



Shelter Monitoring Committee

MEMORANDUM [DRAFT]

TO: Shelter Monitoring Committee
FROM: Committee Staff
DATE: July 31, 2025
RE: June 2025 Staff SOC Report

Client Complaints

11 formal complaints were submitted through the SMC to City shelters in June of 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.*

Ansonia Hotel

Client 1 (108)

Submitted to SMC: 5/28/25 Sent to shelter: 6/23/25 SMC received response: 6/27/25

Standards of Care (SOCs) Allegedly Violated: 1, 2, 31

Allegation 1 (SOCs 1, 2, 31)

- The complainant reports she received a denial of service after being accused of threatening behavior toward a supervisor. She had been experiencing ongoing mistreatment and felt targeted over time, which led to an emotional reaction. On the day in question, the complainant's roommate allegedly woke up and began shouting at her, accusing her of letting the roommate's cat out through the window. During this confrontation, a shelter supervisor also yelled at her. The complainant reports that, overwhelmed with having experienced an ongoing biased attitude from the supervisor, she lost her temper and made the remark, stating, "If I were a man, I would kick your ass, but I'm not, I'm a woman, so I can't." The complainant states she had attempted to express concern about the supervisor's language and attitude, but was instead told to "shut up" and go back to her room. The complainant believes staff exhibited unprofessional behavior, as well as the lack of appropriate response when she tried to voice her concerns.
- *The shelter agreed staff should always treat guests with dignity and respect. In this case, when the complainant was issued the denial of service, she was asked if she would like a hearing. She refused the hearing. She was told she had 5 business days to change her mind. They never received a grievance from the client. Had she submitted one, they would have responded immediately. The supervisor in question has completed an online de-escalation training via Paycom.*

Bayshore Navigation Center (109)

Client 1

Submitted to SMC: 5/28/25 Sent to shelter: 6/23/25 SMC received response: 5/27/25

Standard of Care (SOCs) Violated: 1, 2, 31

- The complainant reports she began to feel overwhelmed due to being around many people. To manage her emotions and de-escalate her frustration, she attempted to step outside for some air. However, staff on duty refused to allow her to go outside. The complainant states that she tried to express her emotional state to the staff member at the front desk. In response, the staff member reportedly told her, “You can just go to another shelter.” The complainant found this comment dismissive and unhelpful, which further escalated her frustration. She further reports that the staff member began laughing at her reaction. The complainant informed him that being laughed at and mocked is a known emotional trigger for her, but he continued to laugh, which she found deeply upsetting and inappropriate. The complainant believes the shelter must address the lack of empathy and professionalism shown by staff, and to train them to react in a trauma-informed manner to clients.
- *The site states an emergency situation occurred, requiring temporary restrictions on guest movement. During such incidents, staff are instructed to limit entry/exit for safety until the situation is resolved (e.g., during SFPD or medical interventions). While this protocol led to the complaint, they acknowledge that staff should always provided a respectful explanation of the restriction, offer trauma-informed alternatives, and avoid dismissive or unprofessional language. Staff’s reported response of “You can just go to another shelter” and laughter are unacceptable and inconsistent with our standards. This has been addressed this with all staff, emphasizing situational awareness, respectful communication, and proactive de-escalation—even during emergencies. They say they reinforced protocols for explaining safety restrictions empathetically and identifying alternatives for guests in distress. The site manager also met personally with the complainant who indicated this incident occurred early in her stay and that she now feels well-supported at the shelter. All Five Keys staff complete annual mandated trainings, including but not limited to: Trauma-Informed Care, De-escalation Techniques, and Safe/Appropriate Client Interaction. Additionally, daily pre-shift briefings reinforce respectful service standards and emergency protocols..*

Ellis Hotel (110)

Client 1

Submitted to SMC: 5/29/25 Sent to shelter: 6/18/25 SMC received response: 6/21/25

Standard of Care (SOC) Violated: 1, 15

Allegation #1 (SOCs 1, 15)

- The client reports shelter kitchen staff have been ending mealtimes earlier than what is posted. They rush through the meals as if they want to finish fast, not caring if people go without eating.
- *The shelter responded that these allegations are without merit and appear to have been filed in retribution for the shelter’s having warned the client to avoid violating the 48-hour rule.*

