



Shelter Monitoring Committee

MEMORANDUM

TO: Shelter Monitoring Committee
FROM: Committee Staff
DATE: June 16, 2017
RE: **May 2017 SOC Staff Report**

Standards of Care Staff Report

May Client Complaints

There were a total of sixteen complaints submitted to the Shelter Monitoring Committee by sixteen unduplicated clients in May 2017. Of those sixteen complaints, five received responses that satisfied the client, one received responses that did not satisfy the client and one complaint was closed due to No Contact from the client. Sites have responded to the other nine complaints which 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 conducts an investigation.

First Friendship

- **Client #1**
- **Complaint submitted: 5/30/17**
- **Response received: 5/31/17**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 1:** Treat all clients equally, with respect and dignity...
 - **Standard 3:** ...clean shelters on a daily basis...
- The complainant alleged that shelter staff were rude and unprofessional, that there are bed bugs at the shelter and that they heard people engaging in sexual activity at night.
- In the response, the site stated that the site manager and several supervisors were on duty on the date listed in the complaint and that none of them saw any staff being rude to clients or heard anyone having sex at the shelter. The response also stated that they had not received any reports about bed bugs and that the site gets monthly pest control treatment.

Closed – The complainant was satisfied with the site’s response.

Hamilton Emergency

- **Client #1**
- **Complaint submitted: 5/8/17**
- **Response received: 5/10/17**

- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 2:** Provide shelter services in an environment that is safe...
- The complainant alleged that another client (Client A) hit her son and that shelter staff only temporarily moved her to another room.
- The response states that Client A and the complainant's son both claimed that they had been attacked by the other party, but because shelter staff did not witness the incident they couldn't deny services to either client. The response also states that the complainant and her son were moved to another room for the rest of their reservation.
- **HSH was notified of this complaint because it contains allegations of acts of violence.**

Pending – Site has responded to this complaint but it is still open pending a response from the client

Mission Neighborhood Resource Center

- **Client #1**
- **Complaint submitted: 5/11/17**
- **Response received: 5/18/17**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 1:** Treat all clients equally, with respect and dignity...
- The complainant alleged that she has signed up for the weekend bed waiting list several times but that she never gets placed even though she sees male clients getting placed in weekend beds.
- The response stated that the complainant was placed in a weekend bed on the date listed in the complaint after staff recommended that she sign up for beds at additional shelters in addition to the shelters she originally signed up for. The response explained that multiple factors impact whether or not clients get placed in weekend beds, such as the time of day they come in, the shelters clients sign up for and the number of beds available.

No Contact – The phone number provided by the complainant has been disconnected.

MSC South

- **Client #1**
- **Complaint submitted: 5/8/17**
- **Response received: 5/22/17**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 1:** Treat all clients equally, with respect and dignity...
- The complainant alleged that staff were rude and did not give him a copy of his DOS paperwork when they denied him services.
- In the response, MSC South denied that staff were rude to the complainant and stated that staff attempted to give the complainant his DOS paperwork but that he had left the site before it was completed.
- *Pending – Site has responded to this complaint but it is still open pending a response from the client*

- **Client #2**
- **Complaint submitted: 5/24/17**
- **Response received: 6/1/17**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 8:** Provide shelter services in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act...
- The complainant states that a security officer made him walk through a metal detector and climb stairs without his cane as part of the security check-in process.

- In the response, MSC South stated that management had met with the client and had informed him that he had the option of having security officers wand him instead of walking through the metal detector without his cane. The response also states that management met with security officers to discuss the incident and how to better serve ADA clients.

Pending – Site has responded to this complaint but it is still open pending a response from the client

Next Door

- **Client #1:**
- **Complaint submitted: 5/4/17**
- **Response received: 5/11/17**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 1:** Treat all clients equally, with respect and dignity...
- The complainant alleged that her current case manager refused to help her apply for housing lists and that the case manager supervisor refused to assign her a new case manager when she requested one.
- The response acknowledged that finding affordable housing in San Francisco is difficult but that case managers had attempted to help the complainant apply for housing and that the complainant would be given a new case manager as soon as it was feasible.

