



Shelter Monitoring Committee

MEMORANDUM

TO: Shelter Monitoring Committee
FROM: Committee Staff
DATE: November 24, 2025
RE: October 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.*

MSC-South (39)

Submitted to SMC: 10/3/25 Sent to shelter: 10/6/25 SMC received response: 10/10/25

Standards of Care (SOC) Violated: 2

Allegation 1 (SOC 2)

- A report that a guest, who identifies as a woman, was behaving in a way indicative of mental instability and possibly a tendency toward sexual predation. Staff knew this guest had a habit of engaging in this very inappropriate behavior (e.g., “flashing”) in public, and described an incident that took place at a sporting event. This kind of behavior also was happening regularly in the shelter; it went on for many days and many female guests complained. The failed to persuade this client to stop engaging in disturbing (sometimes frightening) behavior. While the complainants understand the shelter needs to be respectful of everyone, they were slow in taking decisive action.
- *The shelter responded that they took appropriate action, e.g., banning the guest in question from outings. As far as this kind of behavior happening often in the shelter, they could not substantiate what staff did not see. It is very hard to persuade people to do the right things. They have rules and guidelines that are presented to guests at intake. They are also posted throughout the shelter, and they expect everyone to adhere to these. When they find people violating them, they take appropriate disciplinary action.*

Oasis Family Shelter (41)

Submitted to SMC: 9/23/25 Sent to shelter: 10/6/25 SMC received response: 10/13/25

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

Allegation 1 (SOCs 1, 30)

- The client. The complainant reports he was previously DOS'd and his belongings packed by staff. He was allowed to return to the shelter but upon inspecting his property he found that he was missing a touchscreen laptop. He was very upset by the loss of this expensive item.

- *The shelter stated that although the Denial of Service was subsequently overturned, the initial response necessitated that two staff members—a supervisor and a tenured employee—preserve and secure his belongings. Staff transported the property to the storage room without opening or tampering with any items. No one was observed accessing or handling the client’s property while it remained there. Upon reinstatement, the client entered the storage room and retrieved his belongings directly. There was, according to the shelter, no evidence to suggest that the client’s property was mishandled or accessed inappropriately. Be this as it may, they promised to review protocols for property handling during Denials of Service.*

Sanctuary/ECS

Client 1 (42)

Submitted to SMC: 10/3/25 Sent to shelter: 10/6/25 SMC received response: 10/7/25

Standards of Care (SOC) Allegedly Violated: 1, 15

Allegation 1 (SOCs 1, 15)

- *The client reported she has not been provided with storage space. When she arrived both drawers were occupied by the bunkmate. She began using the empty drawer for a nearby bed. Management informed her she could not do this. She explained there was no drawer for her, but they made her remove her items. They did not require the same as the individual using the drawer that should have designated for her. Because of this she has been keeping all of her belongings in two bags on the floor. Staff have been pressuring her about her belongings not considering that she has no space to place them. She has been refused entry into the shelter for “having excessive property.”*
- *The site manager explained staff must ensure that clients are not bringing excessive belongings into the facility. The complainant has now been provided with space to store her belongings like all clients. The site manager stepped in to address the complainant’s concern that she was refused entry into the shelter when having property for being marked as having excessive property. She regularly sells some of her belongings. The supervisor on duty was unaware about her taking things out to sell and bringing them back when they are not sold. All clients must limit themselves to the “two bag plus drawer” policy. It is the client’s responsibility to keep their bed areas free of excessive belongings, so that personal belongings do not impede janitorial staff from cleaning bed areas. All clients are treated equally, with respect and dignity, according to Sanctuary management, and are provided with pest-free, secure property storage.*

Sanctuary/ECS

Client 2 (43)

Submitted to SMC: 10/6/25 Sent to shelter: 10/6/25 SMC received response: 10/7/25

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

Allegation 1 (SOC 2)

- *The client asserted that a “few weeks ago” a younger client “beat up” an older client, who reported it. The injured client submitted a grievance. There were witnesses, but the shelter did not act. The alleged perpetrator ended up beating up another guest. The first elderly assault victim appears to have been DOS’d and the complainant sees this as retaliation by the shelter.*
- *The shelter always takes action if they witness misbehavior or the client admits rules were violated. In this case, staff denied witnessing the alleged incident. He did inform the client that acts of violence are not tolerated. The allegation that the first elderly assault victim-guest appears to have been DOS’d is not correct. The client in question got his reservation through CAAP and it they discontinued it.. The second guest referred to was DOS’d for engaging in threats and calling another client a “N***,” which led to a fight. Both clients were DOS’d, per shelter rules.*

Allegation 2 (SOCs 1, 2)