Dolores Street (113)

Client 1

Submitted to SMC: 6/10/25 Sent to shelter: 6/11/25 SMC received response: 6/23/25

Standard of Care (SOC) Violated: 1, 11

Allegation #1 (SOCs 1, 11)

- The complainant reports on or around 5/25/2025 or 5/26/2025 at 2:30am, he witnessed staff in one of the Jazzy bathroom stalls smoking a cigarette. The complainant went to Supervisor Frank and informed him that he has health problems that were exacerbated by secondhand smoke, and the supervisor replied that if he did not witness it, he cannot do anything, despite it being a report about one of his staff. The supervisor said he would inform higher management but never checked in with the complainant. The complainant continued having health problems, so he spoke to a staff lead, who deflected saying it must be from people smoking in the courtyard.
- *Shelter management informed the complainant that the facility is a smoking-welcome shelter (outdoors), but staff are certainly not allowed to smoke in the restroom. Staff denied doing so. The complainant was upset, citing health issues that were being affected by the smoke and did not allow further conversation.*

Lark Inn (114)

Client 1

Submitted to SMC: 6/12/25 Sent to shelter: 6/13/25 SMC received response: 6/20/25

Standard of Care (SOC) Violated: 1, 2

Allegation #1 (SOCs 1, 2)

- The complainant states she was retaliated against for pointing out issues at the shelter, like staff eating the clients' food, and for pointing out abuses of authority, and speaking up in defense of her pregnant twin sister (who was also treated with disrespect and lack of professionalism). She was spoken to with disrespect by a case manager and other shelter employees. The animus from the CM built up to the point where she screamed at the complainant after she stayed outside the shelter one night. Finally, "the daughter of a good friend of [the CM]" assaulted her. The assault took place near (well within 200 feet of) the shelter's entrance. The manager and supervisor who witnessed this did not make any attempt to dissuade the assailant or otherwise intervene, according to the complainant, and only belatedly called the police, i.e., after the assailant departed. The complainant had previously reported the assailant was becoming increasingly threatening. Management was aware of threats she had made and should have done more to provide a safe environment for the complainant and other guests. Worse, the complainant believes the CM either put her attacker up to assaulting her or at minimum said things that led to the attack. As she was punching the complainant in the face, the attacker said something to the effect that, "this is for [the CM]." The complainant only punched back in self defense. Though the shelter knew she did not instigate the altercation, they used the incident to DOS her.
- *The shelter argued that grievances submitted by the complainant were addressed by program leadership. They heard from the client directly on how to correct the situation. Their disciplinary process normally can't be shared, due to confidentiality. They noted that the client did not work directly with this Case Manager. Regarding the altercation that led to the client's immediate DOS, both staff members mentioned during the altercation off the clock for a lunch break. Shelter staff monitor video surveillance while on shift, but their primary focus is within the shelter itself.*

Upon being called by the client, both staff members returned to work and utilized CPI training skills to de-escalate the altercation. Larkin Street has a strict hands-off policy and does not physically intervene during physical altercations. Staff followed the agency protocol by keeping other clients within the shelter and used various statements to de-escalate, as well as warning the clients that the police would be called prior to calling. The client can be seen running away from the altercation and then running back while staff ask her not to, actively re-engaging. Staff were unable to allow the client back into the shelter as she charged the door while verbally threatening a client inside with physical harm. During a subsequent hearing, she further threatened staff involved, stating "One of ya'll is going to die for your job." The program to uphold their decision. After the hearing the client continued to try and physically harm other clients outside of our Community Drop-in Center. As this date, the client has declined arbitration. During the client's time at the Lark Inn shelter concern for the client's safety was taken seriously. The client declined a safety transfer, three Transitional Living placements, and two Permanent Supportive Housing placements. The shelter stated they were actively investigating the claims that client who struck the complainant has a personal connection to a staff member. Larkin Street staff are required to disclose any ties to clients. The client described in the complaint is not a Lark Inn client; however Larkin Street has other residential and non-residential programs, and the client is known to them. All those involved in this altercation blamed one another. Since the actual physical altercation is not viewable from the security footage, it would be hard to show that the complainant's outlook is true (especially as other factors weigh against this).

