



Fw: City council meeting- agenda item 3.5

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Mon 3/23/2026 7:56 AM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José
200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
Main: 408-535-1260
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

From: Madeline Onumbu <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Sunday, March 22, 2026 6:56 PM
To: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: City council meeting- agenda item 3.5

[**External Email.** Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear City Council Members and San Jose Community

I am sharing the following email chain as evidence that the situation at the San Jose shelter has not improved.

The shelter still lacks documented process and policies. I tried to seek clarity as what I witnessed went against the training from DPFL (taught by rescue PACC). The volunteers at the shelter have implemented controls and training to ensure people's skills match the dogs they can handle, and yet the shelter leadership has not adopted ours, nor implemented their own to keep their employees and community members safe.

Maddy

Forwarded message

From: Madeline Onumbu <[REDACTED]>
Date: Wed, Mar 18, 2026 at 9:20 PM
Subject: Re: Staff Observation dog handling

To: Kinsman, Mallory <mallory.kinsman@sanjoseca.gov>
CC: VolunteerACS <volunteeracs@sanjoseca.gov>, Robinson, Edward <edward.robinson@sanjoseca.gov>, Chris Chiappari <[REDACTED]>, Marek Markuszewski <[REDACTED]>, Kiska Icard <Kiska.Icard@sanjoseca.gov>, Wylie, Monica <Monica.Wylie@sanjoseca.gov>

Hi Mallory and leadership team-

I wanted to follow-up as I am still pending a response from my March 9 email where I sought clarification on what is expected when handling dogs (and my follow up reminder on March 12 when Monica and Kiska were added).

It's my understanding that you have worked since March 9 and actively emailing since Mallory responded to the SDF email update. While I understand receiving updates about Olive and Boya are uplifting, I hope you are able to prioritize my email as I am seeking clarity expectations/standards around dog handling. I want to ensure the shelter team (both staff and volunteers) are all clear on the policies and are able to support each other. The lack of clarity means this is not possible.

-Maddy

On Thu, Mar 12, 2026 at 8:54 PM Madeline Onumbu <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Hi Mallory-

Can you please respond to the items below. I want to make sure I am clear on expectations.

I have attached Monica and Kiska given this has now been pending for 3 days.

Maddy

On Mon, Mar 9, 2026 at 4:42 PM Madeline Onumbu <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Hi Mallory-

Thanks for the additional details, I am happy to hear Frank stopped when he was uncomfortable.

In reading your response I have a few items I want to ensure I have interpreted correctly:

1. that it is suitable for non trained staff to handle dogs they are not qualified for when staffing needs require it.
2. it is okay for non trained staff to do D2D appointments (with a non shelter dog) when staffing needs require it
3. It is okay to do D2D without tools outlined in DPFL model

As for the space, this was easily resolved, volunteers know adoptions (and especially a D2D) get yard priority. Frank got access to the yard the moment he notified a volunteer it was needed. The issue was he did not ask and defaulted to the courtyard- just as he defaulted back to the courtyard kennels when doing the D2D with Oso. At a minimum, the standard should be addressed and communicated to staff. This is standard practice for me when doing adoptions and I have never had an issue getting a yard.

- Maddy

On Mon, Mar 9, 2026 at 2:27 PM Kinsman, Mallory <Mallory.Kinsman@sanjoseca.gov> wrote:

Hello Maddy,

Thank you for taking the time to share your concerns and observations.

To address your questions, D2D meetings are typically conducted by our adoption staff, though there are times when additional staff may be present or assisting. My understanding in this situation is that Frank was unable to get within six feet of the other dog before Willow began reacting, and he appropriately stopped the adoption at that point.

Safety for staff, volunteers, and the animals is always our priority during introductions. If there are concerns about how a particular meeting was handled or who was involved, we will take those concerns into consideration and follow up as needed.

Regarding location, as a shelter environment it can be difficult to completely avoid being around other dogs regardless of where introductions occur. Our space is limited and dogs move through many areas of the facility throughout the day. While we try to use the most appropriate spaces available, it is not always possible to eliminate those challenges entirely.

