



City and County of San Francisco

Shelter Monitoring Committee

MEMORANDUM

TO: Shelter Monitoring Committee
FROM: Committee Staff
DATE: January 30, 2026
RE: **December 2025 Staff SOC Report**

Client Complaints

Eight formal complaints were submitted through the SMC to City shelters in October 2025.

****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 response, 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 (55)

Submitted to SMC: 11/17/25 Sent to shelter: 12/10/25 SMC received response: 12/15/25
Standards of Care (SOC) Allegedly Violated: 1

Allegation 1 (SOCs 1)

- According to the complaint, he had an issue with his laundry and approached staff. They began arguing about the laundry policy. The staffer demanded that the complainant cease talking and if he did not, she would DOS him. Another staff member intervened and walked away with the complainant. Two days later he had decided to fill out an internal complaint. The staffer told him, "I thought we had settled this issue," and they again began arguing. The complainant saw this pattern of behavior as harassment.
- *The shelter confirmed the complainant signed up for a laundry slot at 9:00 a.m. However, he said he had appointments throughout the morning and wanted to drop off his laundry beforehand. Staff suggested an afternoon laundry time and he was assigned a laundry slot at 1:00 p.m. He missed this time. Staff advised the complainant that we would be unable to wash his clothes as others were in line. He started to argue with staff. He then stated that he was going to write them up for harassing him. The complainant was issued a Warning Notice for verbal harassment, intimidation, or bullying, e.g., calling the staffer a b**ch.*

Dolores Client 1 (63)

Submitted to SMC: 11/24/25 Sent to shelter: 12/1/25 Response: **No Written Response Rec'd**
Standards of Care (SOC) Allegedly Violated: 1, 3

Allegation 1 (SOC 1)

- According to the complainant, staff demonstrate a disrespectful approach when enforcing site rules and policies. The complainant reports that instead of approaching residents directly and explaining

expectations or rules, particularly those not posted or previously communicated, staff will shout down the hallway or address residents in a manner that causes embarrassment. The complainant further reports that both she and other residents have overheard staff making disparaging remarks about LGBTQ+ individuals, including homophobic slurs and mocking LGBTQ+ residents.

- *SMC staffer McFarlin reached out to the site's Program Manager who worked to effect transfer of the complainant to Lower Polk Tay Navigation Center. The complainant had been given the option between Taimon Booten and this site.*

Allegation 2 (SOC 3)

- According to the complainant, the facility is not being properly sanitized. She reports that the shared showers are rarely cleaned and the shower curtain smells strongly of mildew. The complainant expresses concern about general cleanliness given the number of residents using shared facilities.
- *SMC staff spoke with the complainant at length discussing the pros and cons between each site and the complainant chose LPTNC. SMC staff informed the PM of the choice and the transfer was completed on 11/26/2025. Note that although the complainant's personal concerns were resolved, **Dolores Street Shelter did not ever provide a formal response.***

Dolores Client 2 (64)

Submitted to SMC: 11/24/25 Sent to shelter: 12/1/25 Response: **No Written Response Rec'd**
Standards of Care (SOC) Allegedly Violated: 1, 3

Allegation 1 (SOC 1)

- According to the complainant, staff demonstrate a disrespectful approach when enforcing site rules and policies. The complainant reports that instead of approaching residents directly and explaining expectations or rules, particularly those not posted or previously communicated, staff will shout down the hallway or address residents in a manner that causes embarrassment. The complainant further reports that both she and other residents have overheard staff making disparaging remarks about LGBTQ+ individuals, including homophobic slurs and mocking LGBTQ+ resident

Allegation 2 (SOC 3)

- According to the complainant, the facility is not being properly sanitized. She reports that the shared showers are rarely cleaned and the shower curtain smells strongly of mildew. The complainant expresses concern about general cleanliness given the number of residents using shared facilities.
- *SMC staffer McFarlin was informed by the complainant that the site supervisor did come to speak with her about the complaint and that the concern was resolved. The complainant requested a transfer, which was completed at later date of to Taimon Booten Navigation Center. Although the concern was resolved **the site never provided a formal response.***

MSC-South (65)

Submitted to SMC: 11/20/25 Sent to shelter: 12/1/25 SMC received response: 12/8/25
Standards of Care (SOC) Allegedly Violated: 1, 25, 28

Allegation 1 (SOCs 1, 25, 28)

- The client says he had to take the 4:45 laundry time. However, when he went to the laundry, he was no longer on the list. At the front desk, the original signup sheet showed his number had been scratched out and replaced by someone else's. He had been moved to a 9PM "emergency wash" slot. That time

was not acceptable. He is disabled and had already gotten his laundry together and taken it to the basement. The female supervisor flatly refused to assist him and acted as though he had done something wrong. He was bumped to the end, when he wouldn't even be finished in time to put his stuff away with the lights on. He was "basically told me I could take what they gave me or be DOS'd."

