



City and County of San Francisco

# Shelter Monitoring Committee

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Shelter Monitoring Committee  
**FROM:** Committee Staff  
**DATE:** July 15, 2024  
**RE:** June 2024 Staff SOC Report

---

### Client Complaints

There were seven formal complaints were submitted through the SMC in June 2024.

*\*\*\*Note: SMC receives Standard of Care complaints each month that do not end up being submitted in writing, either because they were resolved informally or the client did not provide basic necessary details. Narratives provide an overview of the types of complaints forwarded to each site. Not all sites have had a chance to respond to the complaints. Complaints may have already been investigated to the satisfaction of the site or its contracting agency; however, the Committee must allow 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.*

### Division Circle Navigation Center

#### Client 1

**Submitted to SMC: 6/3/24 Sent to shelter: 6/18/2024 SMC received response: 6/28/24**

#### **Alleged Standard of Care (SOC) Violations**

- SOC #1 (Treat clients equally, with respect and dignity...)
- SOC #2 (Safety)
- SOC #13 (Sleep...)
- SOC #15 (Provide shelter clients with pest-free, secure property storage...)
- SOC #31 (Training...requirements under the ADA...sensitivity training re...trauma victims.)

#### **Allegation #1 (SOCs 1, 2, 31):**

- The complainant says male staffers monitor the all-woman dorm without announcing their presence. Some staff consistently treat guests disrespectfully and bully them. Management does not respond meaningfully to complaints submitted using the internal grievance process. The most they will do is promise to talk to staff. Some staff will even enter showers while guests are disrobed/in the shower, without a legitimate reason. This is very humiliating. Wellness can be ascertained by asking from behind the door whether the client is okay.
- *The shelter does not have dormitories that are dedicated to men, women, transgender, or non-conforming guests. They do attempt to place various genders together. Male staff are assigned in each dormitory areas during various shifts and do complete wellness checks in the dormitory areas, which does include walking in the dormitory areas that they are assigned, in addition to the restrooms and shower areas. This is done so that staff can confirm that no guests are suffering a medical emergency. Staff are regularly reminded to treat each guest with dignity and respect. Staff members will only handle guest's property if they are bagging the property due to an immediate denial of service or if a guest has not been seen in over 48 hours. Staff of the opposite sex will knock on the bathroom or shower doors so that their knocking is*

*heard, identify themselves as being of the opposite sex, and will only enter the bathroom or shower if they fail to receive a response. This is done in order to confirm that no guest is suffering a medical emergency.*

**Allegation #2 (SOCs 1, 13):**

- The client says the night crew flashes bright light into the faces of guests every hour between 11PM and 2AM, waking her up. This is not necessary if the goal is to make sure she is okay. Staff intimidate guests. For example, one circled her bed for no reason, staring at her.
- *Graveyard and Swing Shift staff members conduct bed checks at 2AM and 9:45PM, as well as wellness checks in and around their assigned areas in addition to the bathrooms and showers, during their respective shifts. Staff members do use flashlights, as lights are out between 10PM and 7AM. Staff members are respectful of guests sleeping and will only shine the light in the guest's general area if they are concerning that the guest is suffering a medical emergency.*

**Allegation #3 (SOCs 1):**

- The client reports that her case managers were ineffective. When she complained, the supervisor took paperwork to her to sign to indicate that she wanted to decline case management services altogether. This was not correct. She wanted the shelter to tell her what other options were available. She certainly did still want assistance with housing.
- *The Complainant was assessed to be at Problem Solving Status. ECS-SF provided her with information concerning housing opportunities within the San Francisco Bay Area. After repeated attempts to meet with the complainant, she received a Rapid Rehousing Housing referral through ECS-SF. An ECS-SF Rapid Rehousing manager attempted to engage with complainant on several occasions and it was finally decided that they would no longer engage with complainant after she did not sign the Rehousing Participation Agreement. ECS-SF was not engaging with the complainant concerning case management services, but rather with housing services. The complainant refused to sign the Rehousing Participation Agreement and further Rapid Rehousing Referral assistance was discontinued.*

**Allegation #4 (SOCs 1, 15):**

- Clients are asked to pack belongings in only two bags for pest control on Wednesdays, and for deep cleaning day, which isn't always announced or posted. They are forced to take their property out of the dorm but have not been provided with a place to put this. The time/date is often changed at the last minute or without notice. Guests with excessive belongings make the situation challenging for everyone, but the rules are often unenforced. The shelter ends up punishing everyone, because they all have to participate in the cleaning, which would not be required as frequently if everyone complied with the rules limiting property).
- *The Participant Agreement that guests sign specifically states that a guest is to only have belongings that fit two large trash bags. They do post signage in common areas five days prior to pest control or deep cleaning and remind guests repeatedly leading up to either pest control or deep cleaning via announcements during weekly Community Meetings. Staff members also make announcements in the dormitory and community areas.*