Thank you,

Mallory Kinsman
Shelter Operations Supervisor
San Jose Animal Care and Services
2750 Monterey Road
San Jose, CA 95111

From: Madeline Onumbu <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Sunday, March 8, 2026 9:51 PM
To: VolunteerACS <VolunteerACS@sanjoseca.gov>; Kinsman, Mallory <Mallory.Kinsman@sanjoseca.gov>; Robinson, Edward <edward.robinson@sanjoseca.gov>
Cc: Chris Chiappari <[REDACTED]>; Marek Markuszewski <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Staff Observation- dog handling

[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

Hi Mallory and Edward-

I wanted to reach out to report something I witnessed today while at the shelter.

Frank was the adoption counselor for D2D appointment for Willow.

I had noticed the potential adopter early in the day when he was interacting with Willow and a different ACA, so when I saw him again with his family and personal dog they caught my attention. I then saw Frank walked with the family and going to one of the courtyard kennels, I was concerned and went over. Frank confirmed the D2D was with Willow and when I asked why not doing it in a larger space like the side yards, she said he didn't know if one would be free. I told him adoptions get priority and that he just needed to ask for the yard. He took the family to the side yards and since I was training new volunteers I didn't see more.

Later on I then saw Frank with the same family- introducing Oso to their dog. Once again, in a courtyard kennel.

I have a few concerns with this event:

1. Willow is dog selective and reacts to dogs passing by. Trying to do a D2D with her in a courtyard and on a busy weekend is a poor choice. There is not enough space and too much stimuli to properly see if there is a fit between the 2 dogs
2. Willow is a gold dog- Frank does not have the skills nor ability to interpret dog behaviors I would expect of anyone handling her.
3. Willow is dog reactive when in yards- it doesn't mean her being introduced is impossible but I would expect it to be done with someone who has been properly trained. In my time at the shelter I have not seen Frank be involved with playgroups nor any D2D training. He is not qualified to be involved with this situation and put both dogs at risk.
4. Frank did not have tools or even a second pair of hands to assist when in the courtyard (both when preparing for Willow and when Oso was in the courtyard kennel. I am not sure on what happened in the side yard but I am not confident he grabbed tools as he was never trained on how to use them.

After witnessing this event I am left with questions:

1. Who is approved to do D2D meetings. I was under the impression she would be someone who has been properly trained. If Frank does not meet this requirement why was he involved in this case
2. Why is more caution not being used. In my opinion Frank was not the right ACA for this meeting, especially with Sean and Daniel being present.
3. Why do D2Ds continue to happen in the courtyard. There should be a Full stop to this. The courtyards lack the double back areas/ greeter space. As a result it's difficult to introduce dogs with a behavior in between them as you cannot drop the leash. Courtyards limited space already create higher risk but the high volume of foot traffic is not beneficial. I was disappointed to see Frank went there immediately for the very next dog.

- Maddy

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

FW: Do Not Accept ACS Audit Report – It Does Not Reflect What Is Happening to Animals

From Taber, Toni <toni.taber@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Mon 3/23/2026 7:59 PM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

Toni J. Taber, MMC
City Clerk
City of San José
200 E Santa Clara Street
San José, CA 95113
408-535-1260

The content of this email is confidential and intended for the recipient specified in message only. It is strictly forbidden to share any part of this message with any third party, without a written consent of the sender. If you received this message by mistake, please reply to this message and follow with its deletion, so that we can ensure such a mistake does not occur in the future.

From: Christina Callahan [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, March 23, 2026 6:45 PM
To: Mallari, Michelle Ann <Michelle.Mallari@sanjoseca.gov>; katrina.gutierrez@sanjoseca.gov; Haider, Hiwad <Hiwad.Haider@sanjoseca.gov>; Khudoyberganova, Dilnoza <Dilnoza.Khudoyberganova@sanjoseca.gov>; Mandrekar, Gitanjali <Gitanjali.Mandrekar@sanjoseca.gov>; Obi, Ebelechukwu <Ebelechukwu.Obi@sanjoseca.gov>; michael.oconnell@sanjoseca.gov; Pauly, Alison <Alison.Pauly@sanjoseca.gov>; Perez, Adrian <Adrian.Perez@sanjoseca.gov>; Valle, Maria <Maria.Valle@sanjoseca.gov>; joe.rois@sanjoseca.gov; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; Mulcahy, Michael <Michael.Mulcahy@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Ortiz, Peter <Peter.Ortiz@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Candelas, Domingo <Domingo.Candelas@sanjoseca.gov>; Doan, Bien <Bien.Doan@sanjoseca.gov>; Batra, Arjun <arjun.batra@sanjoseca.gov>; Maguire, Jennifer <jennifer.maguire@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Loesch, Matthew <Matt.Loesch@sanjoseca.gov>; Rios, Angel <Angel.Rios@sanjoseca.gov>; Taber, Toni <toni.taber@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: Do Not Accept ACS Audit Report – It Does Not Reflect What Is Happening to Animals

[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear City Clerk, please add this to Letters from the Public section 3.5 on the agenda for 3/24/2026 council meeting.