- The client states that the first event (Allegation #1) took place in front of a shelter employee who did not report it and asked other guests to “keep quiet.” This same employee appears to be soliciting stolen goods from guests, according to the complainant, including shelter towels.
- *The staffer denied witnessing the incident. Management informed the client violence is not tolerated. No corroboration could be found to the accusation that any staffer deals in stolen goods.*

Sanctuary

Client 3 (46)

Submitted to SMC: 10/14/25 Sent to shelter: 10/23/25 SMC received response: 10/28/25

Standards of Care (SOC) Allegedly Violated: 1, 2, 4

Allegation 1 (SOCs 1, 2, 4)

- The complainant reports that another guest had his bed urinated on by his upper bunkmate. The injured party was afraid of retaliation, but “everyone knows” and the complainant said this has happened before. The resident in the upper bunk is regularly extremely intoxicated and urinated all over himself so heavily that it dripped down and “soaked” the lower bed. Staff were notified but did not take any action. When multiple guests approached her, the attendant “just turned the other way like we were bothering her.” Another employee working on the top floor handed the client some wipes. He told him that was all he could do.
- *The shelter explained that the complainant is mistaken. The client who was accused of urinating on another client’s bed is in the lower bunk. Not does he have a history of urinating on himself. Also, it should be noted that clients must be capable of self-care in order to stay at Sanctuary.*

Allegation 2 (SOCs 1)

- The complainant reports a staffer keeps making rudely making a disgusted face and saying “we all smell bad because we don’t shower.” He tried to tell him about the smell but he rudely “didn’t let me finish talking and told me that we all had to shower meaning all 16 bunks everyone on that side he says because we all smell.” Complaints are ignored by shelter management. “Emeka thinks his staff are always right and guests are wrong.” He “doesn’t want to hear it and is “very rude to the residents and walks away when you’re saying your side.”.
- *The employee denied the allegation. The shelter manager talked to guests in the area in question and received positive feedback about him.*

Sanctuary

Client 4 (47)

Submitted to SMC: 10/15/25 Sent to shelter: 10/22/25 SMC received response: 10/23/25

Standards of Care (SOC) Allegedly Violated: 1

Allegation 1 (SOCs 1)

- The client states that the site manager went straight to the side of the room where several Hispanic men have their bunks. He said a cell phone had been stolen and he had “traced it” to that part of room. He told those present that he wanted it back. Then a resident pointed at a white male guest on the other side of the room. It turned out that it was in fact in the man’s backpack inside his locker. The complainant found this incident to be offensive and an example of discrimination, i.e., to be accused of theft based on minimal and incorrect information. Other members of staff lately are behaving even more unfairly. The site manager should set an example rather than acting in the same way.

- *The shelter reported that nonresidents traced their lost or stolen phone to Sanctuary shelter. Management assisted in finding the phone and made an announcement on the men's floor, stating if anyone is in possession of the phone to please turn it in and that no one would be denied services if they turned in the phone. One client pointed to another who had shared with him that he had the phone. The phone was returned to the owner. Problem solving is part of the Site Manager's responsibility. This issue was resolved in a peaceful manner. The anonymous complainant no doubt believes there was discrimination, but that does not represent how the incident unfolded. Hispanic clients are not discriminated against. Many appreciated how the problem was resolved in peace. All clients are treated equally and respected at Sanctuary.*

Division Circle

Submitted to SMC: 10/22/25 Sent to shelter: 10/30/25 SMC received response: 9/ /25

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

Allegation #1 (SOCs 1, 30)

- The complainant experienced an ongoing issue with a female resident in a neighboring bed. On one night, the resident was seated on the floor, blocking the complainant's path. When she refused to move, the complainant sought assistance from staff. She told the resident to move, but gave up after being yelled at and berated by this resident.
- *The shelter pointed out that the complainant could have gone around the guest who was sitting on the floor; however, staff could have done a better job of deescalating the situation. They promised to provide relevant training to the staffer in question.*

Allegation #2 (SOCs 1, 2)

- Following the incident above, the complainant reports being targeted by the same staff member who was unable to help him. He was falsely accused of smoking. She eventually directed profanities and racial slurs at him, including "pestoso," "mayate," "puta," and "pendejo." When he filed an internal grievance, he got no response. He was even threatened by staff for discussing the incident with others. They reportedly told him that speaking about it constituted harassment, and when he questioned how, they replied, "for going on and on."
- *The complainant frequently smokes marijuana on the property. Staff appear to have reminded him in a respectful and professional way. He does not like to be told this and he has been verbally aggressive in response. Other guests in the area were questioned and did not recall staff using any inappropriate language.*

Lower Polk TAY (50)

Submitted to SMC: 10/31/25 Sent to shelter: 10/31/25 SMC received response: 11/4/25

Standards of Care (SOC) Allegedly Violated: 1, 3

Allegation 1 (SOCs 1)

- The complainant reports he submitted as many as seven written grievances with not a single written response. Then he was DOS'd in a way that was unreasonable. He felt it was done in retaliation for his having spoken up. Some of his neighbors and friends became engaged in a heated verbal discussion and, since staff were not out on the floor, he went to the office where they were ensconced to ask them to intervene. Even though he was the one who brought the matter to their attention, and had been careful to commit no violation of the rules, he was kicked out with the others, en masse.