**Allegation #5 (SOCs 2):**

- At least one man has been placed in the Women's dorm area. An assistant supervisor told the complainant that they were no longer segregating women and men.
- *DCNC does not have dormitories that are dedicated to men, women, transgender, or non-conforming guests. They do, however, attempt to place various genders together. Being near capacity, intakes must be placed in the next available bed. DCNC will place an intake in another bed once one is available in an area that aligns with their gender.*

## **Baldwin Hotel**

### **Client 1**

**Submitted to SMC: 6/10/24 Sent to shelter: 6/11/2024 SMC received response: 6/18/24**

#### **Alleged Standard of Care (SOC) Violations:**

- SOC #1 (Treat clients equally, with respect and dignity...)
- SOC #2 (Safety)
- SOC #8 (Provide...information on shelter rules and how to access case management services...)
- SOC #15 (Provide shelter clients with pest-free, secure property storage...)
- SOC #31 (Training...requirements under the ADA...sensitivity training re...trauma victims.)

#### **Allegation #1 (SOCs 1, 31):**

- The complainant reported that since she had no bag, security had her go through the metal detector, bypassing another guest who had a lot of things in his backpack. (She stated that this procedure was the norm, allowing for improved efficiency at the entrance). However, a supervisor appeared and proceeded to harass her, asking if she thought she had “some special right to cut” the line. He then stood in her path, preventing her from going to the kitchen to get something to eat. He rudely and scornfully “ripped into her” about her personal business. She expressed anxiety, but he only doubled down. She was very stressed out by this and unable to eat. The next morning, she went to the kitchen for a cup of hot water. She asked for a 2nd cup and was asked by kitchen staff to ask management for permission for this. She became angry and was written up for this.
- *The shelter states all guests who enter the building must properly be searched. Security was assisting another guest when the complainant entered the building. She stood against the wall for a moment. She walked erratically, holding a clutch purse, past the other guest. A supervisor saw that she had jumped the line and had not been properly searched. She began cussing, stating she had not eaten all day. As the supervisor was trying to explain that every guest must be treated equally, she began spinning in circles and yelling and cussing.*
- *Due to the number of cups used, limits are in place. This client had reached the daily limit.*

#### **Allegation #2 (SOCs 1, 2, 8, 31):**

- The complainant stated she came in through the shelter entrance one afternoon and was immediately handed a write-up. As she attempted to read this in the lobby, a supervisor came up and began questioning her aggressively. She was just trying to read the write-up, not willing to sign it unread. He showed signs of anger, advancing toward her and shouting. Frightened, she ran to get away from him and pleaded to be allowed to go to her room. He denied the request, which upset her greatly and in fact induced a panic attack. The supervisor, ignoring her obvious distress, continued shouting—screaming, even—at her, to “get out of my building, right now...or I am going to DOS you!” Her pleas were ignored. She felt that his behavior crossed the threshold into assault. She was refused the chance to retrieve a sweater and her wallet, and not told when she would be allowed back in. She was not dressed to be wandering the streets, having only intended to step out for a few minutes. This was embarrassing and disconcerting. A couple hours later, she approached the entrance to ask to be admitted. She was denied. She informed staff that she is sensitive to the cold, but only received more derision and insults. She ended up spending several hours out in the cold.
- *The guest was issued the write up. She took it to another part of the lobby, upset it included a request to meet with a supervisor. When the supervisor entered the building, he tried but was unable to get her to listen to him. When he requested the pen and paper back, she refused and left the building with it. [She was told not to return until she had calmed down.]*

**Allegation #3 (SOCs 1, 15):**

- The client alleged that when she got to her room one night, her possessions showed signs of having been perused. A particular ID card had been taken from her drawer and placed conspicuously on top of her other possessions, as if to taunt her. Struggling to rest after this mistreatment, she emerged from her room at only to find a “24-hour notice” on her door. It said she had failed an inspection “for excess trash.” But there was virtually no trash and when she presented the situation to the night manager, the notice was rescinded. This incident was seen as evidence of retaliation for objecting to the shelter’s actions and for her community activities.
- *Staff did wellness checks when the guest was absent. They must check the room when a guest does not respond. This includes looking under the bed and on the sides of the room and behind the door. This takes about 10 seconds each time due to the openness of the room and size. Other than that, no one else had entered the room or was in the room long enough to tamper with her possessions. During room inspections a supervisor is involved and is accompanied, so there are two people each time. When a guest fails a room inspection, notices are placed giving them 24 to rectify the problem. The room was dirty and had excessive property. Nothing was done in retaliation for anything. There are flyers posted on every floor informing guests of impending inspections.*