Hi Mayor Mahan and Councilmembers,

I am writing to formally oppose acceptance of the March 18, 2026 Status of Open Audit Recommendations report as it relates to Animal Care and Services. The report states that all 39 recommendations from the 2024 ACS audit have been implemented or closed. I want to be very clear that this does not mean the system is working. What has been completed are internal processes and policy updates. What has not been resolved are the outcomes affecting animals in this system.

The report focuses on compliance, not results. It does not answer whether animals are safer, whether overpopulation has decreased, or whether euthanasia decisions reflect exhausted alternatives. Those are the metrics that actually matter, and based on available data and real-world outcomes, the system continues to fail in those areas.

The shelter remains overwhelmed, particularly with puppies. In FY 2023–2024 there were 5,027 dogs taken in, including 1,089 puppies. In FY 2024–2025 there were 4,483 dogs, including 995 puppies. This fiscal year, with four months still remaining, there have already been 3,222 dogs, including 1,073 puppies. Puppies now make up approximately 33% of intake, which represents an 11% increase from last year. In addition, at least 14 dogs have entered the shelter already pregnant this year. In addition to dogs arriving with litters, stray dogs are found pregnant, and the shelter performs what is called a spay abort, meaning the dog is spayed and the pregnancy is terminated during surgery. **When one third of intake consists of puppies and pregnant stray dogs are still entering the system, it is clear the problem is not being prevented, only managed after the fact.**

Return to Owner is also being misrepresented as success. The City promotes a roughly 40 percent RTO rate, but that figure does not reflect what is actually happening. Approximately 13 percent of that 40 percent represents repeated returns of the same dog. In other words, the same animals are being picked up and returned multiple times. One dog, Jada (A1396581), was returned to the shelter at least five separate times. Another example, Papacito (A1393089), was confiscated from an unsafe environment and later returned, raising concerns about whether meaningful intervention occurred. Returning dogs to the same conditions without addressing the underlying issue is not a successful outcome. It is a failure to intervene in situations that continue to put animals at risk.

The root cause of intake, which is uncontrolled breeding, remains unaddressed. Puppies continue to make up a large and growing portion of the population, pregnant stray dogs are still entering the shelter, and community evidence shows ongoing backyard breeding and puppy sales. Cases like Marsha (A1378326), a pregnant dog reported behind the shelter who was later reclaimed, spayed to waive fees, and then quickly discarded again while her puppies were never confiscated, illustrate how the system is failing to interrupt this cycle. **Without addressing the source of the problem, intake will not decrease, regardless of how many internal policies are updated.**

There are also serious concerns regarding euthanasia practices. While the report highlights alignment with professional guidelines, cases in practice tell a different story. Monet (A1350190), also known as Layla, was a long-term adoptable dog who was euthanized after approximately two days of illness. A dog should not go from adoptable to euthanized in that timeframe without clear evidence that all medical and placement options were exhausted. That raises legitimate questions about decision-making processes.

Adoption outcomes are also not being adequately safeguarded. Adoption is counted as a success, even when it leads to harm. A dog named Luke (A1294264), who was previously healthy and social, was returned to the shelter emaciated and in a critical medical condition. When a dog leaves the

shelter in good condition and comes back in that state, it reflects a failure in adoption counseling, preparation, and oversight.



At the same time, the system is placing an enormous number of dogs on “final” for euthanasia, creating urgent, last-minute situations that put significant pressure on rescue organizations, volunteers, and foster networks. Many of these groups are already overwhelmed. When animals are only being saved because outside groups step in at the last moment, **it is not a sustainable system.**

The report’s statement that all recommendations have been implemented or closed also needs to be understood in context. Recommendations can be marked “closed” even when only partially completed or when the remaining work is considered no longer applicable. That designation does not measure whether the underlying problems have actually been resolved.

If this report is accepted as written, it effectively endorses the current outcomes. It accepts that puppies making up 33 percent of intake is normal, that an 11 percent increase in puppy intake is acceptable, that pregnant stray dogs continue to enter the system, that dogs can be returned repeatedly without intervention, that preventable euthanasia occurs, and that rescue organizations must carry the burden of saving animals. Those are the real-world conditions that still exist.