- *The shelter agreed that though it was Women's Laundry Day the client should not have been moved from 4:45 p.m. to over three hours later. Staff said the client kept yelling and screaming, however, and made it hard to deal with him. Management committed to going over the training on effective communication. Note: staff had their badge on. It was covered by their jacket.*

Adante (66)

Submitted to SMC: 12/12/25 Sent to shelter: 12/12/25 Shelter response: 12/22/25
Standards of Care (SOC) Allegedly Violated: 1, 2, 3, 17

Allegation 1 (SOC 1, 2)

- The client-complainant says staff was being verbally abusive and unprofessional, e.g., using four letter words and giving patronizing advice. After the security staff checks her in and calls for the hall monitor to key open her room, they often do not come. She has had to look for them, and then they show displeasure at having their smartphone activities interrupted, like she is a pest rather than their client. Male staffers are aggressive and confrontational. They even recommended she "just leave [her] door open." Worse, male staffers have opened her door without stating a reason. Once they came in while she was in the bathroom. Generally, her privacy is disrespected.
- *It might have taken some time to assist the client due to short staff. They instruct staff to always inform the clients to keep their doors closed at all times and that doors should never be propped open. Due to the Wellness Check policy, if the client does not respond, staff enter the room and make sure the client is okay. This client allegedly does not respond then tries to prevent entry. She only needs to respond in any way when a wellness check is conducted. Then staff will not have to open the door.*

Allegation 2 (SOC 3, 17)

- When her first room started to flood, with water falling from ceiling inside bathroom area, the client had to use trash cans to catch the water. The water was dripping directly over the toilet so she could not use the bathroom. A supervisor sent housekeeping to clean the floor, which was clearly not a workable solution. They said they had no more available rooms to transfer her to. She said she would complain to the City, and then they found a room; however, it was filthy. The floor had trash on it, the toilet was smeared with feces, and the refrigerator had old food stains. Even the bedding "smelled like urine and underarms and the pillow was wet." Staff asked her to give them 30 minutes to clean it, but they never came. She had to do this the best she could by herself.
- *The client reported her toilet clogged and water was on the floor. Not knowing there was a leak from the ceiling, staff mopped up the water and unclogged her toilet. After they realized there was a leak coming from the ceiling, staff checked the rooms above. They switched the client to another room immediately after knowing the ceiling had to be repaired. The room they switched her to had been cleaned and ready for a couple of days. At no point in time were they informed the client had complaints about her linen that day. Had they known, they would have changed it.*

Allegation 3 (SOC 17)

- The client reports that the heating in the building this month has not worked. She reported this and it came on for a few minutes but then went off again and has been off since. It is "so cold you don't need to put your food in the refrigerator to preserve it."

- *The shelter insists they were never informed by the client her heating unit was not working, nor did they receive complaints from any other guest there was no heat. A Building Inspector informed them. Each unit in this building has its own heating radiator that is time controlled. The inspector adjusted the timer for the heating unit and informed the shelter not to make any more adjustments. Maintenance staff were denied entry to her room. The client said she was “on an important phone call and her heating unit was working and [they] did not need to enter.”*

MSC-South (67)

Submitted to SMC: 12/11/25 Sent to shelter: 12/15/25 SMC received response: 12/17/25
Standards of Care (SOCs) Allegedly Violated: 1, 2

Allegation 1 (SOCs 1, 2)

- According to the complainant, he has been experiencing repeated racism, verbal harassment, and threats from his bunkmate, including threats of violence. He attempted to report these threats to staff on three separate occasions, but staff were dismissive, refused to intervene, and in one instance stated the situation was “not my problem.” He reports that the man in neighboring bed was willing say what he saw, but staff remained uncaring and dismissive. He reports that a staffer refused to provide their name when asked and later appeared to instigate further conflict between the complainant and his bunkmate. The complainant even heard this staff warn the bunkmate to be careful as the complainant may be recording him, only escalating the problems between him and the bunkmate. He expresses concern that shelter staff enforce rules inconsistently and that grievances are not taken seriously
- *The shelter stated the client approached a Case Manager. Since it was not a case management issue he got the Shift Supervisor. He noted he had to advise the client to be respectful in his delivery, because he was being abrasive. The supervisor explained they have to witness inappropriate behavior before they can take action against anyone. The staffer described said hee never heard any threats. The supervisor offered the client a bed move or a transfer to another shelter if he didn't feel safe. He declined this offer. Management did not see what else they could have done or offered the client. However, they do their best to provide shelter services in a safe environment and we go out of our way to make sure every guest is treated with dignity and respect. The staff on the second floor do rounds every fifteen minutes and will pay attention to the complainant's bed area.*

