



City and County of San Francisco

# Shelter Monitoring Committee

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Shelter Monitoring Committee  
**FROM:** Committee Staff  
**DATE:** June 14, 2019  
**RE:** **May 2019 SOC Staff Report**

---

### May Client Complaints

There were a total of six complaints submitted to the Shelter Monitoring Committee by four unduplicated clients in May 2019. There was one complaint that received a response that did not satisfy the client, the investigation for that complaint is currently pending. Sites have responded to the remaining five complaints but they are 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 will investigate the allegations listed in the complaint.

### Harbor House

- **Client #1:**
- **Complaint submitted: 5/29/19**
- **Response received: 6/4/19**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
  - **Standard 1:** Treat all clients equally, with respect and dignity...
  - **Standard 17:** Note in writing and post in a common areas in the shelter when a maintenance problem will be repaired
- The complainant alleged that the shelter was not maintaining shelter facilities, that loud fire alarms are disturbing the young children living in the shelter and that shelter staff are conducting invasive room inspections when looking for contraband.
- The response states that the site addressed all noted facility issues, that families with documented medical causes are notified of fire drills in advance and states that staff only conduct visual inspections of rooms and do not open drawers, cabinets or bags.

*Not Satisfied – The complainant indicated that they weren't satisfied with the response to the complaint and requested an investigation. That investigation is currently pending.*

### Mission Neighborhood Resource Center

- **Client #1:**
- **Complaint submitted: 5/23/19**
- **Response received: 5/28/19**

- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
  - **Standard 1:** Treat all clients equally, with respect and dignity...;
- The complainant states that Mission Neighborhood Resource Center has weekly raffles for donated items. The complainant states that shelter staff are picking out the raffle winners ahead of time instead of running a legitimate raffle. The complainant also states that shelter staff are taking home donated items intended for clients.
- The response states denied the allegation that staff are picking out the raffle winners ahead of time and stated that all tickets are kept in a small box before being pulled out in front of staff and clients. The response also states that the staff listed in the complaint are actually consumers who are volunteering at the shelter, and as a result are allowed to take some donated items home.

*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: 5/24/19**
- **Response received: 6/12/19**
- **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 she is being harassed and threatened by other clients staying at the shelter. The complainant states that shelter staff are encouraging the other clients to harass her.
- The response denies the allegation that staff are encouraging clients to harass and threaten the complainant. The response states that the complainant has repeatedly broken shelter rules and has harassed shelter staff when they try to enforce shelter rules. The response also states that the site has accommodated the complainant by relocating her bed multiple times, giving her access to quiet spaces and more.
- **This complaint was forwarded to the HSH contract monitor because it contains allegations of threats of violence.**

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

### Sanctuary

- **Client #1, Complaint #1:**
- **Complaint submitted: 5/16/19**
- **Response received: 5/23/19**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
  - **Standard 1:** Treat all clients equally, with respect and dignity...;
- The complainant alleged that staff have not addressed another client who has been using her phone to shine a light in the complainant's eyes after lights out. The complainant also stated that a social worker failed to follow-up with her after an appointment.
- The response states that shelter staff have been monitoring the situation and that the other client has not been shining a flashlight in the complainant's eyes. The response also states that the complainant asked the social worker to request that the HOT team make the complainant a reservation. The response states that the social worker told her the complainant that the HOT team doesn't make reservations but offered to call and double check. The response states that the social worker did make the call and reported her findings to the complainant the next day.

*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: 5/23/19**
- **Response received: 5/30/19**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
  - **Standard 1:** Treat all clients equally, with respect and dignity...;
- The complainant reported that kitchen staff are not providing her with second servings like they do with other clients, that staff are wearing their ID badges turned around and that staff are allowing clients to decide which clients gets served in which order.
- The response states that seconds are provided to clients on a “first come first served” basis and that there is not always enough to assure every client that they will get seconds. The response denies the allegations that staff have been wearing their ID badges turned around and that staff are allowing clients to decide the order in which other clients are served.

