



City and County of San Francisco

Shelter Monitoring Committee

MEMORANDUM

TO: Shelter Monitoring Committee
FROM: Committee Staff
DATE: August 20, 2024
RE: July 2024 Staff SOC Report

Client Complaints

There were 13 formal complaints were submitted through the SMC in July 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.*

Embarcadero Navigation Center

Client 1

Submitted to SMC: 7/3/24 Sent to shelter: 7/3/2024 SMC received response: 7/ /24

Alleged Standard of Care (SOC) Violations

- SOC #2 (Safety)
- SOC #3 (Provide, liquid soap with a dispenser permanently mounted on the wall in the restrooms; small individual packets of liquid soap, or small bar soap ...)
- SOC #11 (Comply with ... the San Francisco Health Code that prohibits smoking...)

Allegation #1 (SOC 3):

- The complainant states that for the last month at least there has been no soap or shower gel in most if not all of the sinks and showers. Staff tell him that they are sorry but that people steal the soap and they are unable to replenish it. The client says other guests share his concern. The implication is that guests must provide their own soap or else make due washing with water only.
- *The shelter does their best to replenish the soap in the bathrooms and the toilet paper. Guests frequently make off with these items. They have been giving out individual soaps or liquid soap and toilet paper as well to make sure the guests have what they need. They are in the process of installing some metal soap dispensers and toilet paper holders with locks to address vandalism. They promised to check in with the guest to make sure he knows they are providing additional toilet paper and soap at the bathroom monitor station for the times when we have temporarily run out in case he is not aware of this. They have guests with mental illness and drug addiction. They collaborate with Behavioral Health Services, but problematic comportment may continue.*

Allegation #2 (SOCs 2, 11):

- The client has regularly witnessed other guests smoking cigarettes and marijuana in the bathrooms. They also seem to be injecting drugs. Staff do not do much to dissuade these violations of the shelter's rules. Other guest suffer as a result..
- *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.*

Oasis Family Shelter

Client 1

Submitted to SMC: 7/3/24 Sent to shelter: 7/8/2024 SMC received response: 7/ /24

Alleged Standard of Care (SOC) Violations:

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

Allegation #1 (SOC 1):

- The complainant reported she moved out of the Oasis Family Shelter and into her own permanent housing. On that day she went to retrieve her personal belongings and was told she could take as long as she needed to retrieve her items. The guest reports that when she first went to retrieve her belongings, she was met at the front of the facility by her case manager and management staff. The latter informed the guest not to worry as she could go upstairs and get some of her stuff and come back and get the rest later. The guest asserts that she had left 3 bags which were in the management staffer's office. The guest reports that when she did come to retrieve her 3 bags, she was informed that they were thrown in the garbage despite being told she could take as long as she needed.
- *The shelter states the client signed an agreement that included rules, including the move-out process. According to this agreement, guests have 7 days after leaving the facility to retrieve their belongings. I am attaching a copy of the agreement with the client's signature. They are sorry if their attempt to be flexible lead to confusion that made the client believe there would be no limit to the shelter's keeping o the client's belongings.*

Bayshore Navigation Center

Client 1

Submitted to SMC: 7/8/24 Sent to shelter: 7/10/2024 SMC received response: 7/ 16 /24

Alleged Standard of Care (SOC) Violations:

- SOC #1 (Treat clients equally, with respect and dignity...)
- SOC #31 (Training...)

Allegation #1 (SOCs 1, 31):

- The guest reports that on the evening of July 7th, 2024, upon entering the shelter he was treated poorly and was falsely accused of having weapons. When the guest entered the facility his belongings and person were wanded. A staff member told the guest to empty out his backpack. After the guest had removed a Bible and few other random objects the male staff said, "And the weapons?" The client, having previously experienced this treatment before, became upset and replied, "I don't use weapons. Nor do I take drugs. My Bible is my weapon, and my university

studies." Then as the guest signed in, the supervisor said to him, "I also have a Master's degree. And if you don't like the Shelter, why don't you leave?"

