



City and County of San Francisco
Shelter Monitoring

MEMORANDUM

TO: Shelter Monitoring Committee
FROM: Committee Staff
DATE: August 31, 2026
RE: July 2026 Staff SOC Report

Client Complaints

15 formal Shelter Monitoring complaints were submitted to City shelters in July 2026.

****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.*

Embarcadero Navigation Center Client 1 (1)

Submitted to SMC: 6/29/26 Sent to shelter: 7/1/26 SMC received response: 7/1/26
Standards of Care (SOC) Allegedly Violated: 2

Allegation 1 (SOC 2)

- According to complainant, she attempted to initiate a constructive conversation with a new male resident to discuss how to safely manage their dog's interactions. This male resident responded with immediate verbal aggression and violent threats. While multiple statements were made, the specific threat overheard and noted was: "I'll beat anyone up, women, children, I don't care. I'll beat anyone up so you better stay out of reach of me." Given the proximity of the beds and the enclosed nature of the living space, this statement caused "immediate distress and fear for safety among nearby residents." The complainant said she herself was "shaking from the intensity." She feels "very unsafe with this evidently violent person sleeping in the same room" with her (and a large dog).
- *The shelter stated they looked into the allegations. Neighbors of the two guests "did not substantiate the allegation that threats had been made."*

Embarcadero Navigation Center Client 2 (13)

Submitted to SMC: 7/23/26 Sent to shelter: 7/24/26 SMC received response: 7/27/2026
Standards of Care (SOC) Allegedly Violated: 1 (Respect, fairness); 2 (Safe environment)

Allegation 1 (SOCs 1, 2)

- The complainant says that around 8:30 PM, the main restroom was closed for cleaning which left only the ADA restroom available. Needing to relieve himself badly, he knocked on the door. He waited and then knocked again. At that point he spoke out loud to himself about how long it was

taking. Shortly afterwards, a fellow client opened the door, “walked right into [his] face and yelled, ‘what is your problem—I was changing my clothes’.” The complainant responded to the effect that he could've done that in the dorm, and asked, “why are you all up in my face, do you want to fight or something?” This client grabbed him, “ripped [his] shirt off” and punched him repeatedly. The complainant did not see staff anywhere near, so he defended himself. When staff did appear, the aggressor continued “getting into my face and attacking me.” Forced to defend himself, he pushed back. It took another few seconds before the fight finally was broken up. That's when the manager came and, without offering the complainant a chance to explain, told him he was DOS'd. The complainant did explain what happened and how he felt his judgment was unfair, i.e., he had had no other option but to defend himself. He says that “staff members and people who live in the shelter actively came out to tell [him] they witnessed the entire situation and agreed it was unfair” and surprising he was kicked out. He was not given a chance to retrieve his belongings. His iPhone 14 Pro Max has gone missing, as has his iPhone SE he received from his mother who recently passed away. Both phones are expensive and also have sentimental value, i.e., many photos, videos, and social media posts that he will not be able to recover. He feels the shelter was negligent. He also has had to pay out of his few resources for a hotel while awaiting alternate shelter.

- *The shelter responded that the guest who had occupied the restroom was only there for about five minutes. The complainant began repeatedly knocking on the restroom door before the other guest had a reasonable opportunity to complete his use of the restroom. Changing clothes is a reasonable use of the restroom, especially as the dormitory houses both male and female guests. The complainant argues he was acting in self-defense, but the shelter manager observed the altercation and feels he was the one in control. He continued striking the other guest after repeated verbal commands to stop and ceased only after the manager placed himself between the two. The assertion that the complainant was not given sufficient time to retrieve his personal belongings is inaccurate. Following the incident, he brushed his teeth, returned to his assigned bed, gathered the personal belongings he wished to take with him, including multiple cell phones (one of which he was actively using), and placed them into a plastic bag. Before leaving the shelter, he asked how long the shelter would retain his remaining belongings. He was informed that personal property would be held for 14 days, after which he voluntarily departed the facility.*

Sanctuary Client 1 (2)