**Allegation #4 (SOCs 1):**

- One morning as she was departing the building, staff harassed the client asking rhetorical questions and making snide comments—another example of the habitual bullying and of the animus she was being subjected to. She believes this was promoted or at least abetted by management.
- *Shelter staff deny having behaved or spoken in the manner the client alleges.*

**Client 2**

**Submitted to SMC: 6/11/24    Sent to shelter: 6/12/2024    SMC received response: 6/24/24**

**Alleged Standard of Care (SOC) Violations:**

- SOC #1 (Treat clients equally, with respect and dignity...)
- SOC #28 (Provide clients with access to free laundry services)

**Allegation #1 (SOCs 1, 28):**

- The client reports that he did not receive his laundry after it was sent out for cleaning. The client reports he went to all the staff on duty looking for his clothing bag but the response he received was that he never turned one in. The client asserts that staff said this without even attempting to look for the bag or any records of it. The client was simply dismissed and given no additional support in locating his belongings.
- *Five Keys responded that they work to build a community grounded in dignity, respect, and care for all its guests, and community members. Staff who do not follow these guidelines are held accountable. Clients have access to free laundry services. Each floor has their own laundry day. Clients are only allowed one laundry bag per wash day, not to exceed 15 pounds. This client did not turn in any laundry on schedule. Note, he was DOS’d for credible threats of violence towards staff, and the cleaning crew found a laundry bag in his room. The client was notified of this.*

**Allegation #2 (SOC 1):**

- The client reports he requested a grievance form to fill out regarding the lost items. He filled it out immediately. The client later spoke with site supervisors who denied they had received a grievance form from him. The client then spoke to the director who was going to set up a day to look at the

camera footage to see if he had submitted a bag. The client was later exited from the site, for engaging in an argument and has not yet received his laundry.

- *The shelter reports that they did review relevant footage. See response to Allegation #1.*

## **MSC-South**

### **Client 1**

**Submitted to SMC: 6/12/24 Sent to shelter: 6/13/2024 SMC received response: 7/2/24**

#### **Alleged Standard of Care (SOC) Violations:**

- SOC #1 (Treat clients equally, with respect and dignity...)
- SOC #2 (Safety)

#### **Allegation #1 (SOC 1):**

- The guest reports that since her initial encounter with staffer a particular staffer she has felt belittled and demeaned. Whenever the guest questioned the treatment, she would be accused of misconduct and her concerns would be ignored. One occasion when she asked for some deodorant, she noticed it was used. She questioned this and she was subsequently berated. The guest sensed hostility building towards her from the staff.
- *The shelter denies having any used hygiene products at the Front Desk. They may not have the brands people desire but everything is sealed.*

#### **Allegation #2 (SOC 2):**

- The guest reports that as she was heading up the stairs, one of the aggressive staffers was going in the opposite direction. She made sure she was as close to the wall as possible, but as the staffer passed, she “body checked her,” intentionally driving her shoulder into the guest. The guest reports it was a very strong shove. The staffer said nothing and kept going. When confronted, the staffer admitted bumping into her, but denied it was intentional.
- *At a time when shelter management had yet to determine who the staffer in question was, the complainant one day began yelling, “there she is that’s the bitch that hit me!” The staffer, in front of the manager, said, “I apologized the day that that happened and I thought you accepted my apology.” The client was really upset and began really cursing and becoming disruptive. She had to be warned. Her partner was able to calm her down. She was referred to Behavioral Health and accepted. The staffer denied any intentional aggression.*

## **MSC-South**

### **Client 2**

**Submitted to SMC: 6/20/24 Sent to shelter: 6/24/24 SMC received response: 7/7/24**

#### **Alleged Standard of Care (SOC) Violations:**

- SOC #1 (Treat clients equally, with respect and dignity...)
- SOC #15 (Provide shelter clients with ... secure property storage...)

#### **Allegation #1 (SOCs 1, 15):**

- The client reports that while at work the lock was cut off from his bunk drawer without cause. When he found his belongings, they had another guest’s name and bunk number on them. Upon retrieval of his belongings, a change jar with about \$150 in cash was missing.

