1	1			1		4
Santa Ana		1			1			2					4
Santa Marta/Maria				2			1			1			4
St. Joseph's			1	1						1		1	4
United Council		1			1		1					1	4
Total	0	6	9	9	9	1	13	14	3	7	3	8	82

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	7/17	8/17	9/17	10/17	11/17	12/17	1/18	2/18	3/18	4/18	5/18	6/18	Total
A Woman's Place			1								1		2
A Woman's Place Drop In Center				1							1		2
Bethel AME					1							1	2
Compass			1						1				2
First Friendship						1					1		2
Hamilton Emergency				1					1				2
Hamilton Family				1					1				2
Hospitality House		1							1				2
Interfaith Winter Shelter								1					1
Jazzie's Place					1						1		2
Lark Inn									1			1	2
Mission Neighborhood Resource Ctr.											1	1	2
MSC South Shelter				1							1		2
MSC South Drop In Center				1								1	2
Next Door					1							1	2
Providence												2	2
Sanctuary												2	2
Santa Ana									1			1	2
Santa Marta/Maria					1						1		2
St. Joseph's					1				1				2
United Council												2	2
Total	0	1	2	5	5	1	0	1	7	0	6	12	41

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 Howard Chen at 415-255-3653 or email howard.c.chen@sfdph.org if you are interested in applying.

Staff Update

Howard will be out of the office from July 27, 2018 – August 1, 2018.

FY2018-2019 Meeting Calendar

- July 18
- August 15
- September 19
- October 17
- November 21
- December 19
- January 16
- February 20
- March 20
- April 17
- May 15
- June 19