Pending – Site has responded to this complaint but it is still open pending a response from the client

- **Client #2:**
- **Complaint submitted: 5/15/17**
- **Response received: 5/22/17**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 1:** Treat all clients equally, with respect and dignity...
- The complainant alleged that shelter staff were rude to her and made her go outside when she submitted a complaint about her bunkmate.
- In the response, the site stated that the complainant was asked to leave the shelter until she calmed down because she was growing combative and creating a disturbance while reporting the issue with her bunkmate to staff.

Pending – Site has responded to this complaint but it is still open pending a response from the client

- **Client #3:**
- **Complaint submitted: 5/15/17**
- **Response received: 5/23/17**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 1:** Treat all clients equally, with respect and dignity...
- The complainant alleged another client (Client A) spoke to her in an aggressive tone and that that shelter staff spoke to Client A but did not penalize her for her behavior.
- In the response, the site stated that staff were correct in not penalizing Client A for the incident because she did not threaten or behave aggressively towards the complainant. The response also stated that shelter management would be meeting with the complainant about the incident.

Pending – Site has responded to this complaint but it is still open pending a response from the client

- **Client #4:**
- **Complaint submitted: 5/18/17**
- **Response received: 5/30/17**
- **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 offered her drugs, paid her to watch his car and attempted to pay her in exchange for sexual acts.
- The response states that management investigated the complaint and that the shelter employee initially denied all allegations but later admitted to paying complainant's husband to watch his car. The response concluded by stating that neither the complainant's nor the employees version of events could be confirmed but that the employee was disciplined for inappropriate interactions with a client.
- **This complaint was forwarded to HSH because it contains allegations of staff engaging in illegal acts.**

Pending – Phone number provided by client was a wrong number, Committee staff are currently attempting to locate the client to follow-up with them about the complaint.

- **Client #5:**
- **Complaint submitted: 5/22/17**
- **Response received: 5/30/17**
- **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 was involved in a verbal altercation with another client and that shelter staff did not deny services to the other client after investigating the incident.
- In the response, the site stated that shelter staff made the correct decision after investigating the incident by de-escalating the situation and asking both parties to leave each other alone.

Closed – The complainant was satisfied with the site's response

- **Client #6:**
- **Complaint submitted: 5/23/17**
- **Response received: 5/30/17**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 1:** Treat all clients equally, with respect and dignity...
- The complainant alleged that a shelter employee would not allow her to finish her load of laundry even though she had signed up to wash her clothes at that time.
- In the response, the site stated that shelter staff asked the complainant to leave the laundry room after seeing her pour a bucket of water into one of the washers. The response also states that shelter staff were enforcing shelter rules that prohibit clients from tampering with laundry machines.

Pending – Site has responded to this complaint but it is still open pending a response from the client

- **Client #7:**
- **Complaint submitted: 5/24/17**
- **Response received: 6/2/17**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 1:** Treat all clients equally, with respect and dignity...
- The complainant alleged that a case manager called an ambulance and insisted that complainant go to the hospital even though she did not want to.

- In the response, the site stated that the case manager called the ambulance based on recommendations from medical staff and that shelter staff were practicing due diligence to make sure that the complainant was medically cleared.

Closed – The complainant was satisfied with the site’s response

- **Client #8:**
- **Complaint submitted: 5/24/17**
- **Response received: 6/2/17**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 2:** Provide shelter services in an environment that is safe...
- The complainant alleged that another client threatened to kill her cat.
- In the response, the site stated that they moved the other client to a different area on the floor away from the complainant. The response also stated that Client A had been referred to SF-START team for mental health evaluation and was being monitored by shelter and clinic staff.

Closed – The complainant was satisfied with the site’s response

Providence

- **Client #1:**
- **Complaint submitted: 5/24/17**
- **Response received: 6/2/17**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 1:** Treat all clients equally, with respect and dignity...
 - **Standard 3:** ...clean shelters on a daily basis
 - **Standard 25:** Require all staff to wear a badge...
- The complainant alleged that shelter staff were rude to her, that staff weren’t wearing ID badges and that she shower facilities were dirty.
- In the response, the site stated that the shelter did not employ any staff that matched the physical descriptions listed in the complaint and that management believed the complainant was actually referring to members/volunteers of the Providence church. The site also stated that there is only one shower that families are allowed to use and that they will occasionally become dirty due to the number of families using that shower.