Submitted to SMC: 6/26/26 Sent to shelter: 7/7/26 SMC received response: 7/8/26
Standards of Care (SOC) Allegedly Violated: 1, 3

Allegation 1 (SOCs 1, 3)

- The complainant reports she witnessed the facilities manager, “yelling at the women” about excessive property. He “kept asking us if we were getting housing.” When he was asked not to yell, he accused the guest who spoke up of being disrespectful and asked Supervisor X to give the lady a write up. He told the lady she could not talk to him “because she specialized in complaining.” The complainant says the individual who spoke up is a nice person who is helpful to everyone. She states that the employee pointed his finger at her and said, “you have a complaint go write it up and tell [the site manager], don't talk to me. This is my building, and I run this building.” Per the client, the squabble arose “because the shelter is very dirty.” Clients and employees “are getting attacked by bed bugs all the time.” A coworker told the site manager to call for another employee, “but he just kept yelling.” Eventually the site manager came over. He had to intervene “because the situation was out of control.”

- *According to shelter staff, the facilities manager made a general announcement to first-floor guests regarding excessive personal property in shared areas. Guests were informed that ECS operates two nearby storage sites, that they should speak with their case managers about housing solutions because Sanctuary is a temporary shelter, and that transportation support would be available as needed. The complainant was asked to move excessive belonging blocking part of emergency exit walkway. The complainant refused and made statements that were understood as retaliatory toward the Director and the Site Manager. The Site Manager came at the end of this conversation and assisted with moving the guest's luggage out of the emergency exit pathway. Staff reiterated the importance of the emergency exit pathway. The facilities manager did not point at the complainant during the interaction. First-floor clients were also informed that anti-pest pillows are available upon request at the front desk. Several clients requested pillows and were provided to them. The shelter has had monthly pest control and will continue to maintain this service.*

Allegation 2 (SOC 1)

- According to the client, shelter staff keep closing the bathroom early, denying access to toilets and showers. "The schedule says 12:30 p.m. they are closing it early and cussing us out when we try to use it." They show no concern for clients' bodily needs.
- *The shelter responded to say that cleaning of the bathroom starts 12:30pm and opens at 2:00pm and during the cleaning process clients are allowed to use Senior disabled bathroom currently.*

Sanctuary Client 2 (4)

Submitted to SMC: 7/2/26 Sent to shelter: 7/7/26 SMC received response: 7/8/26
Standards of Care (SOC) Allegedly Violated: **1, 2, 9, 30**

Allegation 1 (SOC 1)

- According to complainant, clients at Sanctuary "have to choose between losing their bed or property when they check in for first time." They are not informed in advance of the rules or options for property storage and end up either being denied admittance or being forced to dispose of their property. "Management staff are making people throw away belongings without following the rules, blaming the City." The client thinks they are misleading clients and behaving unprofessionally. "They pick and choose who they write up" and verbally denigrate guests rudely.
- *The shelter denied that clients have to choose between losing their beds or property when they check in for the first time. They are informed during intake about the participant agreement and during new client orientation about the options for property storage and are not being denied admittance or being forced to dispose of their property. Clients with excessive belongings that have 3 written warnings go through the hearing process. They are given information about free storage locations.*

Allegation 2 (SOC 2)

- There were "no staff" on Second Floor (Men's area) "all day" June 28.
- *The shelter stated that during all shifts they consistently had one employee on the second floor, as well as the supervisor, who made rounds every 30 minutes.*

Allegation 3 (SOCs 2)

- According to the client, a guest slipped and fell on July 2 because staff did not follow the rules for marking spills or the wet floor after it has been mopped.

