

1 **Shelter Grievance Advisory Committee (SGAC)**

2 **Meeting Minutes**

3 **December 14, 2023, 10:00AM-12:00PM**

4 **San Francisco City Hall – Room 305**

5 **Members Present:** Meghan "RK" Johnson – Chair, Stephen J. Irwin, Jose
6 Landaverde, Azeen ZiaEbrahimi, Javier Bremond, Kathe Shuton, Ben Baczkowski.

7 **Members Absent:** Megan Phalon, Terry Bohrer, Katherine Morales, Patrina
8 Harrison.

9 **Shelter Client Advocates Present:** Ben Baczkowski

10 **HSH Staff Present:** Tommy Le, Christopher Kramer, Lisa Rachowicz, Namon
11 Little, Angelica Varela, Tameika Enis, Janay Washington.

12 **Others Present:** Javier Bremond, Eldridge Cruse, Myesha Gonzales, Mike
13 Bruenski, Agnen Elgovani, Ruthie Van Ezzo, Scotty Manley.

14 **Introduction and Welcome – Chair Johnson:** Members and guests introduced
15 themselves.

16 **Review and Approval of the Agenda:** The agenda was reviewed and approved.

17 **Review and Approval of Minutes from 6/20/2023 Meeting:** Meeting minutes were
18 reviewed and approved.

19 **SGAC Business**

20 Chair Johnson: Namon Little (HSH) will be serving as Shelter Grievance Advisory
21 Committee Secretary.

22 **Public Comment:** No public comment.

23 **Review of Shelter Grievance Statistics Report**

24 **15-Month Denial of Services, Internal Hearings, and Arbitrations (8/22-11/23)**

25 **Public Comment**

26 Lisa Rachowicz: The adult shelter system, HSH has been working with a large
27 shelter program on adding additional beds into the program. HSH reinflated four

28 programs in our system. During November and December, we added 327 additional
29 beds to the adult shelter system. I want to make sure that the group is aware that
30 there are some interim housings that are showing up in the report. There are four
31 interim housing sites that HSH operates. They are 1321 Mission Street, 835 Turk
32 Street, and Casa Esperanza. Those sites transitioned to permanent housing as of
33 March 2023. The Mission Inn is still operating as interim housing. HSH worked to
34 correct having Taimon Booton Navigation Center in the report. [Overall], in the last
35 quarter, there were 102 Denial of Services in August, 74 Denial of Services in
36 September, and 80 Denial of Services in October. In August, out of 102 DOS, 31
37 were appealed, 38 internal hearings, and 2 arbitrations. In September, out of 74 DOS,
38 20 were appealed, 23 internal hearings, and no arbitration. In October, out of 80
39 DOS, 23 were appealed, 26 internal hearings, and 4 arbitrations. Sometimes, the data
40 doesn't match exactly. We do have HSH Program Managers that reach out to the
41 program to make sure that they enter the data. It is a requirement in the [shelter
42 program] contracts that they submit this data on a monthly basis.

43 **Board Comment:**

44 Azeen ZiaEbrahmi: do the gaps in the data correlate with specific [HSH] program
45 managers? Is [HSH] keeping track with the program managers responsibilities and
46 their ability to engage in the projects and programs?

47 Lisa: I think that there are programs that have capacity issues for periods of time or
48 have vacant positions and have difficulty [fulfilling admin support] at various
49 shelters. It hasn't been my experience that there is a particular [HSH] program
50 manager that correlates with the [gaps].

51 Chair Johnson: At our next quarterly meeting, we would like to following on those
52 sites that need to be report.

53 **Public Comment:**

54 Lisa: I want to talk about the way the ordinance defines how we can utilize rules.
55 Especially at some of the non-congregate shelters program where things are
56 happening behind closed doors that the staff are not able to witness the rule violation.
57 There is a threshold that requires witnessing a behavior before an action can be taken
58 against them. There is a process at HSH that review specific site rules.

59 **Review of Client Advocate Report**

60 **Hearing and Arbitration Comparison Report (9/23-11/23)**

61 Ben Baczkowski: We included the data from the last quarter since we didn't have a
62 meeting last time. We had 73 hearings in June, 47 in July, 52 in August, 57 in
63 September, 41 in October, and 58 in November. We didn't include the hearing
64 outcomes because there were still hearing on our calendar being completed. For
65 Arbitration, we have 6 in June, 4 in July, 6 in August, 4 in September, 6 in October,
66 and 4 in November. Generally, there are a few upheld and a couple of modified
67 decision. The [Committee] asked for race and gender information to be added to the
68 report. We have the information but we didn't include it in the report because we are
69 working on reformatting the infographic part of it.