Pending – Site has responded to this complaint but it is still open pending a response from the client

United Council

- **Client #1:**
- **Complaint submitted: 5/1/17**
- **Response received: 5/4/17**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 2:** Provide shelter services in an environment that is safe...
- The complainant stated that he was locked into a room at United Council several times after using the restroom and alleged that this was a safety issue if an emergency ever came up and clients were unable to exit the area.
- In the response, the site stated that management instructed staff to monitor the area more closely and to always leave at least exit door unlocked in that area.

Not satisfied – The complainant has requested an investigation into this complaint. This investigation is currently pending.

- **Client #2:**

- **Complaint submitted: 5/23/17**
- **Response received: 5/30/17**
- **Alleged SOC Violations:**
 - **Standard 1:** Treat all clients equally, with respect and dignity...
- The complainant stated that a shelter employee denied him services without telling him the length of the denial of service (DOS) or giving him any DOS paperwork.
- In the response, the site stated that management investigated the incident and stated that the complainant was not denied services at the time of the incident, which was why he was not given any DOS paperwork.

Closed – The complainant was satisfied with the site’s response.

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...	12
Standard 2: Provide shelter services in an environment that is safe...	5
Standard 3: ...hire janitorial staff to clean shelters on a daily basis	2
Standard 8: Provide shelter services in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)...	1
Standard 25: Require all staff to wear a badge that identifies the staff person by name and position	1

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

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 two investigations in May, both for clients of Next Door:

Next Door

Client #1

Alleged SOC violation: Standard 15) Provide shelter clients with...secure property storage...

In the initial complaint, the complainant alleged that two pieces of luggage that he checked into the property storage room had gone missing. Next Door stated in the response that storage room records indicated that the complainant had signed out his property a day after checking it in for storage. Next Door provided of the property storage log that showed the initial storage date and the complainant signing out his property.

The complainant requested an investigation because he alleged that he did not retrieve his property from the storage room. When Committee staff showed the complainant the property storage log, he confirmed that it was his signature but stated that he had mistakenly signed it while he was checking in his property.

Committee staff made an unannounced visit to Next Door to look for the complainant's property and to review property storage records. Committee staff were unable to determine if the complainant had retrieved his property due to conflicting accounts from the complainant and shelter staff. Committee staff did verify that shelter staff had informed the complainant that the shelter could only hold client property for 72 hours. As the amount of time that had passed from when the complainant checked in his property to when he discovered his property was no longer in the storage room exceeded the 72 hour limit, the site would have been adhering to shelter policy if they had purged the complainant's property. Committee staff were able to verify the accuracy of Next Door's property storage log by locating property belonging to five out of five randomly selected entries from the log inside the storage room. As a result of these findings, Committee staff determined that Next Door was in compliance of Standard 15.

Recommendations: Committee staff found an untagged piece of luggage that matched the description of the complainant's property during the investigation. Committee staff requested that Next Door hold that piece of luggage until the client could inspect it in person to check if it belonged to him.

Client #2

Alleged SOC violation: Standard 3) ...clean shelters on a daily basis...;

In the initial complaint, the complainant alleged that the women's showers on the 4th floor needed additional sweeping/mopping during evening hours because the amount of trash on the floor made the restrooms unusable. In the response, Next Door stated that bathrooms are routinely cleaned twice a day at 2:30 PM and 8:00 PM and that management would be reviewing the cleaning schedule with facilities staff to ensure that bathrooms were being cleaned in the evenings.

The complainant requested an investigation because she alleged that facilities staff were not consistently cleaning/restocking the women's restrooms in the evenings.

Committee Member Watson and Committee staff made an unannounced visit to Next Door to inspect and document conditions in the women's restrooms. The investigation team inspected the women's restrooms at 8:20 PM and found that they had been recently cleaned and did not note any excessive trash or waste on the floor. The team did note several facility issues that were Standard 3 violations:

- Several restroom stalls needed to be restocked with toilet paper
- One toilet had a large crack in the porcelain
- One soap dispenser was broken

Based on these findings, the investigation team determined that Next Door was not in compliance with Standard 3.