- *The shelter did not respond to this allegation.*

Allegation 4 (SOCs 3)

- Staff “are not doing their jobs.” The shelter is dirty. “Bed bugs everywhere.” [Two named staffers], especially, “are rude and disrespectful to people.”
- *The shelter responded that they have monthly pest Control, and clients are encouraged to avoid picking belongings off the street as that can contribute to pest problems. They also asserted that all clients are treated with respect and dignity.*

Allegation 5 (SOCs 9, 30)

- Staff is serving cold food, i.e., inadequately heated. People are getting sick and having stomach problems, e.g., on July 1. Some staff handle both trash and food trays without changing gloves. This may be leading to cross contamination and the spreading of microbes/disease.
- *The shelter says food is delivered while it is hot and served by the staff. There was a recent visit by Health housing & Vector Control Inspector from DPH in the last two weeks and there was no finding. Staff that serve the food change their gloves.*

Sanctuary Client 3 (8)

Submitted to SMC: 7/14/26 Sent to shelter: 7/15/26 SMC received response: 7/16/26

Standards of Care (SOC) Allegedly Violated: 1

Allegation 1 (SOC 1)

- Employee A who tends to be rude to everyone threatened Client C. Client B “was bullying [Client D] who does not bathe.” Client C tried to tell the supervisor and Employee A that this (apparently mentally challenged) Client D was getting mistreated. Employee A didn’t want to hear it. She told Client C to “drop it or go outside.” Client C was telling the truth. Client D is yelled at and cussed out all the time. She “looks autistic or something like she is vulnerable or disabled.” Client C should not have been threatened to be “put outside for standing up for someone.” Employee A and other employees at the shelter are generally rude to the clients.
- *The shelter (again) said all clients are treated with respect and dignity. Employees A and M reminded Client D to utilize the main pathway instead of walking through other clients’ areas and to stop hanging out in other guest areas. It has happened that when something goes missing, they may be accused unfairly if seen in other clients’ bed areas. Staff were being proactive by ensuring that the main pathway is utilized instead of clients going to other clients’ bed areas.*

Next Door Client 1 (3)

Submitted to SMC: 7/4 /26 Sent to shelter: 7/7/26 SMC received response: 7/10/26

Standards of Care (SOC) Allegedly Violated: 1, 30

Allegation 1 (SOCs 1, 30)

- The complainant reported that in the 2nd Floor Women's section there was a guest “lying in filth and covered with vermin.” She “fills the entire floor” with “an extremely foul and toxic body odor.” The “extreme bug infestation of her clothes and belongings which are never washed” is obvious, and “she never showers.” The smell “permeates the entire floor, forcing many guests to endure it or wear masks.” Guests have complained for a long time but no effective action has been

taken. The guest “seems to have a mental health issue and perhaps requires an intervention and somewhere more suitable and helpful for her to stay.” The complainant believed the situation evidences a lack of respect for client dignity, as well as in adequate training. They are asking that the shelter respond now and address this “unbearable and unfair” situation.

- *The shelter claimed they maintain a “rigorous health and safety protocol, which includes regular, professional pest control inspections throughout the facility” and had “found no evidence of any bug or pest infestations on any guest, bed, or surrounding area.” They cannot force clients to engage in personal hygiene. But staff continuously focuses on building rapport with guests to encourage and support them. Following a productive conversation, the guest in question voluntarily agreed to shower. Many guests navigate complex mental health challenges, but they cannot mandate a transfer. They promised to monitor the situation to ensure a clean, safe, and dignified environment for all residents.*

Next Door Client 2 (12)

Submitted to SMC: 7/17/26 Sent to shelter: 7/27/26 SMC received response: 7/31/26
Standards of Care (SOC) Allegedly Violated: 1, 2, 16, 28

Allegation 1 (SOC 1)

- The client-guest has experienced a pattern of inappropriate and intimidating conduct by a group of staff members. She also reports witnessing similar conduct directed toward other female guests. For example, staff falsely told a female guest that she had received a DOS and would be removed from the shelter. The guest reportedly had an anxiety attack because she had previously been removed from another location with her dog and had nowhere else to go. Staff later dismissed the incident as a joke! In June 2026, police were called regarding a guest experiencing a mental health crisis. The complainant stated that she heard a staff member say that they “would love to see that bitch get shot”! She also reported hearing staff refer to a guest as a “broke bitch.” According to the complainant, one of these comments was made within the guest’s hearing and was later dismissed by staff as being part of song lyrics (and not directed at any guest).
- *The shelter conducted an extensive investigation and discussed this situation at length with the complainant. Specific staff names were not provided, so they were “unable to hold single individuals directly accountable.” However, “out of an abundance of caution, they “reassigned some floater staff to different floors.” Furthermore, all supervisors were instructed to “make mandatory announcements at the start of every shift reminding staff of the requirement to remain professional, respectful, and courteous to all guests and team members at all times.” Finally, they, have assigned a mandatory training on Code of Ethics and Boundaries to all staff members, to be completed by September 30th.*