- *The shelter regrets the client felt treated and received an accusation of possessing weapons. Security protocols are in place to ensure the safety of all clients and staff, and they aim to conduct these procedures with respect and professionalism. Procedures have been reviewed and management commits to ensuring they are implemented appropriately. At the same time, this client has had security protocols explained to him on several occasions. The shelter understands that the interaction with the staff members left the client feeling disrespected. They encourage staff to respect and support clients. They will continue to reinforce the importance of cultural humility and de-escalation techniques through ongoing training and supervisory oversight.*

Baldwin Navigation Center

Client 1

Submitted to SMC: 7/8/24 Sent to shelter: 7/12/2024 SMC received response: 7/18/24

Alleged Standard of Care (SOC) Violations:

- SOC #1 (Treat clients equally, with respect and dignity...)
- SOC #2 (Safety...)
- SOC #31 (Training...)

Allegation #1 (SOCs 1, 2, 31)

- The complainant states that a staffer was playing a movie on his portable electronic device that was obviously pornographic. It was loud enough to be heard in the stairway. The complainant immediately and again later in the morning attempted to report this to the night shift supervisor. He peremptorily dismissed the client the first time (in the presence of two other employees). The second time the client approached him, during the morning shift, he waved the client off, making it clear he did not want to hear what the client had to say, telling the client to "file a grievance." The client was offended by the audio and found the behavior concerning. Staff should be aware that some clients are sensitive to audio or video that is sexually explicit. It is inappropriate for staff to be sharing or consuming it where clients might be exposed to it. Some clients have experienced sexual violations or harassment and feel vulnerable and prone to anxiety. Nor should staff be distracted by *any* entertainment while on the clock: They should be monitoring the site to ensure that any problematic situations that arise do not go unnoticed, and generally to ensure client safety. Not only is this a violation of their assigned duties, it also creates an impression of lack of concern that is disrespectful and violates or at least undermines the dignity of clients.
- *The Supervisor brought a complaint to management's attention regarding an incident involving an ambassador. This complaint was filed prior to a complaint from SMC. The site manager spoke with the staff involved in the initial complaint, who felt it was an act of retaliation due to a previous complaint that had been found inconclusive. Footage from the relevant date and shift was reviewed. Staff members are positioned in specific areas for the protection of everyone in the building and are monitored on camera at all times. The footage confirmed that the staff member in question was at their post not using their phone. Based on this review, management could not corroborate the complaint. Since the complaint was made regarding the swing shift, footage for both the swing and graveyard shifts on the specified date were reviewed.*

Client 2

Submitted to SMC: 7/8/24 Sent to shelter: 7/12/2024 SMC received response: 7/30/24

Alleged Standard of Care (SOC) Violations:

- SOC #1 (Treat clients equally, with respect and dignity...)
- SOC #2 (Safety...)
- SOC #31 (Training...)

Allegation #1 (SOC 1)

- The complainant reports she has had several negative interactions with staff. They are unprofessional and aggressive. When the complainant exercised her right to file a grievance, she experienced certain staff members become aggressive towards her. For example, a staff member entering her room without announcing himself or knocking and then when confronted about this he began yelling at the client in the face stating, “put the bubble down and this wouldn’t be happening to you!”
- *This client has raised concerns about her treatment at the shelter, specifically regarding interactions with certain staff. In response to reports from other supervisors, the site manager repeatedly requested a meeting to discuss these issues in detail. However, she has not attended the scheduled appointments and has been unavailable. Supervisors were asked to encourage her to submit grievances, but she has not done so.*

Allegation #2 (SOC 2)

- The complainant reports that when exiting the building at 3:30 PM she was approached by the site director who began arguing with her about where she was going and what she should be doing. This ended with her being threatened to be DOS’d. The director began saying to the supervisor next to her, “I am going to flash on her,” and that she would physically remove the complainant herself. The supervisor then said to the complainant, “that is the boss lady right there.”
- *The site manager was seated in the lobby with staff when the complainant made to exit the building. Staff members asked her three or four times for her room number, but she did not respond. Upon re-entering the building shortly afterward, she cut the line and began demanding her lighter. The site manager attempted to explain that she needed to wait in line if she required assistance and that it was necessary for staff to know her room number upon entering or exiting the building. She then began yelling. The site manager informed her that yelling at staff was not acceptable and that continued disruptive behavior could result in DOS. The complainant made a derogatory remark about the the site manager to another staff member, asking, “Who does this bitch think she is?” Staff said, “That is the Boss.” She requested a grievance form and the manager’s name, which were provided.*

Bayview Navigation Center

Client 1

Submitted to SMC: 7/15/24 Sent to shelter: 7/16/2024 SMC received response: 7/ /24

Alleged Standard of Care (SOC) Violations:

- SOC #1 (Treat clients equally, with respect and dignity...)
- SOC #2 (Safety)
- SOC #11 (Smoking...)