Recommendations: Committee staff recommended that Next Door restock the stalls with toilet paper and repair the broken soap dispenser and cracked toilet and requested a written follow-up on the status of repairs. Next Door has provided a response to the investigation, which states that all facility issues noted in during the investigation have been repaired and that management met with staff to remind them to restock hygiene supplies during evening rounds.

Total Client Complaints FY 2016-2017

Site	Site Capacity	7/16	8/16	9/16	10/16	11/16	12/16	1/17	2/17	3/17	4/17	5/17	Total (16-17 FY)
A Woman's Place	11 mats	0	0	1	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	5
A Woman's Place Drop In Center	63 chairs	0	3	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	8
Bethel AME	30 mats	0	0	1	0	0	2	3	4	1	0	0	11
Compass	22 families	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
First Friendship Family	25 families	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	3
Hamilton Emergency	46 beds, 8 cribs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
Hamilton Family	27 families	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hospitality House	30 beds/mats	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	6
Interfaith Winter Shelter	60-100 mats depending on the site	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jazzie's Place	24 beds	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	1	0	0	6
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	0	1	1
MSC South Shelter	340 beds	3	5	1	0	2	2	2	1	1	0	2	19
MSC South Drop In Center	75 chairs	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	7
Next Door	334 beds	8	9	7	8	9	7	7	16	25	8	8	112
Providence	110 mats	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4
Sanctuary	200 beds	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	8
Santa Ana	28 beds	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Santa Marta/Maria	56 beds	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
St. Joseph's	10 families	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
United Council	48 chairs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Total	Single adult: 1203 beds/mats Interfaith: 60-100 mats Resource Centers: 256 chairs Family: 84 family rooms, 46 beds and 8 cribs	12	26	14	10	17	18	14	26	32	14	16	199

May Site Visit Infractions

There were nine site visits conducted in May. Two sites were not cited for any Standard of Care infractions, these sites were Hamilton Family Shelter and Mission Neighborhood Resource Center. The infractions for the other seven sites are listed below:

A Woman's Place Shelter

Site visit date: 5/23/17

Infractions submitted to site: 6/6/17

Site responded: 6/8/17

SOC infractions:

- Standard 8: No information posted about how clients access case management services – **Resolved**
- Standard 20: Case management information noted posted in Spanish – **Resolved**

A Woman's Place Drop In

Site visit date: 5/11/17

Infractions submitted to site: 6/14/17

Site responded: Pending

SOC infractions:

- Standard 3: One bathroom needed additional cleaning
- Standard 6: No CPR masks
- Standard 26: No MUNI tokens available for clients
- Standard 30: No protective gowns for staff

First Friendship

Site visit date: 5/15/17

Infractions submitted to site: 5/22/17

Site responded: Pending

SOC infractions:

- Standard 6: AED battery needs to be replaced
- Standard 12: Not all clients given two sheets, pillow or pillowcase (site provided extra blankets for pillows and to accommodate for no sheets)
- Standard 21: No Language Link

Hamilton Emergency Shelter

Site visit date: 5/18/17

Infractions submitted to site: 5/31/17

Site responded: Pending

SOC infractions:

- Standard 7: Two broken water fountains next to unisex bathrooms near room #403

Hospitality House

Site visit date: 5/23/17

Infractions submitted to site: 6/2/17

Site responded: 6/9/17

SOC infractions:

- Standard 6: AED battery needed to be replaced – **Resolved**

Next Door

Site visit date: 5/10/17

Infractions submitted to site: 5/22/17

Site responded: 5/30/17

SOC infractions:

- Standard 3: No paper towels in one restroom; Bathrooms were dirty and needed additional cleaning – **Resolved**
- Standard 12: Not all beds had pillows and pillowcases – **Resolved**
- Standard 25: Not all staff wearing ID badges – **Resolved**

Sanctuary

Site visit date: 5/15/17

Infractions submitted to site: 5/22/17

Site responded: 5/30/17

SOC infractions:

- Standard 17: Signage for broken laundry machine didn't note status of repair or expected repair date – **Resolved**