Allegation 2 (SOCs 1, 2)

- The complainant expressed a great deal of concern that headcounts and wellness checks have not been completed on her floor. Staff have reportedly failed to follow the procedure of calling her to her assigned floor. The complainant stated that she could be written up if she entered the floor without being called, meaning staff’s failure to follow the procedure could expose her to discipline. According to the complainant in July 2026, staff reportedly questioned the complainant repeatedly about when she would be leaving and denied her entry into the building. The complainant stated that she had not completed an exit slip, had not been informed that she was being discharged or denied services, and that her name remained on the shelter roster. Throughout this period, the

complainant reports experiencing ongoing mockery, laughter, remarks made within her hearing, and intimidation by the same group of staff members. She stated that these interactions have occurred too frequently to identify each one individually but believes the incidents described above demonstrate a broader pattern of inappropriate and potentially retaliatory treatment.

- *See the response to Allegation #1. Wellness check logs for the 1st floor were reviewed. Due to occasional short-staffing, responsibility for these checks falls on the floaters and 1st-floor staff to perform and record in Salesforce every two hours, backed by staff signatures. Upon reviewing these records, they found no discrepancies; all scheduled wellness checks were completed and logged at the appropriate times.*

Allegation 3 (SOC 16)

- According to the complainant in June 2026, the complainant requested that staff charge her phone, which she described as a standard service available to guests. She stated that the service was deliberately delayed.
- *As expressed during our discussion, you mentioned feeling that we are like family to you, and in speaking with our staff, they share that same warm regard. The manager wanted the client to know they are truly sorry she experienced these negative interactions with staff and to assure her that if she can provide specific names or witnesses in the future, swift and proper disciplinary action will be taken. In the meantime, he made it crystal clear to all personnel that unprofessionalism will not be tolerated and that anyone failing to meet our standards will be held accountable.*

Allegation 4 (SOC 28)

- The staff allegedly refused to return the complainant's laundry. She received it only after another employee retrieved it and handed it directly to her.
- *The shelter apologized for any error staff made in handling the laundry.*

A Woman's Place Client 1 (5)

Submitted to SMC: 7/7/26 Sent to shelter: 7/8/26 SMC received response: 7/16/26
Standards of Care (SOC) Allegedly Violated: 1, 15, 30

Allegation 1 (SOCs 1, 15, 30)

- The complainant says staff, misinterpreting events, came into the dorm and said to the complainant, "You need to stop being so loud." "Quiet, down please!" The complainant did not respond, but the client who had actually been making noise continued ranting. The complainant calmly asked her to stop. Laying her coat on her bed, she then went to the dining hall for dinner. Soon after, the complainant returned to the dorm to iron her clothes for work, which had been her routine. She opened her drawers and left them open, finished ironing, and began getting ready for bed. As she was standing over the bed starting to put on clean sheets, the other guest started yelling again and did so till staff entered the dorm area. Staff walked in and (again) started berating the complainant, not the one making the noise. The complainant responded, "I didn't make noise, I was just standing here." Another employee then opened the reception door and ostentatiously started completing a write-up form. The two staffers then colluded to falsely document the situation. Again, the complainant said, "I was [quietly] making my bed, I never opened or closed my drawers. You came in because [redacted] was yelling." Staff, according to the complainant, intentionally set her up to have her exited from the shelter.

