

From: [Francesca Agrusa](#)
To: [Ford, John](#)
Cc: [Johnson, Cliff](#); [Dorris, Joshua](#); [Planning Clerk](#); [Bushnell, Michelle](#); [Arroyo, Natalie](#); [Bohn, Rex](#); [Wilson, Mike](#); [Madrone, Steve](#)
Subject: Concerns Regarding Miranda's Rescue and the Need for Further Investigation
Date: Sunday, June 21, 2026 7:24:49 AM

Caution: This email was sent from an EXTERNAL source. Please take care when clicking links or opening attachments.

Good Morning,

As a Berkeley resident and former volunteer with Berkeley Animal Care Services (BACS), one of the organizations that transferred dogs to Miranda's Rescue, and as a concerned member of the animal welfare community, I would like to respectfully share my observations and raise questions regarding Shannon Miranda's competence, compliance, operational practices, and animal welfare standards.

The public is seeking answers, and regardless of what legal conclusions investigators ultimately reach, serious questions remain about whether Shannon Miranda was qualified to operate a rescue entrusted with some of the most behaviorally challenging dogs from shelters throughout California.

Miranda's Rescue marketed itself as a sanctuary and rehabilitation facility capable of managing large-breed and difficult dogs that shelters often struggled to place. Many organizations transferred animals there specifically because they believed the rescue had the expertise, facilities, staffing, and behavioral programs necessary to provide these dogs with a safe environment and a chance at rehabilitation.

However, according to Mr. Miranda's own public statements, numerous dogs in his care displayed aggressive behavior, attacked other animals, escaped confinement, or otherwise created safety concerns. The issue is not whether some dogs exhibited behavioral challenges. The issue is whether the rescue possessed the resources, training, containment systems, enrichment programs, behavioral assessment protocols, and risk-management practices necessary to safely manage those animals.

When a rescue voluntarily accepts behaviorally complex dogs, it assumes responsibility for evaluating, managing, rehabilitating, and safely housing them whenever possible. If dogs repeatedly became unmanageable, posed risks to other animals, or exceeded the organization's capabilities, that raises legitimate questions about whether the rescue was equipped to fulfill the role it claimed to provide.

One example appears in a June 18, 2026, North Coast Journal article by Jennifer Fumiko Cahill, in which Mr. Miranda discussed Charmaine, a dog transferred from Berkeley Animal Care Services. According to the article, Mr. Miranda stated that Charmaine was adopted but later returned due to aggressive behavior. He further claimed that three days after the adoption, the dog jumped from a vehicle window and chased a child riding a bicycle while the child was walking another dog. If accurate, this account raises important questions regarding behavioral assessment, adopter

screening, adopter counseling, transport safety, rehabilitation efforts, and placement decisions. A dog exhibiting such behaviors would require specialized management and careful evaluation before being placed in an adoptive home.

More broadly, if a significant number of dogs accepted for rehabilitation were ultimately deemed too dangerous to safely manage, it raises questions about operational capacity, behavioral expertise, professional oversight, and whether the rescue was accepting animals whose needs exceeded its capabilities.

At its core, this issue is about trust. Shelters, rescue organizations, volunteers, donors, and members of the public entrusted animals to Miranda's Rescue because they believed those animals would receive appropriate care and have an opportunity for a positive outcome. If the rescue's actual practices, capabilities, or conditions materially differed from what was represented, that deserves thorough investigation and continued media scrutiny.

The most important question is not whether isolated incidents occurred. It is whether there was a broader pattern of inadequate management, insufficient resources, poor record-keeping, lack of oversight, or failure to meet accepted standards of animal care that contributed to the conditions now under criminal investigation.

There are also immediate concerns about the present situation. **Reports indicate that animals remain on the property and that Mr. Miranda may still be operating.** What measures have been implemented to ensure no additional animals are transferred there while the investigation continues? Which agencies are responsible for monitoring the welfare of the animals that remain?

This investigation may take months to fully resolve. However, the animals that suffered and died deserve accountability, transparency, and meaningful reform. The public deserves answers, and the organizations that entrusted animals to Miranda's Rescue deserve to know how this happened and how similar tragedies can be prevented in the future.

We owe that much to every animal that lost its life there.

Sincerely,

Francesca Agrusa
Berkeley, California