70 **Board Comment**

71 Azeen ZiaEbrahmi: I wonder what the scope of the metrics is and who is in charge
72 of deciding those metrics.

73 Ben: We report the whole number of hearings and then outcomes. The demographic
74 data [is detailed] although there is some misleading information because there are
75 people who didn't show up for the hearings.

76 Azeen: Is there any post-hearings tracking or any outreach data? My concern is
77 always the data that is only consumed institutionally, as opposed to community
78 outreach.

79 Ben: We do track case outcomes and demographic information. [We do not] know
80 why some are upheld and some are not.

81 Azeen: So, [there is no] community outreach after DOS right?

82 Chair Johnson: I do want to say that we do collect data from the clients that we serve,
83 we don't always follow up with client unless we visit the program. We do outreach,
84 but we do preventative outreach before people get DOS [from shelters].

85 Kate Shuton: When people are medically frail and are DOS. [Department of Public
86 Health] always notified our staff and [we] work closely with [our] HSH partner. If
87 we can't find the person, we then work closely with our Homeless Outreach Team
88 and Street Medicine. There is a big network of people who are investing in our
89 clients.

90 Azeen: I'm asking for a collection point of outreach data. There [are] a lot of
91 different points of contact and if those points of contact are not being collected into
92 a central point, then our optics are myopic. I would like those points to be collected
93 so that we can bolster and keep people from falling through these cracks.

94 Ben: We are working on updating and integrating feedback. We could report
95 satisfaction that has to do more with their opinion on the result of either the hearing
96 or arbitration. As far as this meeting, we generally track the outcome. We could, in
97 the future, add a question to our after-hearing survey to get some of the information
98 [requested].

99 Chair Johnson: I'm opening this [agenda] to comment from the entire body.

100 Ben: Generally, you can compare this to HSH data. The reason for HSH and [Shelter
101 Client Advocates] (SCA) report this information is because we report the hearings
102 and arbitrations that were requested of us. HSH reports all the DOS'es that are
103 issued regardless of whether they resulted in an appeal or not.

104 Azeen: where is the oversight when you're getting zero data from HSH?

105 Ben: That's the part of [HSH] report.

106 **Public Comment**

107 Chair Jonhson: I will open it up to public comment. Please comment or ask to the
108 relevance of the [SCA] data.

109 Pastor Dorn: When you are receiving this data, do you track why a case was either
110 overturned or upheld? Was safety concern taken into account when these cases
111 overturned or upheld? Also, I think some of the rules are geared more toward
112 congregate [shelter] than non-congregate settings. They don't help when the client
113 is in a non-congregate setting.

114 Ben: The post ordinance hearings decision documents have an explanation of why
115 the decision was made. [SCA] does not track it as an explicit data point, but as a
116 piece of information that is collected on the form. It would be hard to collect the data
117 as a reportable point. As far as the hearing decision, it's the program that makes the
118 decision, so we assume that the safety considerations are being made by the
119 [provider]. I can't speak for the Arbitrators, but I think they also take safety concerns
120 into consideration. For program rules, I think it would be good to connect with the
121 [HSH] Program Managers.

122 Pastor Dorn: We want to keep people housed, but when it becomes a safety issue for
123 the rest of the guests, then overturning a DOS based on a technicality rather than
124 merit of what was occurred can be a disservice.

125 Chair Johnson: At SCA, there is a safety threshold that we have to mark, whether
126 it's low, medium, or high. It depends on the interactions that we have with those
127 cases and what it takes. The type of behaviors that are displayed are taken into
128 account when we grade them.

129 Pastor Dorn: Normally, what can occur is that there is a hearing, but the hearing is
130 pretty much adversarial, and the merit of the case is overlooked for looking for a
131 technicality to then bring it to arbitration. Then the Arbitrator overturns [the case]
132 based on technicality, not on the merit of what has occurred.

133 Ben: We are taking a different approach to the hearing process and implementing
134 more restorative justice practices. I think going forward, you can report back to us
135 how that is going. The process is adversarial, although it doesn't have to be
136 adversarial all the time, especially when it comes to safety issues. We are trying to
137 move away from an adversarial kind of relationship or practice and towards
138 restorative justice one.

139 **Old Business**

140 No old business.

141 **New Business**

142 **Providers Safety Regarding to Hearings Consideration**

143 **Public Comment**

144 Angel Wolf: I would like to discuss further how the safety of the providers is being
145 taken into consideration in these hearings' considerations.

146 **Next Meeting**

147 Tuesday, March 12, 2024

148 2:00-4:00PM

149 SF City Hall – Room 305

150 1 Dr Carlton B Goodlett Pl, San Francisco, CA 94102

151 **Meeting Adjourned**