- *The shelter reviewed the guest complaint, camera footage, the Swing Shift Report, and spoke with staff involved in the incident. This did not support the allegation against staff. They did report hearing yelling between the guests and observed the guest standing near Bed #[redacted] while making comments that Bed #[redacted] was "drunk" and "belligerent." Staff intervened, reminded both guests of quiet hours expectations, addressed the inappropriate language used during the interaction, and monitored the dorm area to prevent further escalation. The guest was later provided the opportunity to complete and submit a Guest Input Form. The available camera footage does not capture the interactions inside the dorm and therefore could not independently verify all verbal exchanges described in the complaint. Based on the evidence reviewed, staff responded to the disturbance, documented the incident, and addressed the situation in accordance with shelter procedures.*

A Woman's Place Client 2 (14)

Submitted to SMC: 7/28/26 Sent to shelter: 7/29/26 SMC received response: 8/17/26 (late)
Standards of Care (SOC) Allegedly Violated: 1, 28

Allegation 1 (SOCs 1, 28)

- The complainant says staff behaved unprofessionally. She went to the lobby and requested, via a written sign, "Can I do laundry & have my plate?" A staffer replied, "Someone will be down to meet you." She saw his "refusal to assist her as part of a pattern of harassment, bullying, and aggressive behaviors." She asked if he could accompany her, as no other employees were available. She did not want "to be in an enclosed space with the [shift supervisor] without any cameras or witnesses." She says that individual consistently "harasses, bullies, and intimidates" her. The staffer "became agitated" and said, "No, someone will be down to help you—you don't get to decide." She asked him to please assist her, but his coworker interjected, and "began coaching" him. She said, "[redacted name], is she making you feel uncomfortable? Tell her she's making you uncomfortable, and you can't take her to do her laundry." Looking down, [redacted name] "repeated it verbatim like a sheepish kid." Then [shift supervisor] said, "Ok, he told you he wasn't taking you, now you're harassing us." In the end, she was unable to do her laundry. She argued the personal relationship between the two employees impaired their judgment, to her detriment. She also believes staff claim they cannot hear her in order to "intentionally provoke frustration and escalate conflict." The manager even told her that the employee mentioned above "is not going to serve you, he's not going to talk to you. You cannot address him, and you need to stop talking to him."
- *The shelter insists staff did not refuse the guest access to laundry. On July 18, the guest specifically requested that [redacted] assist her because she did not want to work with other staff. [Redacted] explained that he was uncomfortable providing assistance under the circumstances and that another staff member could assist her. The guest did not want to work with other staff members. Ultimately, her laundry did not end up being done that evening. Staff were subsequently coached that, regardless of interpersonal discomfort, required services must continue to be provided unless there is a legitimate safety concern. The July 19 records also show that the guest had already completed the two-load daily laundry limit. Staff explained the limit and did not permit additional loads, regardless of what she claimed happened the day before. The records further document that staff had assisted the guest with laundry earlier that day. Therefore, the available documentation does not support a finding that staff intentionally denied her laundry services. Regarding the July 21 incident, staff reported that the guest requested paper and a marker. Staff provided*

the materials they had available, which was scratch paper and pens, and redirected her to the Guest Input Forms to write on. Staff do not have independent access to the supply closet where additional blank paper and markers were stored, only managers have access to the supply room. The staff present during this incident did ask what she wanted after providing scratch paper and a pen. Security intervenes when guests are becoming escalated with staff. She testified she told the guest, “[Redacted] asked you to leave the lobby area” to wait on the bench in the hall before redirecting her to the available Guest Input Forms. The shelter did not see that records substantiated a refusal to provide service.

Allegation 2 (SOCs 1, 9)