Allegation #1 (SOCs 1, 2)

- The complainant reports that there are ongoing concerns with the night shift staff in Dorm 10 not addressing fentanyl use within the dormitory. According to the complainant, guests have attempted to enlist the support of staff to address concerns within the dormitory. The guests are mostly dismissed or ignored.
- *This has been an ongoing issue with guests who use. Staff do their best to do daily rounds and enforce the rules as best they can, but most of the time, unfortunately the neighboring guests see them more than staff does. In these cases, they ask the alleged perpetrator to please have respect for their neighbors and to do any drugs outside the facility. They cannot write them up until staff sees the guest using (drugs, smoking etc.), and when they do witness it, they address it immediately with a meeting and shelter write-up and reminder of future write-ups.*

Allegation #2 (SOC 11):

- Guests in dorm 10 report that during the evening shift they are struggling with other individuals using fentanyl within the confined space of the dorm, which is a direct violation of Article 19F of the San Francisco Health Code. Reportedly this has caused some of the guests to wake up feeling ill and lightheaded.
- *See above. The shelter states that they communicate this information with their case managers and staff on site. They follow the program rules and implement them daily and try to accommodate everyone on site so that everyone feels comfortable and safe.*

MSC-South

Client 1

Submitted to SMC: 7/18/24 Sent to shelter: 7/19/2024 SMC received response: 7/25/24

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 complainant states that his bagged possessions, including all his clothing, was taken to be laundered in connection with bi-weekly bed bug mitigation/spraying. This would not have been a problem, but his possessions and those of up to 50 other guests were not returned for over two days. The complainant, et al., had to go without a change of clothes and access to other property for over two days. The client's understanding is that the clothing should have been laundered and returned the same day it was removed. In the end, he went without a change of clothing or shower for almost three days. Additionally, the client states that it was not made clear to him in advance that his possessions, including very important paperwork, would be placed in a freezer (as part of the anti-bedbug mitigation effort). The paperwork could have been damaged by condensation or other sources of moisture. This caused the client some anxiety before he ascertained that the papers and other property did not appear to be damaged.
- *Shelter management spoke with the complainant about the incident. He remembered they had retrieved his medication and gave that to him before the property treatment. He was also offered temporary clothing to tide him over until his clothes back. The shelter understands the bed bug treatment process is discomforting for guests, but it is necessary. For the most part clothing is returned in a day, documents and other property is returned in two days as they have to undergo a freezing process. Standard of Care 28 is designed to cover inhouse laundry issues. The client got all of his property and clothing back and is reported to be satisfied.*

Client 2

Submitted to SMC: 7/24/24 Sent to shelter: 7/24/2024 Response: (late) 8/13/24

Alleged Standard of Care (SOC) Violations:

- SOC #1 (Treat clients equally, with respect and dignity...)
- SOC #2 (Safety)
- SOC #31 (Training)

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

- The client stated he was aggressively awakened. Staff forcefully slammed/slapped the bed and then grabbed him on the shoulder and shook him, as a way of telling him to get up immediately. Given the physical shaking, the client claims this amounted to assault. Staff did not apologize or express any regret. In fact, he evinced an insulting lack of concern at the prospect of being named in a serious complaint. The client went to a supervisor, who was unwilling to address the issue immediately. Rather, he asked the client to submit a grievance. The client, having had a little success in the past when he submitted grievances, said he was going to go to the Shelter Monitoring Committee to submit a complaint. This behavior is part of a pattern.
- *Management spoke with the staff member who was alleged to have assaulted the client. It was a Bug Spray Day and all guests needed to have their property bagged, tagged and beds stripped before 10:00am. He said that it was already 9am so he was going around waking all guests that were still sleeping. He said he understand that people wake up in all kinds of moods so he gently taps the beds and give them space but the complainant jumped up screaming and yelling. Management spoke with guests in the area where the client sleeps. They were not able to corroborate the client's description of the staffer [as abusive].*