MSC-South (115)

Client 1

Submitted to SMC: 6/11/25 Sent to shelter: 6/18/25 SMC received response: 6/27/25

Standard of Care (SOC) Violated: 1, 2, 31

Allegation #1 (SOCs 1, 2, 31)

- The client reported retaliation after filing a complaint about staff playing loud music in the last week of May. She had asked the staff to lower the volume or use headphones. The day after filing the complaint, a staff member named John claimed she hadn't signed in for 24 hours and her bed would be dropped. The complainant contacted "General Assistance (GA), which confirmed her bed was still active. While trying to mediate between the staff member and GA, the staffer became aggressive, insisted the bed was dropped, and told the complainant to find a new one. When the complainant referenced the 48-hour policy, the staff became confrontational. She was given only 1.5 hours to resolve the issue, despite available beds and GA confirmation. Upon returning from the GA office, she found her belongings packed, her lock broken, and items missing. She received no written notice or explanation and was not given a chance to secure her belongings. The complainant reports she was missing about \$300.00 worth of clothing items.
- *The shelter had a significantly different take on events. They stated that the complainant was sleeping on the wrong bed. She claimed the swing shift told her that she could do so because the bed she was assigned to was right under a vent, which bothered her. The supervisor explained she would have to request a reasonable accommodation. She was shown four beds that were not near a vent; however, she refused them. Coincidentally, the 48-hour exit list came out and her bed was on the list. She had not been checking in per the rule. She was advised to go to 1235 Mission Street to ask that her bed be reinstated. She responded that she could have "CAAP reinstate [her] bed over the phone," and said she would take care of the situation. She was asked to remove her property but left without clearing her bed. They had to cut her lock and remove her property. When CAAP reinstated her shortly afterwards it was to the same bed, which was not to her liking.*

*She then told the shelter supervisor she was “going to have someone beat [his] a** when [he] get off work,” at that point she was told she was being denied service for creditable threats of violence and she would have to exit the facility. Management was not able to interview the complainant.*

Larkin Street Youth (117)

Client 1

Submitted to SMC: 6/11/25 Sent to shelter: 6/18/25 SMC received response: 6/27/25

Standard of Care (SOC) Violated: 1, 2, 31

Allegation #1 (SOCs 1, 2, 31)

- According to the complainant, she and her sister were outside the shelter when two staff members exited the building. The complainant was sitting on the sidewalk, visibly ill. Her sister, accompanied by her dog, joined her. Two other clients of the shelter and two individuals who are not residents of the shelter but receive services elsewhere approached the complainant and her sister in an aggressive manner. In response, the complainant says she called out to the shelter employees. They witnessed the escalation but took no action. She was physically restrained while her sister was attacked. The complainant’s sister said she was not going to fight in front of the shelter. One assailant chased her sister across the street and continued assaulting her. Her sister defended herself, and the attacker then pulled her hair. A client who attempted to intervene was punched in the face. The aggressors left the area once the police were called. The complainant further states she is 11–12 weeks pregnant and was placed in additional risk because of this. She holds the Larkin shelter responsible, because staff witnessed the ongoing harassment and did not intervene appropriately prior to or during the violent assault.
- *The staff members mentioned off the clock for lunch break. Shelter staff monitor video surveillance while on shift, but their primary focus is within the shelter itself. Upon being called by the client, both staff members returned to work and utilized CPI training skills to de-escalate the altercation. Larkin Street has a strict hands-off policy and does not physically intervene during physical altercations. Staff followed the agency protocol by keeping other clients within the shelter and used various statements to de-escalate, as well as warning the clients that the police would be called prior to calling. Staff witnesses report the client was restrained by an individual who is a friend of the client (and did so) for her safety.*

Allegation #2 (SOC 1)