- The complainant the client was refused a meal. Staff claimed they had not received the usual note she leaves, in accord with an understanding worked out with the site Director. In what seemed like retaliation for requesting services she was entitled to, [staff] made as if to give her a handful of write-ups. In fact, these were never handed to the complainant and appear to have just been part of the above-noted pattern of harassment/intimidation.
- *On July 23, the guest did not request a saved plate in advance, and there were no extra plates available by the time she returned to site. This guest knows that a plate may not be available if she does not submit a saved plate request in advance. Afterwards, staff checked the refrigerator in the kitchen for extra plates, and only saw one saved for a different guest. When this was shared this with the guest, she stated, “That’s not my problem.” Staff offered a snack for the guest. Later, the second issue involving the guest occurred in connection with the shelter's mask-distribution protocol. Staff were given a verbal directive by a Director earlier that week to use gloves when handing masks to guests, and staff attempted to follow that directive. The guest insisted on reaching into the box of masks herself. The guest reached around the gloved hands of the security guard to reach into the box of masks after she was told multiple times not to do so. A written warning was prepared after staff consulted management regarding the incident, and an attempt was made to deliver it to the guest that evening. When approached, the guest declined to look up, take off her headphones, or acknowledge staff in any way. The written warning was subsequently reviewed by the Director and overturned the following day. Although the guest perceived the preparation of the warning as retaliatory, the available documentation indicates that staff sought management guidance before preparing it and that the warning was ultimately rescinded after reviewing the incident and communication of the changed protocol for mask distribution. Overall, while the interactions described reflect areas where staff communication and de-escalation could be improved, the documentation reviewed was not felt to substantiate intentional denial of required shelter services. Nor was there evidence of retaliation or harassment.*

Ansonia (6)

Submitted to SMC: 7/10/26 Sent to shelter: 7/13/26 SMC received response: 7/15/26
Standards of Care (SOC) Allegedly Violated: 1, 3, 8, 12, 13, 15, 30

Allegation 1 (SOCs 1, 8, 30)

- The complainant According to the client, the Asst. Director and other employees consistently treat guests with contempt. When not long after Five Keys took over, furniture, TVs, fans, and min-fridges were taken away, staff said it was “because you do not deserve it” or “you have no rights,” and threaten to “write up” people who argue with them. Those working the graveyard shift are particularly harsh and ruthless. Case managers are not providing useful guidance, and, along with the Assistant Director, have pushed or strongly suggested to older clients that they

should find somewhere else to live. They call guests things like “entitled” when they ask for services. Finally, staff discriminate against elderly and disabled clients, denying use of the elevators even to those with visible mobility challenges.

- *The shelter assured Shelter Monitoring that staff all receive training in trauma-informed care, de-escalation, client engagement, and the Shelter Standards of Care. The allegations “have not been substantiated.” Since assuming operations on April 1, 2026, Five Keys has implemented several facility-wide changes to improve safety and sanitation. Glass-top desks were removed from guest rooms because glass furniture is prohibited for safety reasons. Mini refrigerators were also removed because food was being stored in shared rooms, creating sanitation concerns and increasing the risk of pests. These changes applied to all rooms and were “communicated through written memos and multiple Town Hall meetings.” They said that the “allegation that guests with disabilities are denied elevator access is not consistent with shelter operations. The elevators are available for use by both guests and staff, and Five Keys provides reasonable accommodations in accordance with ADA requirements.” Case managers are working with residents on individualized housing plans and finding resources. “Discussions about alternative housing occur as part of housing planning and are not intended to pressure guests to leave the shelter.”*

Allegation 2 (SOCs 3, 12)

- The client The client says the shelter has not provided mattress covers, and that some mattresses are visibly dirty/ moldy. Also, bedding is not laundered weekly—not even monthly. Bath towels are in very short supply and often unavailable. Shared restrooms frequently are all out of toilet paper.
- *Five Keys responded that when they assumed operations, management identified that many mattresses did not have protective plastic mattress covers. “Replacement covers were immediately ordered, and the maintenance and janitorial teams have been installing them room by room. Due to the size of the shelter and the number of occupied beds, this work is being completed in phases. The shelter provides clean bedding and bath towels. Every resident is assigned a weekly laundry day, and the laundry schedule is posted on each residential floor. Shared restrooms are routinely stocked with toilet paper and other hygiene supplies, and supplies are replenished as needed.”*

Allegation 3 (SOC 13)

- The complainant has a hard time sleeping because employees on the night shift talk loudly in the hallway and conduct overly frequent wellness checks.
- *The shelter says it “provides guests with the opportunity to sleep as required. “The allegation that staff conduct repeated wellness checks throughout the night is not consistent with shelter policy. The final routine wellness check is conducted at approximately 10:45 p.m., with the next routine check occurring at approximately 8:00 a.m. Overnight staff are expected to maintain a quiet environment during sleeping hours unless an emergency requires staff intervention.”*

Allegation 4 (SOC 15)