At this point, the City is not funding solutions. It is payrolling the problem. Resources are being absorbed into operations while the root causes, including breeding, enforcement, prevention, and accountability, remain largely unaddressed. Until those are addressed, the system will continue to produce the same outcomes regardless of how many recommendations are marked complete.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Council not to accept this report as it relates to Animal Care and Services. Instead, I ask that the City require outcome-based reporting, including repeat RTO rates, improve due diligence and standardized adoption counseling protocols for animals with known needs, ensure transparency in euthanasia decision-making, and pursue legislative solutions to address unregulated breeding and intake drivers.

Thank you for your consideration.

Christina Callahan

Fw: City Hall Meeting Public Comment - Agenda Item 3.5

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Tue 3/24/2026 8:52 AM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José
200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
Main: 408-535-1260
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

From: Courtney Ferro [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2026 7:57 AM
To: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: City Hall Meeting Public Comment - Agenda Item 3.5

[**External Email.** Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

You don't often get email from doghausfosters@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear City Council members,

I am writing today to express my concerns about the completed status of many audit recommendations for the San Jose Animal Care Center. From my own experience working at the shelter in 2025, I can attest to how necessary these recommendations truly are. From what I am hearing from current internal low level staff and volunteers, little has actually changed. Policies, procedures, adequate oversight, and responsiveness from shelter leadership on key issues are still deeply lacking.

Your constituents, many of whom are volunteers, staff, adopters, or otherwise interact with the shelter, deserve your continued attention.

Did you know that just this past week, a community member went to pick up a cat after its neuter and thankfully, lifted the towel before leaving, only to discover they had been given the wrong cat?

This has happened repeatedly in the past and is clear evidence that stronger oversight is needed... particularly real, standardized policies and procedures, not handwritten sticky notes and feral dens left in

hallways on carts where these mix-ups can occur.

Do you know that concerned citizens who find stray animals or attempt to report issues to animal control are frequently not assisted? Or that, for example, in a case where three loose dogs, one visibly injured, were reported entering a roadway, the call was assigned the lowest priority by dispatch? In this particular case from June 2025, one of the dogs was hit by a car and died.

Is this really how we want San Jose to be viewed? As the heart of Silicon Valley..a place known for innovation yet also a place where dogs can roam the streets without help? Or where the high cost of living pushes pet owners to desperation, forcing them to rehome their animals because they cannot access basic resources like medical care or even spay/neuter services?

Also from the December NSE meeting, I believe an amendment was requested asking for more financial transparency from the shelter. When most people hear the word “audit” they expect financials to be covered. Yet, this has still not been made public.

I know during my own brief tenure working at the shelter, we would run out of critical supplies like kitten formula and trash bags, and requests to work more than 20 hours/week with part-time status were denied even when the shelter was understaffed and more animal care was needed. Can we please follow up on this financial transparency for the June meeting?

San Jose deserves a transparent, accountable public animal control and care center. What exists now is falling short. I urge you to keep paying attention to what is going on and to ask for real accountability.

Thank you,

Courtney Ferro

Former San Jose Animal Care and Services employee, March–June 2025

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Fw: Public Letter Agenda Item 3.5

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Tue 3/24/2026 8:58 AM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José
200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
Main: 408-535-1260
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

From: Christina Callahan [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2026 7:12 AM
To: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: Public Letter Agenda Item 3.5

[**External Email.** Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

Dear City Clerk,
Can you please add this to today's meeting?
Thank you,
Christina

Begin forwarded message:

From: Christina Callahan [REDACTED]
Date: March 23, 2026 at 18:45:25 PDT
To: michelle.mallari@sanjoseca.gov, katrina.gutierrez@sanjoseca.gov, hiwad.haider@sanjoseca.gov, dilnoza.khudoyberganova@sanjoseca.gov, gitanjali.mandrekar@sanjoseca.gov, ebelechukwu.obi@sanjoseca.gov, michael.oconnell@sanjoseca.gov, alison.pauly@sanjoseca.gov, adrian.perez@sanjoseca.gov, maria.valle@sanjoseca.gov, joe.rois@sanjoseca.gov, matt.mahan@sanjoseca.gov, michael.mulcahy@sanjoseca.gov, pam.foley@sanjoseca.gov, david.cohen@sanjoseca.gov, sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov, Peter Ortiz <Peter.Ortiz@sanjoseca.gov>, dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov, domingo.candelas@sanjoseca.gov, bien.doan@sanjoseca.gov, arjun.batra@sanjoseca.gov,