- According to the complainant, Ivoryanna and Ashanti of violating HIPAA by sharing confidential shelter information, making threats, spreading rumors about her pregnancy, and involving outsiders to cause conflict. The complainant states she does not feel safe returning to the shelter and is requesting immediate assistance with permanent housing. She also expresses her intent to take legal action and has filed multiple grievances regarding the behavior of certain clients and staff.
- *Larkin Street requires staff to comply with HIPAA, but clients cannot be stopped from sharing confidential information or spreading rumors. See the Shelter Grievance Ordinance (SGO). Clients can receive a warning notice for making threats and or an immediate denial of service as per rules 2b General threats that lack specificity and 1c Credible threats of violence that include specific actions or plans when threats are made in front of staff members. Due to the limitations of SGO, staff members cannot write warnings or issues immediate denials of service based on reports of clients only. Larkin Street staff do however offer restorative meetings for clients involved and offer a safety transfer. Staff have not heard or seen credible or general threats made towards the complainant.*

Mission Cabins (118)

Client 1

Submitted to SMC: 6/18/25 Sent to shelter: 6/24/25 SMC received response: 7/1/25

Standard of Care (SOC) Violated: 1, 2, 31

Allegation #1 (SOCs 1, 2, 31)

- The complainant alleges retaliation following a prior internal complaint. She had raised concerns about a group granted site access by claiming affiliation with a religious sect. The complainant attempted to complain about their behavior to a manager, but her concerns were dismissed. They were eventually banned. Soon thereafter she found the kitchen unattended. She asked the above-referenced manager about the schedule and was told the staff were on break. The complainant noted this was a recurring issue and requested consistency. The manager did not seem to like being given advice and visited the complainant's room about an hour later, telling her she would be written up for being rude and demanding, adding, "I have to document everything because you're going to email [CBO leader's name redacted]." She also commented on the complainant's length of stay and implied it was at her discretion. When the complainant asked, "Is that a threat?" she walked away.
- *Due to the site being short-staffed, the manager in question was covering the kitchen. At the point where there were no more guests in or near the kitchen, she went change the battery to her Walkie Talkie. Shortly thereafter the complainant came yelling, "Why isn't the kitchen opened, I need someone to get me hot water." The manager replied, "Staff are on break, but I can help you." The complainant said, "You don't need to take breaks." The manager went to the kitchen and hot water was dispensed. Nothing was said to the guest that was retaliatory and any words of disrespect. She stated to [CBO leader's name redacted] that the reason why she filed a complaint is because she was thinking she had been targeted to be removed from Mission Cabins. Once she understood this was not the case, she was relieved. The shelter will respect the client's wishes for management not to talk to her unless it is an important matter no one else can relay.*

Sanctuary (116)

Client 1

Submitted to SMC: 6/11/25 Sent to shelter: 6/18/25 SMC received response: 6/24/25

Standard of Care (SOC) Violated: 1, 2, 31

Allegation #1 (SOCs 1, 2, 31)

- The complainant asserts that a shelter employee made homophobic slurs. He was awakened by the declaration of, "I don't care what that fa*****y ass..." When questioned, the staffer boldly admitted it was him and told him to mind his own business. The complainant pointed he felt targeted as a member of the LGBT+ community. The staffer said he could leave if he had a problem with it. The complainant then went to see the attendant on duty in the downstairs lobby, whose response was, "It's just a word." This was not the first time the complainant has heard both staff and residents use homophobic slurs.
- *The staffer in question was coached not to make such inappropriate verbal comments, and he agreed to do better. He made the inappropriate verbal comment while speaking to someone on his phone. (He is no longer with Sanctuary shelter.) All site staff are trained, and guests are expected to treat others with dignity, civility, and courtesy.*

Allegation #2 (SOCs 1, 2)