- “Not all clients are given storage (lockers, dressers, etc.). Storing medicine and medical equipment in a safe place where it can be retrieved when needed is a challenge.”
- *“Guests are provided storage space within their shared rooms. Management has identified that some rooms currently do not have an individual locker for every guest. Five Keys is actively working to purchase and install additional lockers so each resident has secure individual storage. This process is underway and will be completed as equipment becomes available.”*

Bayview Drop-in Center (7)

Submitted to SMC: 7/ 6/26 Sent to shelter: 7/14/26 SMC received response: 7/23/26

Standards of Care (SOC) Allegedly Violated: 1, 2, 8, 30

Allegation 1 (SOCs 1, 30)

- According to the client, employees of the shelter treated her unfairly and with contempt. Specifically, a security person, “who smelled very strongly of marijuana,” falsely accused her of insulting another client, i.e., calling her nasty. The complainant assured the Shelter Monitoring team that she did not do so. She admits she referred to a mess of crumbs that another guest had left behind as “nasty,” but did not engage in an argument or dispute of any kind. In fact, the other guest recognized she had made a mess and voluntarily tried cleaning it up. The complainant was unfairly exited from the center by this security employee “who seemed too high” to patiently, and professionally assess the situation.
- *The shelter manager attempted to reconcile the client with the peer advisor (not a security guard, as the client had assumed). She did not recognize him/his face. He was amenable to using deescalation strategies and had no hard feelings or animus toward the client.*

Allegation 2 (SOC 2)

- The complainant also asserts that in ushering her out of the drop-in center, this guard grabbed her and threatened her. When she objected to his assessment of the situation and accused him of being high, saying she would call the police, he said, “I could slap you down and no one would say a thing.” (The police were in fact called.)
- *The shelter says the client stated to them that the incident had been a misunderstanding and expressed that she did not want to continue “dragging” the situation on. They went over the program’s expectations with her, emphasizing that all participants are expected to treat staff and fellow clients with respect and to refrain from any physical contact.*

Allegation 3 (SOCs 8, 30)

- The client is over 60, and disabled. She has a hearing problem. But her disabilities were in no way accommodated. Staff were negligent in making no attempt to smooth things out and de-escalate, evincing an inadequate level of training and/or ability needed for the role in which they are serving.”
- *The shelter insists they considered her well-being a priority and are being as flexible as they can.*

Dolores (9)

Submitted to SMC: 7/17 /26 Sent to shelter: 7/29/26 SMC received response: **none**

Standards of Care (SOC) Allegedly Violated: 1

Allegation 1 (SOC 1)

- The complainant told Shelter Monitoring that a new client completed intake and was assigned a locker that was still assigned to the complainant. Although the complainant had previously been moved to a new bed, she had not been assigned a corresponding locker and still had the key to her original locker. Staff provided the new client with another key, allowing him to open the locker and access the complainant’s belongings. He removed her belongings and placed them on her bed. Although nothing was taken, the complainant stated that she “felt violated” by the incident. She further alleges staff have not provided her with a key to a locker corresponding with her new bed and that cleaning staff sometimes move clients’ belongings to “random

locations,” where other clients may mistakenly take them, believing the items are donations. Generally, she alleges staff do not follow procedures related to property. She also expressed concern that staff do not adequately respond when clients “expose themselves” in shared areas.

- *The shelter did not provide a response.*

MSC-South (10)

Submitted to SMC: 7/17/26 Sent to shelter: 7/17/26 SMC received response: 7/20/26
Standards of Care (SOC) Allegedly Violated: 1

Allegation 1 (SOC 1)

- The complainant claimed a staff member repeatedly struck him on the arm, causing cuts and a scar. The complainant, who acknowledged he was intoxicated, stated he was attempting to eat in the dayroom when he began feeling nauseated, leaned back, and closed his eyes. A female staff member approached him and said something that he could not recall. He asked her for a cold towel for his face. According to the complainant, the staff member instead began striking his arm repeatedly with the back of her hand. He stated that she was wearing large rings, which cut his arm. He then stood up and yelled that no one should touch him. The staff member contacted security, and the complainant called 911. He alleges that staff falsely reported that he had threatened to harm the staff member. The complainant reported that police responded to the incident and photographed the injuries to his arm.
- *The shelter says the complainant did not respond when asked if he needed help. After being tapped on the arm he responded aggressively, specifically telling an employee he would “f*** [her] up” when she got off work. A DOS was upheld at arbitration.*

