



City and County of San Francisco

Shelter Monitoring Committee

MEMORANDUM

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

May Client Complaints

There were a total of eleven complaints submitted to the Shelter Monitoring Committee by eight unduplicated clients in May 2018. Sites have responded to all eleven complaints from this month. One complaint at Next Door received a response that did not satisfy the client; that investigation was completed in June 2018. There were four complaints that received responses that satisfied the client, those complaints are now closed. The remaining six complaints have received a response from the site but 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.

A Woman's Place Drop In

- **Client #1**
- **Complaint submitted: 5/8/18**
- **Response received: 5/22/18* extension requested**
- **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 staff were rude, unprofessional and that she was punched by another client.
- The response states that management investigated the complaint but were unable to verify that an assault took place. The response states that management interviewed other clients and staff that were on-duty at the time of the incident and that all parties confirmed that the complainant was in a verbal altercation with the other client but stated that the situation did not escalate to physical violence.
- **Due to the nature of the allegations, this complaint was forwarded to the DPH contract monitor.**

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

Compass

- **Client #1**

1380 Howard Street, First Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103
www.sfgov.org/sheltermonitoring

(415) 255-3642 (phone)
(415) 255-3629 (fax)
shelter.monitoring@sfgov.org

- **Complaint submitted: 5/22/18**
- **Response received: 5/24/18**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 2:** Provide shelter services in an environment that is safe...
- The complainant stated that she believed intruders were sneaking into her room because she couldn't lock her windows.
- The response states that shelter management reviewed security footage and that there was no activity occurring outside of the complainant's unit.

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: 5/24/18**
- **Response received: 6/13/18**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 1:** Treat clients equally, with respect and dignity...
 - **Standard 15:** Provide shelter clients with...property storage...
- The complainant alleged that he went back to MSC South to retrieve his property after his bed was dropped, but was told by staff that they couldn't locate his property. The client alleged that he returned to the shelter within 72 hours of his bed being dropped so his property should not have been purged.
- The response states that after the site received the complaint, a shelter supervisor searched the storage room and was able to locate and return the complainant's property to him.

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: 5/1/18**
- **Response received: 5/11/18**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 1:** Treat all clients equally, with respect and dignity...
 - **Standard 2:** Provide shelter services in an environment that is safe and free from physical violence
 - **Standard 15:** Provide shelter clients with...property storage...
- The complainant alleged that shelter staff are rude, that the tops of the dividers in the sleeping areas are dusty, that clients are spraying chemicals inside of the shelter and that several pieces of her property have been stolen.
- The response states shelter management asked staff to stop residents using air fresheners/pest sprays while inside the shelter and instructed ECS maintenance staff to clean the tops of dividers. The response also states that they could not verify the allegations that clients were stealing the complainant's property.

Not satisfied – The client was not satisfied with the response and requested an investigation. This investigation is currently pending.

- **Client #1, Complaint #2:**
- **Complaint submitted: 5/22/18**

- **Response received: 5/25/18**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 3:** Provide...liquid soap with a dispenser...
 - **Standard 8:** Provide shelter services in compliance with ADA...
- The complainant alleged that several fixtures in the ADA restroom were broken and needed to be repaired.
- The response states as of 5/24, shelter staff have repaired the fixtures that were listed in the complaint.

Closed – The complainant was satisfied with the response. As a result, this complaint has been closed.

- **Client #2, Complaint #1**
- **Complaint submitted: 5/1/18**
- **Response received: 5/11/18**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 2:** Provide shelter services in an environment that is safe...
- The complainant alleged that another client chased him out of the Quiet Room and wouldn't let him back into the room so he could retrieve his property. The complainant also alleged
- The response states that staff that were present during the incident stated that they saw the complainant and the other client involved in a verbal dispute, but they did not see the other client threaten or chase the complainant. The response also states that staff asked the complainant to stay out of the Quiet Room while they were de-escalating the situation.

Closed – The complainant was satisfied with the response. As a result, this complaint has been closed.

- **Client #2, Complaint #2**
- **Complaint submitted: 5/11/18**
- **Response received: 5/14/18**
- **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 also alleged that shelter staff assigned him to a bed that was next to other clients who have harassed him in the past.
- The response also states that management instructed staff to find the complainant a temporary bed until a more suitable assignment could be found.

Closed – The complainant was satisfied with the response. As a result, this complaint has been closed.

- **Client #2, Complaint #3**
- **Complaint submitted: 5/17/18**
- **Response received: 5/24/18**
- **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 other clients have been verbally harassing him.
- The response states that shelter management have attempted to meet with the complainant about these incidents but that the complainant has been unwilling to meet with them. The response states that management is still opening to having the complainant meet with the Restorative Justice Coordinator in order to resolve these issues.

Closed – The complainant was satisfied with the response. As a result, this complaint has been closed.

- **Client #3**
- **Complaint submitted: 5/22/18**
- **Response received: 6/11/18**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 1:** Treat all clients equally, with respect and dignity...
- The complainant alleged that a shelter employee took away her late pass and accused the complainant of drinking in public instead of going to work.
- The response states that shelter staff have seen the complainant drinking near the shelter, which cast doubts on her work schedule. The response also states that the complainant has not provided a hard copy of her work schedule which would provide proof of employment, but that shelter management would be speaking to staff about communicating with clients in a discreet and professional manner.