FY2016-2017 Unannounced Site Visit Tally

Site	Q1 July-Sept.	Q2 Oct.-Dec.	Q3 Jan. - March	Q4 April – June	Total (16-17 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	-	3
Compass	1	1	1	-	3
First Friendship Family	1	1	1	1	4
Hamilton Emergency	1	1	1	1	4
Hamilton Family	1	1	1	1	4
Hospitality House	1	1	1	1	4
Interfaith Winter Shelter* seasonal shelter open during winter months	*Closed	1	1	*Closed	2
Jazzie’s Place	1	1	1	-	3
Lark Inn	1	1	1	-	3
Mission Neighborhood Resource Ctr.	1	1	1	1	4
MSC South Shelter	1	1	1	-	3
MSC South Drop In Center	1	1	1	-	3
Next Door	1	1	1	1	4
Providence	1	1	1	-	3
Sanctuary	1	1	1	1	4
Santa Ana	1	1	1	-	3
Santa Marta/Maria	1	1	1	-	3
St. Joseph’s	1	1	1	-	3
United Council	1	1	1	-	3
Total	20	21	21	9	71
Assigned	20	21	21	20	82
Compliance	100% compliance for Q1 FY16-17	100% compliance for Q2 FY16-17	100% compliance for Q3 FY16-17	45% compliance for Q4 FY16-17 (through May only)	87% compliance for FY16- 17 (through May only)

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

FY2016-2017 Announced Site Visit Tally

Site	Total (16-17 FY)
A Woman's Place	1
A Woman's Place Drop In Center	0
Bethel AME	1
Compass	1
First Friendship Family	1
Hamilton Emergency	2
Hamilton Family	2
Hospitality House	1
Interfaith Winter Shelter *seasonal shelter open during winter months	1
Jazzie's Place	1
Lark Inn	1
Mission Neighborhood Resource Ctr.	1
MSC South Shelter	1
MSC South Drop In Center	1
Next Door	1
Providence	1
Sanctuary	1
Santa Ana	1
Santa Marta/Maria	1
St. Joseph's	1
United Council	1
Total	22
Required	41
Compliance for FY16-17	53%

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

Committee Membership and Staff Update

Membership

The Committee currently has twelve members and there is one vacancy. Details of the vacant seat is as follows:

Local Homeless Coordinating Board

*Seat 1-Member shall be nominated by a non-profit providing advocacy or organizing to homeless people. Please attach a letter of support from the community agency nominating you for this seat.

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

Stipend Protocol

The Shelter Monitoring Committee contact person will distribute to each Committee member a \$25 stipend and a one-time \$100 travel stipend if the following criteria will be met:

- a. \$25 Stipend

The stipend is awarded on a quarterly basis (up to \$75 per member) for each Committee member who attended both the meeting and two site visits for each month upon team captain or Committee Chair approval. Members' attendance will be monitored by the Shelter Monitoring Committee staff and noted in the Minutes of the meetings. If a meeting was canceled due to lack of quorum either on the day of the meeting or before the meeting, the Committee members who either attended the meeting or indicated that they would be able to attend a meeting that was canceled before the date of the meeting will receive credit for that meeting. The cancellation notice will indicate the Members present if the meeting was canceled on the day of the meeting and if the meeting was canceled before that date due to lack of quorum, there will be an additional memo submitted explaining which Members will receive credit for attending and which will not. Additionally, Committee Members who are excused from the Committee Meeting and noted on the agenda as "excused" will be eligible for the stipend as long as they complete the required site visits.

b. **\$100 One-time Travel Stipend**

After Committee members are appointed to their two-year term or the remainder of a two-year term left vacant, they will be eligible for a one-time \$100 annual travel stipend usually paid in January of each calendar year or when a Committee member is appointed to fill a vacant position. To be eligible for the Travel Stipend, Committee members must attend two visits per month or six visit per quarter.

c. **Stipend Limit-Not to exceed \$400 per year**

No Committee member will be eligible for more than \$400 of stipend disbursement.

2017 Meeting Calendar

- July 19
- August 16
- September 20
- October 18
- November 15
- December 20