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

- **Client #2:**
- **Complaint submitted: 5/21/19**
- **Response received: 5/29/19**
- **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 stated that another client has a dog that has been growling and threatening her for several months. The complainant states that she has reported the dog to staff but they haven’t addressed the issue with the other client.
- The response states that shelter management addressed the issue when the complainant reported the dog to them by speaking to the other client and asking them to ensure that the dog doesn’t make excessive or disruptive noise. The response also states that staff have been monitoring the situation and have repeatedly spoken to the other client about monitoring her dog’s behavior. The response states that if the dog is left unattended or creating a disruption inside the shelter that staff will call animal control.

*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...	6
Standard 2: Provide shelter services in an environment that is safe and free from physical violence	2
Standard 17: Note in writing and post in a common area in the shelter when a maintenance problem will be repaired and note the status of the repairs	1

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

## May Investigations

The Committee completed three investigations in May for a clients who were not satisfied with the site's response to their complaint. The following section provides an overview of the investigations, including any findings and recommendations:

### Interfaith Winter Shelter – Canon Kip

**Complaint filed: March 1, 2019**

**Response received: March 14, 2019**

**Investigation requested: March 21, 2019**

**Investigation completed: May 17, 2019**

**Alleged SOC violations:**

- **Standard 1:** Treat clients equally, with respect and dignity...;

**Allegations:**

- **Standard 1:** Shelter staff did not follow shelter reservation procedures, which states that reservations will be given out weekly on Sundays. The complainant stated that he and several clients lined up on Sunday 2/24 to get a reservation for the week, only to find out that other clients had already been given reservations on Friday 2/22.
- **Standard 1:** Complainant stated that when he tried to protest the fact that Interfaith shelter staff weren't following the appropriate procedures for giving out reservations, a shelter supervisor threatened to kick him out of the shelter if he continued to press the issue.

**Investigation:** Committee staff submitted questions for Interfaith Winter Shelter staff and determined the following:

**Findings:**

- **Standard 1:** Shelter management denied the allegation that they had given out reservations that week on Friday 2/22, and stated that a supervisor had given out the reservations on Sunday 2/24 as required by City and shelter policy. Shelter management informed the Committee that they had sign-in sheet for the week of 2/24 which as the complainant's signature on it. Although the sign-in sheet indicates that the complainant checked in for one night, it does not confirm when the reservations were given out.
  - **Inconclusive, no corrective action recommended**
- **Standard 1:** Shelter management informed Committee staff that the shelter supervisor named in the complaint is no longer employed by the shelter. As a result, the employee could not be interviewed or answer written questions for the investigation.
  - **Inconclusive, no corrective action recommended**

### Next Door

**Investigation #1**

**Complaint filed:** January 31, 2019

**Response received:** February 7, 2019

**Investigation requested:** February 21, 2019

**Investigation completed:** May 22, 2019

**Alleged SOC violations:**

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

### Allegations:

- **Standard 1:** Shelter staff are discriminating against the complainant by allowing African American clients to use the Vanity Room after “Lights Out”, but not the complainant.
- **Standard 1:** Shelter staff denied services (DOS) to the complainant by falsely accusing her of causing a disturbance inside the shelter.
- **Standard 1:** Stated that there were two staff who worked on her DOS paperwork. The complainant alleged that it is a violation for one employee to start a DOS and for another employee to finish it.
- **Standard 1:** Shelter staff purposely falsified DOS records to show that the complainant was denied services at 6:00 AM, when staff actually made her leave at 1:00 AM. The complainant states that staff were trying to hide the fact that they kicked her out in the middle of the night.

**Investigation:** Committee staff sent Next Door management a set of written questions for staff and determined the following:

### Findings:

- **Standard 1:** Shelter staff denied the allegation that they were discriminating against the complainant when they asked her to leave the Vanity Room. Shelter staff stated that there were several clients using the Vanity Room at the same time as the complainant and that she asked everyone to leave the room once it became “Lights Out”. Shelter staff stated that all of the guests left the Vanity Room except for the complainant.
  - **Inconclusive, no corrective action recommended**
- **Standard 1:** Shelter management stated that when asked to leave the Vanity Room, the complainant would not cooperate, became aggressive and engaged in a loud verbal rant using expletives and racial slurs. Shelter management stated that the complainant was denied services as a result of her ongoing disruptive behavior.
  - **Inconclusive, no corrective action recommended**
- **Standard 1:** Shelter management stated that according to their records, the on-duty supervisor put the DOS into CHANGES and dropped the complainant’s bed. However, Committee staff found that there is no shelter rule or Standard of Care that prohibits more than one shelter employee from working on a DOS.
  - **Inconclusive, no corrective action recommended**
- **Standard 1:** Witness accounts from the complainant and shelter staff both agreed that the police were called and came out to the shelter on the night of the incident. The complainant provided a copy of the police report from that evening, which stated that they arrived at the shelter at 12:39 AM. The complainant also provided Committee staff with a copy of her DOS paperwork, which stated that she was denied services at 6:00 AM. When asked about the discrepancy between the time listed on the police report and the time listed on the DOS paperwork, shelter management stated that the DOS form appeared to have been pre-populated and that the on-duty supervisor should have been more diligent about filling out the DOS paperwork.
  - **Out of Compliance, Standard 1**
  - **Corrective Action:** Please have the supervisor named in the complaint review procedures for filling out denial of service paperwork.

### Investigation #2

**Complaint filed:** February 25, 2019

**Response received:** March 5, 2019

**Investigation requested:** March 8, 2019

**Investigation completed:** May 30, 2019

**Alleged SOC violations:**

- **Standard 1:** Treat clients equally, with respect and dignity, including in the application of shelter policies and grievance process
- **Standard 2:** Provide shelter services in an environment that is safe and free from physical violence;

**Allegations:**

- **Standard 2:** The complainant alleged that there have been ongoing issues between herself and Client A. The complainant stated that when she saw the Client A leaving the shelter, she ran outside to take a picture of the other client. The complainant stated that when the Client A saw the complainant recording her, the Client A knocked the phone out of the complainant's hands and tried to kick and punch her. The complainant stated that there was a security officer and shelter employee present and that they both told the complainant to stop recording but didn't attempt to stop Client A from attacking her.
- **Standard 1:** The complainant states that Client A was not denied services and did not face any disciplinary action for attacking her within 200 feet of a shelter entrance, which is a violation of shelter rules.

**Investigation:** Committee staff sent spoke to Next Door's shelter management and reviewed statements from staff that were present during the incident and the complainant and determined the following:

**Findings:**

- **Standard 2:** The shelter staff reported that on the day of the incident, Client A knocked the complainant's phone out of her hand after Client A saw the complainant recording her. Shelter staff reported that Client A then tried to walk away, while the complainant continued to follow Client A while escalating the situation. Shelter staff reported that they did not see Client A attempt to punch or kick the complainant during the incident.
  - **Inconclusive, no corrective action recommended**
- **Standard 1:** Committee staff were unable to prove that the complainant was attacked by Client A. However, witness accounts from staff and the complainant both agree that Client A knocked the complainant's phone. Though there may have been extenuating circumstances, this incident warranted an additional response from shelter staff because it was a violation of shelter rule A3, which prohibits "*Verbal threats of violence, threatening body language such as a raised fist...within 200 feet in any direction from a currently used access door*".
  - **Out of Compliance, Standard 1**
  - **Recommended Action:** Have shelter staff review de-escalation practices and shelter guidelines for addressing conflicts between clients.
  - **Site response:** Next Door informed Committee staff that the shelter employee named in the complaint would be going through a de-escalation training on 6/10/19.

**Total Client Complaints FY 2018-2019**

Site	Site Capacity	7/18	8/18	9/18	10/18	11/18	12/18	1/19	2/19	3/19	4/19	5/19	Total (FY18-19)
A Woman's Place	11 mats	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
A Woman's Place Drop In Center	63 chairs	1	0	1	1	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	7
Bethel AME	30 mats	5	4	2	1	3	3	3	3	1	1	0	26
Compass	22 families	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dolores St - Santa Marta/Maria/Ana/Jazzie's Place	56 beds	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	3
First Friendship	25 families	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Hamilton Emergency	22 families	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Hamilton Family	27 families	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
Harbor House	30 families	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	1	1
Hospitality House	30 beds/mats	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
Interfaith Winter Shelter *seasonal shelter only open during winter months	60-100 mats depending on the site	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
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	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
MSC South Shelter	340 beds	0	2	3	4	2	1	1	3	0	0	0	16
MSC South Drop In Center	75 chairs	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
Next Door	334 beds	5	2	2	4	2	8	5	4	1	4	1	38
Providence	110 mats	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Sanctuary	200 beds	3	4	3	3	4	2	5	2	2	2	3	33
Santa Ana	28 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
<b>Total</b>	<b>Single adult: 1203 beds/mats Interfaith: 60-100 mats Resource Centers: 256 chairs Family: 106 families</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>145</b>