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

- **Client #4**
- **Complaint submitted: 5/22/18**
- **Response received: 5/31/18**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 15:** Provide...secure property storage...
- The complainant stated that he ordered a cell phone online that was delivered to Next Door. The complainant alleged that tracking information showed that the cell phone was delivered to the site, but when he asked staff they told him that they hadn't received any of his packages.
- The response states that when the package was originally delivered, the last name of the recipient was covered up by a sticker so staff did not know who to give the package to. The response also states that when staff removed the sticker, they saw that the package belonged to the complainant and delivered it to him.

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

- **Client #5**
- **Complaint submitted: 5/29/18**
- **Response received: 6/6/18**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 2:** Provide shelter services in an environment that is safe...
- The complainant alleged that she was attacked by another client and that shelter staff stood by and did nothing to stop it. The complainant also alleged that she and the other client were both DOS'd even though it was the other client who attacked her first.
- The response denied the allegation that they were present when the fight between clients started and that they could not determine who initiated the altercation. As a result, shelter staff adhered to shelter policy which requires that both parties be DOS'd for fighting.
- **Due to the nature of the allegations, this complaint was forwarded to HSH.**

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

May 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	7
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...	3

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	Total (17-18 FY)
A Woman's Place	11 mats	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	4
Bethel AME	30 mats	2	6	2	4	1	1	2	1	2	0	0	21
Compass	22 families	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
First Friendship	25 families	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	5
Hamilton Emergency	46 beds, 8 cribs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Hamilton Family	27 families	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
Hospitality House	30 beds/mats	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	1
Jazzie's Place	24 beds	0	0	1	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
Mission Neighborhood Resource Ctr.	70 chairs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
MSC South Shelter	340 beds	3	3	1	4	1	1	4	4	2	0	1	24
MSC South Drop In Center	75 chairs	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Next Door	334 beds	4	5	6	4	2	7	2	12	4	8	8	62
Providence	110 mats	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Sanctuary	200 beds	2	3	1	4	3	5	4	0	2	4	0	28
Santa Ana	28 beds	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Santa Marta/Maria	56 beds	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
United Council	48 chairs	0	0	0	1	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	163

May 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

Complaint filed: 4/9/18

Response received: 4/18/18

Investigation requested: 5/8/18

Investigation completed: 5/18/18

Alleged SOC violation:

- **Standard 1)** Treat all clients equally...including in the application of shelter policies...
- **Standard 16)** Provide shelter clients with access to electricity for charging cell phones and other durable medical equipment

The complainants made the following allegations:

- **Standard 16:** The complainant alleged that there is a space next to the charging station at Mission Neighborhood Resource Center that is specifically reserved for clients with mobility issues. The complainant alleged that on the day of the incident, shelter staff wouldn't make another client (Client A) vacate the space next to the charging station so he could use it even though the complainant utilizes a walker and Client A did not appear to have any mobility issues.
- **Standard 1:** The complainant alleged that when he asked staff to clarify why they refused to make Client A get up, he was denied services from the site. The complainant also alleged that he was initially told he was just being asked to leave for the weekend, but when he returned to the site the following Monday he was given a 90-day denial of service (DOS) for threats and acts of violence. The complainant stated that he did not threaten anyone or commit any acts of violence during the incident.

Investigation:

Committee staff inspected the shelter facility and interviewed shelter staff about the about the allegations and determined the following:

- Committee staff visited the site and inspected the area next to the charging station. Signage posted in the area stated that the space directly adjacent to the charging station was reserved for wheelchair charging. Committee staff noted that there were several chairs and table near the charging station that was reserved for ADA seating.
- Committee staff also interviewed two shelter staff that were present during the incident. Both shelter staff reported that site policy gives clients who need to charge electric wheelchairs have priority access for the space and that if there are no wheelchairs being charged, it is available to all other clients. Shelter staff also stated that clients with mobility issues can sit at the table reserved for ADA clients and can ask shelter staff to charge their devices for them at the nearby charging station.
- Shelter staff stated that on the day of the incident, the complainant entered the site and demanded that Client A vacate the space near the charging station. Shelter staff stated that they tried to explain to the complainant that he could not demand that other clients vacate the space for him, but allege that the complainant continued to argue with them while causing a disturbance inside the facility. Shelter staff stated as a result, the complainant was given a time-out for the weekend.
- Shelter staff reported that as he was leaving the facility, the complainant was verbally abusive to staff and other clients and used his walker to ram the windows and the door at the front of the building.

After interviewing the complainant and shelter staff that were involved in the incident, Committee staff were unable to confirm or deny the complainant's allegations that staff gave him an unjustified DOS for threats and acts of violence. However, Committee staff did confirm the presence of the charging stations and other seats that the complainant could have utilized while charging his devices. Both parties were also in agreement that electrical outlets were available for clients to use. As a result, Mission Neighborhood Resource Center is in compliance with Standard 16.