Next Door (68)

Submitted to SMC: 12/17/25 Sent to shelter: 12/18/25 SMC received response: 12/22/25
Standards of Care (SOCs) Allegedly Violated: 1

Allegation 1 (SOCs 1)

- According to the complaint, he had purchased new bike items. They were all still unopened in their package. He was entering the shelter when staff required the complainant to check in the parts along with a lighter and torch. About a week later, the complainant requested the checked-in items and was informed they were missing. The complainant filed a formal grievance. The grievance process was delayed multiple times, with changing timelines and no resolution. The complainant provided a receipt for the bicycle parts but was later told reimbursement would not be considered without the specific staff member's name. After providing the staff member's name, no further action was taken. More than a month after filing the grievance, the issue remained unresolved. After finally speaking with the site director, he was then rudely told, even if he was reimbursed, it would take up to eight weeks.

- *The client was given a written response explaining that the bicycle-related items are not permitted to be brought into or stored at the shelter in accordance with site safety and prohibited-items policies. These policies are applied consistently and equally to all clients. They do not store, hold, or take custody of partial bike components, or tools, regardless of condition or ownership. Staff are not authorized to accept, store, or log such items under any circumstances. As part of the review, management interviewed relevant staff and supervisors across day, swing, and grave shifts. They reported that the client was denied entry with the items and that the items were never accepted, checked in, or stored by the facility. The shelter is unable to substantiate the allegation, as there is no documentation, property log, or staff authorization indicating that the items were taken into custody. Accepting or storing such items would have been inconsistent with established site policy. While the shelter recognizes the client's frustration regarding the missing property, the review found no evidence of unequal treatment, disrespect, or deviation from SOC #1, as the client was subject to the same safety protocols and prohibited-item standards as all other guests. The client was asked why it took so long to bring this matter to their attention. He did not know but needed them now and they were nowhere to be found. He gave a vague description of the staffer in question.*

Hospitality House (70)

Submitted to SMC: 12/22/25 Sent to shelter: 12/23/25 SMC received response: 1/5/26
Standards of Care (SOCs) Allegedly Violated: 1

Allegation 1 (SOCs 1)

- The complainant reports experiencing disrespectful treatment and retaliation while residing at the shelter. A supervisor allegedly made rude and demeaning remarks, calling him “dirty,” “filthy,” and “smelly,” while making direct eye contact and in the presence of other staff members. The complainant states he did not respond but felt deeply offended and humiliated. The following day, she attempted to discourage the complainant from reporting the incident by offering him food she had personally prepared in her home, which was not offered to other residents. The complainant, feeling uncomfortable and distrustful, discarded the food. Since the incident, the complainant reports that other staff members have treated him coldly and have criticized his attitude, despite having remained silent when the reported mistreatment occurred. If the intent was to address or repair the situation, a direct and professional apology, along with reflection on appropriate customer service practices and staff training, would have been a more appropriate.
- *Shelter management apologized for the late response. They were unable to access the email for a few days. They said they appreciated the information and assured SMC and the complainant they are taking the complaint seriously, providing extra training for staff and implementing closer supervision to address and correct any unprofessional behaviors.*

6	First Aid, etc.																		
7	Drinking water																		
8	ADA	4	4			1													
9	Good nutrition	2																	
10	Dietary options																		
11	No smoking					1													
12	Clean bedding																		
13	Quiet time/ Sleep	2	1			1													
14	Daytime access to beds																		
15	Storage			1	1	2													
16	Electric outlets																		
17	Notice re repairs																		
18	Phone availability																		
19	22 inches between beds					1													
20	Postings in Spanish																		
21	Translation services																		
24	Denial of Service > 5PM																		
25	Employee badges																		
26	Transportation available																		
28	Laundry																		
29	OSHA																		
30a	Training - hand washing	7	7																
30b	-Food handling																		
30c	-Emergency procedures																		
30d	-Aggressive clients			2															
30e	-Mental health issues			1	1														
30g	-ADA requirements			1		1													
30h	-Shelter training manual			5	1	3													
30i	-Cultural humility			4															
Total		33	33	41	20	21													

Staff Update and Committee Membership

Membership ([Admin. Code Sec. 30.305](#))

There are currently **two unfilled seats** on the Shelter Monitoring Committee:

Seat 4 - shall be held by persons with experience providing direct services to homeless people through a community setting.

Seat 12 - shall be held by an employee of the Department of Public Health.

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

FY2025-2026 Tentative Schedule of Upcoming SMC Meetings:

April 15, 2026
May 20, 2026
June 17, 2026