Allegation #2 (SOC 1):

- The client asserts that when he returned to the shelter, around noon, he discovered that he was the victim of retaliation. His bed, in a state similar to that of other beds, and no worse than normal, had been “cleaned up” and some of his possessions placed in storage. He has not had his bed “cleaned up” in the 8 months he has been at MSC-South. He immediately checked his jacket, where he had placed a large amount of cash. He had departed to make his formal complaint (see Allegation #1) hurriedly, in a state of significant agitation. The rough treatment triggered some traumatic memories. He asked who had taken his belongings from his bed. He states that the staffer laughed in his face. He insisted on seeing a supervisor immediately. Apparently, management was unavailable. He went downstairs to relate what had happened to a manager. He was again asked to complete a grievance. When he stated that he needed immediate action, he was ushered out of the shelter. Shortly thereafter, a manager met with the client, allowing him to reenter the shelter. SMC staff asked at that time that records of who (two employees) packed up the client's belongings be retained, because this would be relevant to any subsequent investigation into this matter (specifically, into whether this was a retaliatory “clean up” and the associated assertion that property was lost in the process).
- *The shelter points out that this client was notified, like all clients, that they should not leave valuables unattended. **They did not respond as to who did the cleanup. Investigation pending.***

Allegation #3 (SOC 1, 31):

In early July, the client states, he was in a restroom stall when a female staffer entered the restroom to ask him to hurry and get out. He responded that he was not done. She asked him if he had a

doctor's note to verify that he needed extra time. This was disrespectful and humiliating. Staff know he is not a drug abuser. He showed no sign of doing anything inappropriate. He was not allowed to relieve himself in peace.

- *Management did not respond to this allegation. Investigation pending.*

Ansonia

Client 1

Submitted to SMC: 7/16/24 Sent to shelter: 7/22/2024 SMC received response: 7/24/24

Alleged Standard of Care (SOC) Violations:

- SOC #1 (Treat clients equally, with respect and dignity...)
- SOC #8 (Provide shelter services in compliance with the ADA)
- SOC #15 (Provide shelter clients with pest-free, secure property storage inside each shelter)

Allegation #1 (SOC 8):

- The guest reports that when he first moved into the shelter, he informed the individual completing his intake that he had a disability. The client was not informed about the reasonable accommodation process or given any feedback about how to address or gain support for his needs. The client was later moved to a room for the purpose of addressing his disability due to him needing a lower bunk. The client had been previously struck by a car and had problems with his arm, making climbing up difficult. The client reports that a few weeks went by and when he returned to his room there was another individual residing in his bed. That individual informed the client that the staff had told him to take the bed and when the client spoke to the staff, they began demanding that the client provide a reasonable accommodation form that was approved.
- *SMC investigated this complaint. The shelter was not found to be in violation of Standards. SMC staff visited the site and were able to interview witnesses, including clients. Clients were able to identify that they had been questioned about any disabilities and explained the reasonable accommodations procedures. Furthermore, upon staff interview and review of the complainant's hard file SMC were able to find documentation of the complainant having discussed his concerns during the intake procedure and that reasonable accommodation process was reviewed.*

Allegation #2 (SOCs 1, 15):

- The client reported that after the staff had moved in one individual his cell phone came up missing. Later, while the client was sleeping, he awoke to find that his bunkmate had stolen a bag of his clothes off the end of his bed and had placed that bag of clothes on his own bed. The client then went to the staff and told them he needed to move because his belongings were being stolen and the staff replied that they could not get involved and no other rooms were available. The client repeatedly went to the staff for support and began seeing people around the building wearing his clothing. The staff responded to the client that it was his fault for bringing nice clothing into the building.
- *The shelter was not found to be in violation of SOC's. SMC staff interviewed witnesses, including clients. Most of the clients interviewed were able to identify that they had been informed or were aware of the policies regarding personal property. There was documentation of the complainant having acknowledged the facilities policies and procedures related to property and storage. SMC also found signs posted around the facility regarding property storage options.*