### May Site Visit Infractions

The Committee completed four unannounced site visits in May 2019. The infractions from the site visit to Next Door are currently pending, but the infractions from the remaining three visits are listed below:

#### Bethel AME

Site visit date: 5/22/19

Infractions submitted to site: 6/12/19

Site responded: **Pending**

#### **SOC Infractions:**

- **Standard 21:** No Language Link or other professional translation service available, site has access to translators for select languages

#### First Friendship

Site visit date: 5/22/19

Infractions submitted to site: 6/12/19

Site responded: **Pending**

#### **SOC Infractions:**

- **Standard 21:** No Language Link or other professional translation service available, site has access to translators for select languages

#### Hospitality House

Site visit date: 5/21/19

Infractions submitted to site: 6/12/19

Site responded: **Pending**

#### **SOC Infractions:**

- **Standard 8:** ADA information not posted in English and Spanish
- **Standard 10:** No alternative meals available for clients based on health/religious/disability needs
- **Standard 11:** "Smoking Prohibited" signs not posted in English and Spanish



*FY2018-2019 Unannounced Site Visit Tally*

Site	7/18	8/18	9/18	10/18	11/18	12/18	1/19	2/19	3/19	4/19	5/19	Total (FY18-19)
A Woman's Place	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	4
A Woman's Place Drop In Center	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
Bethel AME	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4
Compass	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	4
Dolores St. Shelter (Santa Marta/Maria/Ana/ Jazzie's Place)	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	4
First Friendship	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4
Hamilton Emergency	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
Hamilton Family	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
Harbor House (new site)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	1	0	1
Hospitality House	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	4
Interfaith Winter Shelter	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
Lark Inn	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
Mission Neighborhood Resource Ctr.	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	3
MSC South Shelter	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3
MSC South Drop In Center	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3
Next Door	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4
Providence	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3
Sanctuary	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3
Santa Ana* moved to Dolores St. Shelter site on 10/15/18	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
St. Joseph's	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3
United Council	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>65</b>

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

*FY2018-2019 Announced Site Visit Tally*

Site	7/18	8/18	9/18	10/18	11/18	12/18	1/19	2/19	3/19	4/19	5/19	Total FY18- 19
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
First Friendship			1							1		2
Hamilton Emergency			1									1
Hamilton Family			1									1
Harbor House												0
Hospitality House		1										1
Interfaith Winter Shelter									1			1
Lark Inn			1								1	2
Mission Neighborhood Resource Ctr.		1								1		2
MSC South Shelter			1									1
MSC South Drop In Center					1							1
Next Door					1					1		2
Providence												0
Sanctuary						1				1		2
Dolores St. Shelter						1					1	2
St. Joseph's		1									1	2
United Council												0
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>27</b>

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

## **Staff Update and Committee Membership**

### **Membership**

There are currently three unfilled seats on the Shelter Monitoring Committee:

#### **Board of Supervisors:**

Seat 1-Must be homeless or formerly homeless who is living or has lived with their homeless child under the age of 18.

Seat 2-Must be homeless or formerly homeless within the three years prior to being appointed, and who has a disability

#### **Mayor's Office:**

Seat 3- Must be homeless or formerly homeless who has experience providing direct services to the homeless through a community setting

If you are interested in applying for a seat on the Committee, please contact Howard Chen at 415-255-3653 or email [howard.c.chen@sfdph.org](mailto:howard.c.chen@sfdph.org) for more information.

### **FY2019-2020 Upcoming Meeting Calendar**

- July 17
- August 21
- September 18
- October 16
- November 20
- December 18 – No meeting