- The complainant was repeatedly punched by another guest. He shouted for help. The attacker admitted to attacking the complainant and was DOS'd. The next day the complainant saw the same person hanging out in the parking lot area of the shelter. The complainant immediately reported his presence, but by the time he went to point him out, the attacker was no longer visible. The shelter supervisor essentially dismissed his concern. Soon after, the complainant attempted to leave the building and saw the same individual again, across the street from the facility. He attacked the complainant with a metal canister, striking him in the head and neck.
- *The shelter responded that another client began yelling at the complainant to stop telling people he was a thief "or else." He said several things that could be interpreted as unspecified threats. The complainant responded by yelling back. The Service Coordinator assigned to the second floor separated the two and spoke to both. The Supervisor on duty did the same and the situation seemed resolved. Shortly thereafter, however, voices were raised, and the complainant reported the other client had punched him. Some clients leave peacefully after they are denied services, while others remain on the public sidewalk. Even when police officers come, they cannot force the former guest to leave. The supervisor insists he did not tell the complainant he "deserved it." The shelter does not condone any guest or staff making inappropriate comments or insulting anyone.*

Client 2 (119)

Submitted to SMC: 6/11/25 Sent to shelter: 6/18/25 SMC received response: 6/27/25

Standard of Care (SOC) Violated: 1, 2, 31

Allegation #1 (SOCs 1, 2, 31)

- The complainant alleges ongoing harassment and even stalking by staff. One openly talks to her coworkers about the client in a racist way. She also believes they intentionally placed a mentally imbalanced, aggressive, racist client in the bed next to hers. This client repeatedly called her a "bit**" and made blatantly racist comments and threats, like, "I can't have no white people here," and "I'm going to whup you." (When the client complained, other staffers were able to persuade her to desist.) Another staffer made a number of threats, including, "We'll hurt your children." This seemed connected to the complainant's having brought his coworker's unprofessional and racist comments to the attention of shelter management. He said, "[Name redacted] has been my friend for ten years and I won't let her be hurt."
- *Staff denied stalking, harassing, or engaging in talking negatively of the complainant. The client mentioned has a dog and was placed because the space has room for her and her dog. No one wanted to instigate trouble. It was noted that the client also complained that the complainant is stalking her. A bed switch was in the works to ease the tension. (No response was provided vis-à-vis the retribution for complaints against one staffer by her colleague.)*

Allegation #2 (SOCs 1, 2)

- The complainant has experienced low-level harassment and sees indications some of the staff are "stalking" her. One explicitly told the client he does not like her. On May 21, due to an outbreak of "sinus infection," the complainant and others were temporarily moved to the Windsor Hotel. Some of those with her there insinuated that this shelter employee wanted to cause problems for her. While she was travelling later in May, a camper she did not know yelled out this same employee's name towards her. He called her a bigot and threatened to steal her gear. Other campers reported this, and park staff took him into the office to question him.

She understands this sounds unlikely, and she does not know how he knew her, but she is sure she is not imagining this. On May 25, the complainant received a text from [number redacted], asking if she wanted to have Chinese food for dinner. She suspects it was from an employee who has invited her to a restaurant nearby before. This employee knows she does not date. A manager at the shelter misled her about breakfast. In addition to threats and teasing, he has taken great interest in her affairs, and is even somehow aware of her specific plans. This kind of inappropriate fixation on her by ECS staffers has gone on for years. Her complaints are not taken seriously. Staff say she “has no rights.”

- *The shelter claims they “are unaware of what happened at [redacted] Hotel. The employee in question also stated he has not engaged the complainant in any conversation, and he is unclear where these allegations comes from. The complainant can request a safety transfer when she is ready as we want her to feel safe and not harassed as she has indicated. (Note client specifically stated she did not want a safety transfer.) Sanctuary treats all client with respect and dignity. Note also that SMC asked that the shelter provide copies of their response to any internal complaint the complainant may have submitted in connection with the allegations made above. They did not do so. They said that the “complainant put so many complaints on staff and so of [sic] these complaints are addressed with the Supervisor on duty in several meetings with the clients.)*

Client 3 (120)

Submitted to SMC: 6/18/25 Sent to shelter: 6/24/25 SMC received response: 6/27/25

Standard of Care (SOC) Violated:

Allegation #1 (SOCs)