A Woman's Place

Client 1

Submitted to SMC: 7/21/24 Sent to shelter: 7/24/2024 SMC received response: 8/1/24

Alleged Standard of Care (SOC) Violations:

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

Allegation #1 (SOC 1):

- The complainant reports she has been experiencing concerns with other participants. Staff have failed to intervene. During the shelter's stated lights on time other participants refuse to allow her use of the lights. The turn them off and say disrespectful and profane things to the client. All of this has occurred in front of the staff. The client has attempted to enlist staff support to no avail.
- *According to the shelter, staff have addressed the concerns of the lights with all guests in the dorm multiple times. Staff turn on and off the lights at designated times and will turn the lights back on/off when necessary to address and prevent disruptions in the dorm. This guest has continued to turn the lights on at or before 7:00am, disrupting other residents' sleep, and any verbal altercations that took place were de-escalated by staff at the time. This resulted multiple times in leaving the lights off past 7:00 am because all the other guests present in the dorm were still sleeping, except this guest. Staff have suggested compromise to the light situation to keep the peace and prevent future arguments, including using only the light above her bed, opening the blinds in the morning, moving to a common space once Lights Out/Quiet Hours ended, but the guest has refused any alternative.*

Allegation #2 (SOC 2):

- The client reported that the facility has been excessively cold, and that staff and clients will often turn fans on directed at her bed space. The client reported that she attempted to enlist the support of staff who told her what the thermostat is set at. However, with fans being turned on facing her this reading may not be accurate according to what the client is experiencing. More recently a guest had turned on fans and the client complained as they were making her cold. She then began to follow the client around, screaming profanities at her all in the presence of a staff member. This staff person did not attempt to defuse the situation or utilize de-escalation techniques.
- *Staff did, according to management, attempt to keep the peace, de-escalate, and balance the needs of different guests. A total of 20 blankets and sheets were found on the complainant's bed after she voluntarily exited the program, some of which had been taken out of the linen supply without permission.*

Client 2

Submitted to SMC: 7/28/24 Sent to shelter: 7/30/2024 SMC received response: 8/15/24

Alleged Standard of Care (SOC) Violations:

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

Allegation #1 (SOC 1):

- The complainant reports that her case manager has engaged the client in ways that are unprofessional and inappropriate. The complainant has received text messages from her case manager stating to text her "if she feels lonely," and other messages that she "loves" her.

- *The Director thoroughly investigated this report and took appropriate disciplinary action. The client's case file was reassigned to work with a new Case Manager.*

Allegation #1 (SOC 2):

- The complainant reports that she has been experiencing some concerns with other participants of which staff have failed to intervene. The complainant reported that another client had been harassing her and she was falsely accused of having a knife. That the police had subsequently been called in and the client had been subjected to a search for which no knife had been found.
- *Staff respond to all concerns regarded physical safety that are reported or witnessed. It was previously reported to the Deputy Director that the other guest was standing next to her bed, and this was addressed with the other guest immediately. A guest did call the police to report a knife. When police arrived, the staff on shift complied with officers' request to enter and speak with the guest who called to make the report. Officers spoke with the guest outside and then returned inside to further investigate. The complainant cooperated with police's request to search her belongings for the reported knife, which was not in her possession. The site's Deputy Director checked in with her after the incident, and addressed the concerns/disruption caused by this incident with the other guest. There have not been any further incidents between these guests.*

Sanctuary

Client 1

Submitted to SMC: 7/15/24 Sent to shelter: 7/24/2024 SMC received response: 7/29/24

Alleged Standard of Care (SOC) Violations:

- SOC #1 (Treat clients equally, with respect and dignity...)
- SOC #2 (Safety)
- SOC #13 (Sleep)
- SOC #25 (Badges)
- SOC #31 (Training)

Allegation #1 (SOCs 1, 13, 25, 31):