- *The shelter reported that an acting supervisor had an incorrect bed number, i.e., the lock was cut by accident. The property was placed in the Property Room. The shelter could not verify that there ever was a coin can/piggy bank, but admits the lock was mistakenly cut. Management is considering reimbursing the client for the money he alleges went missing.*

## **MSC-South**

### **Client 3**

**Submitted to SMC: 6/26/24 Sent to shelter: 6/26/24 SMC received response: 7-16-24**

#### **Alleged Standard of Care (SOC) Violations:**

- SOC #1 (Treat clients equally, with respect and dignity...)
- SOC #2 (Safety)

#### **Allegation #1 (SOCs 1, 2):**

- The complainant reports that for months she and a few other residents have been experiencing bullying of which the staff have been aware. They have failed to utilize de-escalation techniques to alleviate the problem. The client asserts that another guest has been threatening her and others in the dorm, and that these occurrences happened in front of staff. In one case, the miscreant struck another guest and staff made no effort to prevent or to later to address the behavior. This same individual spat on and kicked her own bunkmate. Again, staff took no action. The complainant reports that, in addition, this person once awakened everyone in the dorm room at 3:30AM, loudly threatening another guest. Again the staff did not intervene or exhibit the use of de-escalation techniques.
- *The shelter spoke with the client to reassure her of their support. The behavior described is most certainly against shelter rules and an appropriate response would be made if witnessed. However, staff did not admit seeing it, and management claims that no one could corroborate the alleged misbehavior. It should be noted that the guest the client refers to has departed the shelter.*

## **Gough Cabins**

### **Client 1**

**Submitted to SMC: 6/20/24 Sent to shelter: 6/24/2024 SMC received response: 7/9/24**

#### **Alleged Standard of Care (SOC) Violations:**

- SOC #1 (Treat clients equally, with respect and dignity...)

#### **Allegation #1 (SOC 1):**

- The client said his door lock has been broken for four months. During that period, he has requested repeatedly that it be fixed. Staff have repeatedly told the client that the part was ordered and had not yet arrived. Each time the client must go to the staff to get them to unlock his door for him. The client has heard the staff as he approaches refer to him as “the asshole.” The client is aware he can become agitated and excited, and has discussed this with staff. He sees this as all the more reason the door should be properly repaired.
- *The shelter reports that, unfortunately, all their doors exhibit similar issues when it rains. Additionally, this client has admitted borrowing the batteries from his door lock for personal use.*

**June 2024 Client Complaints by Standard**

Standard of Care	Number of allegations of violations of this Standard
Standard 1: Treat all clients equally, with respect and dignity...	14
Standard 2: Provide shelter services in an environment that is safe ...	5
Standard 3: Supply and clean restrooms...	
Standard 8: Provide shelter services in compliance with the ADA...	1
Standard 9: Engage a nutritionist...	
Standard 10: Make dietary modifications...	
Standard 12: Clean bedding...	
Standard 13: Make sleep possible...	
Standard 15: Storage...	3
Standard 17: Maintenance problems...	
Standard 20: Provide materials in English, Spanish, other languages...	
Standard 21: Communicate in the client's primary language ...	
Standard 25: Require all staff to wear a badge...	
Standard 28: Laundry services ...	1
Standard 31: Training...	3

Please note that each complaint can include alleged violations of more than one SOC.

**Total Client Complaints FY 2023-2024\***

Site	Site Capacity													Total (FY23-24)		
		7/23	8/23	9/23	10/23	11/23	12/23	1/24	2/24	3/24	4/24	5/24	6/24	Total	Red indicates late response	
711 Post/Ansonia	250 beds								1				1		2	
Baldwin	179 beds						2						1	2	5	
Bayshore Nav	128 beds			1						1	2				4	
Bayview Nav	203 beds			1							1	1			3	
Gough Cabins	70 rooms												1	1		
Central Waterfront Nav	60 beds		1		2/3	1							2		7	2
Cova Hotel	90 beds												1		1	
Division Circle Nav	186 beds		1	3						1				1	6	
Ellis Semi-Congregate	130 beds	1					1				1				3	
Embarcadero Nav Cntr	200 beds						1		1				1		3	
Hamilton Family	27 fams						1				2		2		5	
Harbor House Family	30 fams												1		1	
Hospitality House	22 beds				1										1	
Lark Inn	36 beds														0	
MSC South Shelter	327 beds					1	1	1	3		1/5	2	3	16	3	
Monarch	93 beds			2	1		1	1		1				6	3	
Next Door	334 beds	1				1					1			3		
Oasis Family	54 beds							1	2			1	1	5		
Sanctuary	200 beds													0		
A Woman's Place	25 beds	1			1				1					3		
<b>Total</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>8</b>	

\*Late responses are in red

## **Staff Update and Committee Membership**

### **Membership (Admin. Code Sec. 30.305)**

There is currently **one unfilled seat** on the Shelter Monitoring Committee:

**Seat 1** - Must be homeless or formerly homeless who is living or has lived with their homeless child under the age of 18. (These requirements are being revised in accord with the changes proposed by the SMC in 2022.)

If you or anyone you would be willing to recommend is interested in applying for a Seat on the Committee, please contact staff at 628-652-8080 or email [shelter.monitoring@sfgov.org](mailto:shelter.monitoring@sfgov.org) for more information.

**FY2024-2025 Upcoming Meeting Calendar:** Aug 21, Sep 18, Oct 16, Nov 20