- *The shelter denies receiving any grievances. The client was “DOS’d based on verified behavioral incidents and community safety concerns, not in retaliation for any grievance.” An off-site physical altercation occurred in which another resident was assaulted; the complainant was present. Afterwards, verbal arguments and banter related to the incident were brought into the dorm area during quiet hours. “Program Monitors attempted multiple redirections, but the claimant continued verbal aggression, disrupting dorm peace and safety. The DOS was executed by staff member JA per policy and supported by verified documentation.”*

Allegation 2 (SOCs 1)

- *The complainant states that two employees of the shelter regularly engaged in sexually inappropriate commentary and/or suggestions. One of them regularly speaks of his conquests and describes himself as a pimp. Many other guests can attest to this. He has repeatedly spoken in this way in front of or to TAY guests or in phone calls audible to those nearby. When the complainant left the shelter after being DOS’d, another employee, who was near the entrance, told the complainant to his face that he should pimp his girlfriend.*
- *The shelter assured SMC and the complainant that staff have completed required training on harm reduction, trauma-informed care, and professional boundaries. Management review found no prior complaints of the nature described by either staff member, and no corroborating statements or documentation have been received to substantiate these claims. Staff reported to management that the complainant and his girlfriend were standing outside within 200 feet of the facility. They asked them to please leave the vicinity as per policy. The female resident who was allegedly assaulted during the altercation involving the complainant and his girlfriend expressed fear of being assaulted again. Staff addressed the claimant and his girlfriend as part of his job duties. The complainant’s report appears retaliatory in nature following the claimant’s denial of services*

Allegation 3 (SOCs 3)

- *The client says the floors are often cluttered and dirty for long stretches of time. Many guests are very messy and the staff do not regularly address this, despite being asked to do so by guests who do not like to live in these conditions.*
- *In response to this complaint, management verified that regular cleanliness and property control measures are in place. This claim also appears merely retaliatory in nature and inconsistent with current operating conditions. Management report they recently “developed and implemented a Resident Cleaning Day where residents participate in organized cleaning efforts alongside staff.” Dorm inspections are conducted following cleaning, and management does walkthroughs, reminding residents to clean their areas, downsize belongings, and utilize available storage bins. To address over-accumulation of property, the shelter has provided additional labeled storage bins accessible to residents. Furthermore, dorm areas are deep cleaned every Friday as part of the program’s ongoing maintenance and health standards. Management has “adopted a solutions-based approach focused on cooperation, accountability, and community participation in maintaining a clean and safe living environment.”*

Total Client Complaints FY 2025-2026*

Site	Site Capacity	7/25	8/25	9/25	10/25	11/25	12/25	1/26	2/26	3/26	4/26	5/26	6/26	Total FY25-26 Red indicates late response	Complaints per 100
Adante	70 Rooms			1										1	
711 Post/Ansonia	250 beds														
Baldwin	179 beds	1	1	2										4	
Bayshore Nav	128 beds	2												2	
Bayview Nav	203 beds			1										1	
Gough Cabins	70 rooms														
Central Waterfront Nav	60 beds														
Compass Family UAV	130 beds	2												2	
Dolores Street	92 beds			1										1	
Division Circle Nav	186 beds		1		2									3	1
Ellis Semi-Congregate	130 beds			1										1	
Embarcadero Nav Cntr	200 beds	1												1	
Gough Cabins	70 rooms		1											1	
Hamilton	27 fams	1												1	
Harbor House Family	30 fams														
Interfaith Winter Shelter	30-80 bed														
Lark Inn	36 beds														
MSC South Shelter	327 beds		2/2	2/1	1									5 ¹	3
Lower Polk TAY	75 beds				1									1	
Mission Cabins	68 beds		1	closed										1	
Monarch	93 beds														
Next Door	334 beds		2											2	
Oasis Family	54 beds			1	1									2	
Sanctuary (ECS_	200 beds		1	2	4									7 ¹	
Taimon Booten	75 beds	2												2	
AWP Drop In	30 beds			2/1										2	1
A Woman's Place	25 beds														
Total		9	11	13	9									40	5

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

August 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 ...	5
Standard 3: Cleaning/ Janitorial	1
Standard 4: feminine hygiene and incontinence supplies	1
Standard 15: Property Storage	1
Standard 30: Training... (Was 31 before change in Admin Code)	2

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 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:

January 21, 2026

February 18, 2026

March 18, 2026

April 15, 2026

May 20, 2026

June 17, 2026