Findings:

Standard 1 – Inconclusive

Standard 16 – In compliance

MSC South

Complaint filed: 3/7/18

Response received: 3/26/18

Investigation requested: 4/10/18

Investigation completed: 5/3/18

Alleged SOC violation:

- **Standard 15)** Provide shelter clients with...secure property storage inside each shelter...

The complainants made the following allegations:

- **Standard 15:** The complainant stated that when shelter staff changed her bed assignment, the drawer under her new bed was allegedly full of another client's belongings. The complainant stated that the drawer under her new bed was full for several days so she kept her belongings in a suitcase next to her bed. The complainant alleged that one day when she came back to the shelter, her luggage was missing and staff were unable to locate it in the property storage room. The complainant also alleged that she spoke to a shelter employee, who told her that property storage records showed that her belongings had been stored on 2/26 and disposed of on 2/27.

Investigation:

Committee staff inspected MSC South's property storage records and interviewed shelter staff about the allegations and determined the following:

- When asked about the allegations that the drawer under the complainant's newly assigned bed was full, shelter management stated that that they couldn't confirm or deny the allegation because staff had not received any reports that the complainant's drawer was full.
- Committee staff also interviewed the shelter staff that were listed in the complaint. Shelter staff stated that they had no records of the complainant's luggage being collected and stored by staff. Shelter staff also stated that that they searched the property storage room but could not find her luggage.
- Committee staff also inspected MSC South's property storage records and could not verify that the complainant's luggage was stored on 2/26 and disposed of on 2/27. Records showed that 3 unmarked bags were stored on 2/22 and disposed of on 2/27. However, none of the bags listed in the log match the description of the complainant's missing luggage.

After speaking to shelter staff and reviewing property storage records, Committee staff were unable to conclusively determine what had happened to the complainant's luggage. Committee staff were unable to find any storage records that indicated that the complainant's luggage been collected by staff on the day that it went missing (2/22) or that her luggage had been disposed of on 2/27.. As a result of these findings, this investigation is inconclusive.

Findings:

Standard 15 – Inconclusive

Sanctuary

Complaint filed: 4/27/18

Response received: 5/11/18

Investigation requested: 5/11/18

Investigation completed: 5/23/18

The complainants made the following allegations:

- **Standard 3:** The complainant alleged that there are several pipes in the women's restroom at Sanctuary that have sprung leaks. The complainant stated that shelter staff have put a bucket under the largest leak, but alleges that clients will frequently move the bucket so the leak makes a mess on the floor or will spit or vomit in the bucket so it creates a health hazard.

Investigation:

- Committee staff inspected the women's restrooms at the Sanctuary shelter but were unable to verify the complainant's allegations that pipes were leaking onto the restroom floor. At the time of the inspection, there were no pipes leaking, buckets on the floor catching leaks or pools of water on the bathroom floor.

Although pipes were not leaking at the time of the investigation, Committee staff was unable to determine if there were any leaks present when the client initially submitted the complaint. As a result, this investigation is inconclusive.

Findings:

Standard 3 –Inconclusive

May Site Visit Infractions

The Committee completed conducted three site visits in May 2018. There were two visits where no infractions were noted, these visits were at A Woman's Place Drop In and Sanctuary. The infractions from the visit to First Friendship are listed below:

First Friendship

Site visit date: 5/10/18

Infractions submitted to site: 5/14/18

Site responded: Pending

SOC Infractions:

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

Standard 21: No Language Link or professional translation service 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	Total (17-18 FY)
A Woman's Place	0				1	1	1					3
A Woman's Place Drop In Center	0		1		1			1			1	4
Bethel AME	0		1	1					1	1		4
Compass	0		1	1						1		3
First Friendship	0			1	1		1				1	4
Hamilton Emergency	0	1					1	2				4
Hamilton Family	0	1					1	2				4
Hospitality House	0		1					2				3
Interfaith Winter Shelter	0						1	1				2
Jazzie's Place	0			2			1			1		4
Lark Inn	0		1		1			2				4
Mission Neighborhood Resource Ctr.	0		1				1			1		3
MSC South Shelter	0		1					1	1			3
MSC South Drop In Center	0	1			1		1		1			4
Next Door	0	1		1			1			1		4
Providence	0		1		1		1					3
Sanctuary	0				1		1	1			1	4
Santa Ana	0	1			1			2				4
Santa Marta/Maria	0						1				1	4
St. Joseph's	0		1	1						1		3
United Council	0	1			1		1					3
Total	0	6	9	9	9	1	13	14	3	7	3	74

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	Total
A Woman's Place			1								1	2
A Woman's Place Drop In Center				1								1
Bethel AME					1							1
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
Mission Neighborhood Resource Ctr.											1	1
MSC South Shelter				1							1	2
MSC South Drop In Center				1								1
Next Door					1							1
Providence												0
Sanctuary												0
Santa Ana									1			1
Santa Marta/Maria					1						1	2
St. Joseph's					1				1			2
United Council												0
Total	0	1	2	5	5	1	0	1	7	0	6	28

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

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