Division Circle (11)

Submitted to SMC: 7/13/26 Sent to shelter: 7/20/26 SMC received response: 7/30/26
Standards of Care (SOC) Allegedly Violated: 1, 15, 30

Allegation 1 (SOCs 1, 15, 30)

- The complainant was exited from the shelter by mistake early on the morning of June 22, 2026. It was the policy of the shelter to exit clients for “bed abandonment” if they were absent from the shelter for 48 hours or more. In connection with this, the “clock” would restart if the client checked in and did not check out for one hour or more. In this instance, the client had checked in for 49 minutes but was, per this rule, exited. Subsequently, he was not able to retrieve his stored property right away and learned shortly thereafter that the shelter had disposed of this, plus some “irreplaceable documents.” He calculated that the combined value of these items approaches \$2,000. The next day the shelter received clarification from HSH that the “48-hour bed abandonment rule” should not have been invoked, insofar as the client had checked in on June 20, even though for less than a full hour. The complainant felt the decision of the shelter’s manager to dispose of his property—valuable items—while he was actively (and correctly) disputing his exit, evidenced a lack of empathy and respect. And the consequences of this decision, despite the shelter’s unawareness of the fact that they were following an unauthorized protocol, should not be borne by him. He requested any documentation completed by shelter staff when they disposed of his property and that he be reimbursed for his loss.
- *The shelter said the complainant was reminded that he had until June 29, 2026 to retrieve his abandoned property. The site Director extended the time to retrieve his abandoned property, which was discarded on July 9. He had “ample opportunity to retrieve their abandoned property...yet*

Central Waterfront Nav	60 beds													0		
Compass Family UAV	130 beds													0		
Dolores Street	92 beds	1												1	1	
Division Circle Nav	186 beds	1												1		
Ellis Semi-Congregate	130 beds															
Embarcadero Nav Cntr	200 beds	2												2		
Gough Cabins	70 rooms															
Hamilton	27 fams															
Harbor House Family	30 fams															
Hospitality House	22 Beds															
Interfaith Winter Shelter	30-80 bed															
Jerrold Commons	68 Beds															
Lark Inn	36 beds															
MSC South Shelter	327 beds	1												1		
Lower Polk TAY	75 beds															
Mission NRC	30 chairs															
Next Door	334 beds	2												2		
Oasis Family	54 beds															
Sanctuary (ECS)	200 beds													3		
Taimon Booten	75 beds															
AWP Drop In	30 chairs															
A Woman's Place	25 beds	2												2	1	
Total		15												15	2	

*Late responses are in red ¹ Multiple complaints from the same client(s) ² Transition from Urban Alchemy to Five Keys April 2026

Standard of Care	Number of allegations of violations of this Standard
------------------	--

Note that each complaint can include alleged violations of more than one SOC or multiple violations of the same SOC.

[illegible]

15	Storage	3												3		.07
16	Electric outlets	1												1		.023
17	Notice re repairs															
18	Phone availability															
19	22 inches between beds															
20	Postings in Spanish															
21	Translation services															
24	Denial of Service > 5PM															
25	Employee badges															
26	Transportation available															
28	Laundry problems	2												2		.047
29	OSHA															
30a	Training - hand washing															
30b	-Food handling	1												1		.047
30c	-Emergency procedures															
30d	-Aggressive clients															
30e	-Mental health issues															
30g	-ADA requirements	1												1		.023
30h	-Shelter training manual	3												3		.07
30i	-Cultural humility	2												2		.047
Total		43												43		1

Staff Update and Committee Membership

Sunset of the Shelter Monitoring Committee (See [260217 - Leg Final](#))

The Board of Supervisors voted to eliminate the Committee effective 6/29/2026 and the mayor approved this.