- The complainant has a reasonable accommodation that allows her to receive three extra small cartons of milk, and this is well-known to staff. A supervisor who has expressed her dislike for the complainant repeatedly took two of the complainant’s four milks back. The complainant sees this as discrimination—an enactment of this employee’s frequently expressed racial prejudice. The withholding of two small cartons of milk was also retaliatory, done after the complainant had stated she was going to report the employee’s racist comments and other harassment. The complainant went to the shelter’s front office to get her two additional servings of milk. Later, she overheard the above-referenced staffer complaining about her, implying she would continue to make life difficult for her.
- *The complainant does have an approved reasonable accommodation. The site Manager reminded staff to ensure that she gets her four milks. The employee referred to reports she does not dislike or discriminate against the Complainant. She denied saying she would “continue to make life difficult for the complainant.” The shelter assured SMC that all clients are treated with respect, civility, and dignity.*

* SOC #31 became SOC #30 during the Fiscal Year. For reporting purposes, the old number will be used for the remainder of the FY.

Total Client Complaints FY 2024-2025*

Site	Site Capacity	7/24	8/24	9/24	10/24	11/24	12/25	1/25	2/25	3/25	4/25	5/25	6/25	Total FY24-25 Red indicates late response	Complaints per 100
Adante	70 Rooms											1		1	.014
711 Post/Ansonia	250 beds	1						1			1		1	4	.016
Baldwin	179 beds	2	1					1			1	2		7	.039
Bayshore Nav	128 beds	1							1	1			1	4	.031
Bayview Nav	203 beds	1		1	1									3	.015
Gough Cabins	70 rooms				1									1	.014
Central Waterfront Nav	60 beds							1						1	.017
Dolores Street	92 beds						1						1	2	.02
Division Circle Nav	186 beds			2	2	1		3	2	1	3	1		15 ¹	.08
Ellis Semi-Congregate	130 beds				1	1				1	1/1		1	5	.038
Embarcadero Nav Cntr	200 beds	1			2				1					4	.015
Gough Cabins	70 rooms							1						1	.014
Hamilton	27 fams	1								1				2	.04
Harbor House Family	30 fams		1									2		3	.10
Interfaith Winter Shelter	30-80 bed							1						1	.036
Lark Inn	36 beds												2	2	.055
MSC South Shelter	327 beds	2/1	1	2	1	1	4/1		1		2		1	15 ¹	.043
Mission Cabins	68 beds										1	1	1	3	.044
Monarch	93 beds				1						1/1			2	.010
Next Door	334 beds				1		1			2	4			8	.012
Oasis Family	54 beds	1												1	.019
Sanctuary	200 beds	1	1		1				1	2		1	3	10 ¹	.05
Taimon Booten	64 beds									1		1		2	.032
AWP Drop In	30 beds							1/1	1/1					2	.067
A Woman's Place	25 beds	2		1							1/1			4	.12
Total		13	4	6	11	3	6	10	7	9	15	9	11	104	7

*Late responses are in red ¹ Multiple complaints from the same client(s)

March 2025 Client Allegations by Standard

Standard of Care	Number of allegations of violations of this Standard
Standard 1: Treat all clients equally, with respect and dignity...	10
Standard 2: Provide shelter services in an environment that is safe ...	2
Standard 3: Cleaning/ Janitorial	0
Standard 8: ADA	0
Standard 10: Make dietary modifications...	0
Standard 13: ... sleeping at least 8 hours per night.	0
Standard 15: Provide shelter clients with secure property storage...	2
Standard 17: post ... when a maintenance problem...	0
Standard 28: ...access to free laundry services...	0
Standard 31: Training... (After change in Admin Code, now SOC #30)	3

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

Staff Update and Committee Membership

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

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

Seat 2 - shall be held by a person who is homeless or has been homeless within the three years prior to being appointed to the Committee, and who has a disability.

Seat 6 - shall be held by a person who is homeless or formerly homeless, and who has been nominated by one or more nonprofit agencies that provide advocacy or organizing services for homeless people.

Seat 7 - Shall be held by persons nominated by one or more nonprofit agencies that provide advocacy or organizing services for 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

Shelters are reminded that they have **five business days** to respond to complaints or ask for an extension, e.g., if they are unable to interview a key witness. It is important to respond to all of the listed allegations in order to fulfill the requirement. Late responses are indicated in the matrix.

FY2025-2026 Upcoming SMC Meeting Calendar:

September 17