- The client reports she witnessed another client engaging in autoerotic behavior. The client informed staff. They responded it was "okay because she has mental health problems since staff did not see this, he would not take any action. He later did witness the behavior and told the perpetrator she could not do that. However, she continued to engage in behaviors that would keep the complainant up at night, so the complainant went to the program director who moved the individual to another area. During this meeting the complainant informed a supervisor that she did not appreciate the way she was being spoken to and that she was considering going to the City to file a complaint. The supervisor responded that if the complainant filed a complaint against them, they would file a complaint against her. The complainant correctly pointed out that this would be **retaliation**.
- *Management responded that staff did properly address the client's concerns. Staff explained rule 2.1 rule to her (Unwelcome sexual advances, request for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature including nudity, where the offensive behavior creates an intimidating, abusive, or hostile environment). He saw the client in her underwear. He asked her to dress appropriately on the floor but did not witness the alleged autoeroticism. Management moved this guest to prevent more friction. The comments interpreted as retaliatory were taken out of context.*

Allegation #2 (SOC 1):

- The complainant was awakened in the middle of the night by mistake and for no good cause. She was not allowed to get a good sleep. The complainant had repeatedly asked one staff member his name of which he refused to provide. The client was later written up by him for being loud and disruptive in the early hours of the night despite being the one who was repeatedly woken up for something she did not do. The write-up was later retracted. The complainant attempted to discuss her concerns with another staffer. Rather than listen, he retaliated by threatening to DOS the client (for reasons that do not even call for a DOS).
- *Sanctuary responded that quiet time there is from 10pm -7am. According to the night shift supervisor, upon hearing the loud noise, he investigated. The complainant and another client were arguing. The complainant would not go to the office, nor would she complete a complaint form. Staff's effort to deescalate the situation was to no avail. The complainant has a propensity to harangue staff on how to do their job. A write-up had to be issued for a violation of Rule 2p violation (failure to comply with quiet hours.)*

Allegation #3 (SOC 1, 2, 31):

- One night the complainant woke and noticed some of her belongings were missing. She went to inform the female night staff that this had occurred and found her asleep and was unable to get assistance. She later went to the supervisor to file a complaint and his response was, "I did not see her asleep, so I can't do anything."
- *Staff did not witness any theft; however, the shelter can still investigate the matter. At the same time, all residents are supposed to protect their personal belongings as ECS are not responsible for lost, stolen, or abandoned personal belongings.*

Hamilton Emergency

Client 1

Submitted to SMC: 7/23/24 Sent to shelter: 7/25/2024 SMC received response: 8/9/24

Alleged Standard of Care (SOC) Violations:

- SOC #1 (Treat clients equally, with respect and dignity...)
- SOC #2 (Safety)
- SOC 31 (Training)

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

- The clients say that another guest in their room threatened and insulted the complainant. The complainant reported these problems. Unfortunately, the shelter's initial response was to imply they could not do very much other than transfer the client and her family to another shelter, saying staff must witness problem behavior in order to be in position to act against the alleged perpetrator. [SMC's position is that there are other ways to ascertain the facts of a situation, and it is incumbent on shelter management to take necessary steps to investigate safety concerns expressed by guests.] However, the clients state, in this case two staffers did witness the behavior. The staffer the client originally went to did not respond in a professional way. And he suggested that the client was fabricating her story to secure some advantage. That is, that she was willing to falsely accuse an innocent third party of a serious transgression in order to gain some advantage for herself.
- *The shelter believes the complainant likely misunderstood the other client, give the language barrier. The clients did not respond to their offer of a safety transfer. Nor did they follow up with the police after calling them. Witnesses did not come forward to corroborate the complainants'*

Lark Inn	36 beds																		
MSC South Shelter	327 beds	2/1															2	1	
Monarch	93 beds																		
Next Door	334 beds																		
Oasis Family	54 beds	1																1	
Sanctuary	200 beds	1																1	
A Woman’s Place	25 beds	2																2	
Total		13																13	1

*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.)

Seat 5 - Shall be held by a person nominated by one or more community agencies that provide behavioral health, housing placement, or other services to homeless people.

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 for more information. the Homelessness Oversight Commission has a nominations subcommittee charged with recommending appointments to the SMC (and some other related groups). Applicants submit a [form](#) and the candidate(s) name is added to the Nomination Committee meeting agenda and invited to meet the members who conduct a soft interview. At this point, the candidate is also able to ask committee members questions. The full HOC will vote to approve the candidacy

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