Jennifer Maguire <jennifer.maguire@sanjoseca.gov>, City Clerk
<city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>, Matthew Loesch <Matt.Loesch@sanjoseca.gov>, Angel Rios
<Angel.Rios@sanjoseca.gov>, Toni Taber <toni.taber@sanjoseca.gov>

Subject: Do Not Accept ACS Audit Report – It Does Not Reflect What Is Happening to Animals

Dear City Clerk, please add this to Letters from the Public section 3.5 on the agenda for 3/24/2026 council meeting.

Hi Mayor Mahan and Councilmembers,

I am writing to formally oppose acceptance of the March 18, 2026 Status of Open Audit Recommendations report as it relates to Animal Care and Services. The report states that all 39 recommendations from the 2024 ACS audit have been implemented or closed. I want to be very clear that this does not mean the system is working. What has been completed are internal processes and policy updates. What has not been resolved are the outcomes affecting animals in this system.

The report focuses on compliance, not results. It does not answer whether animals are safer, whether overpopulation has decreased, or whether euthanasia decisions reflect exhausted alternatives. Those are the metrics that actually matter, and based on available data and real-world outcomes, the system continues to fail in those areas.

The shelter remains overwhelmed, particularly with puppies. In FY 2023–2024 there were 5,027 dogs taken in, including 1,089 puppies. In FY 2024–2025 there were 4,483 dogs, including 995 puppies. This fiscal year, with four months still remaining, there have already been 3,222 dogs, including 1,073 puppies. Puppies now make up approximately 33% of intake, which represents an 11% increase from last year. In addition, at least 14 dogs have entered the shelter already pregnant this year. In addition to dogs arriving with litters, stray dogs are found pregnant, and the shelter performs what is called a spay abort, meaning the dog is spayed and the pregnancy is terminated during surgery. **When one third of intake consists of puppies and pregnant stray dogs are still entering the system, it is clear the problem is not being prevented, only managed after the fact.**

Return to Owner is also being misrepresented as success. The City promotes a roughly 40 percent RTO rate, but that figure does not reflect what is actually happening. Approximately 13 percent of that 40 percent represents repeated returns of the same dog. In other words, the same animals are being picked up and returned multiple times. One dog, Jada (A1396581), was returned to the shelter at least five separate times. Another example, Papacito (A1393089), was confiscated from an unsafe environment and later returned, raising concerns about whether meaningful intervention occurred. Returning dogs to the same conditions without addressing the

underlying issue is not a successful outcome. It is a failure to intervene in situations that continue to put animals at risk.

The root cause of intake, which is uncontrolled breeding, remains unaddressed. Puppies continue to make up a large and growing portion of the population, pregnant stray dogs are still entering the shelter, and community evidence shows ongoing backyard breeding and puppy sales. Cases like Marsha (A1378326), a pregnant dog reported behind the shelter who was later reclaimed, spayed to waive fees, and then quickly discarded again while her puppies were never confiscated, illustrate how the system is failing to interrupt this cycle. **Without addressing the source of the problem, intake will not decrease, regardless of how many internal policies are updated.**

There are also serious concerns regarding euthanasia practices. While the report highlights alignment with professional guidelines, cases in practice tell a different story. Monet (A1350190), also known as Layla, was a long-term adoptable dog who was euthanized after approximately two days of illness. A dog should not go from adoptable to euthanized in that timeframe without clear evidence that all medical and placement options were exhausted. That raises legitimate questions about decision-making processes.

Adoption outcomes are also not being adequately safeguarded. Adoption is counted as a success, even when it leads to harm. A dog named Luke (A1294264), who was previously healthy and social, was returned to the shelter emaciated and in a critical medical condition. When a dog leaves the shelter in good condition and comes back in that state, it reflects a failure in adoption counseling, preparation, and oversight.



At the same time, the system is placing an enormous number of dogs on “final” for euthanasia, creating urgent, last-minute situations that put significant pressure on rescue organizations, volunteers, and foster networks. Many of these groups are already overwhelmed. When animals are only being saved because outside groups step in at the last moment, **it is not a sustainable system.**

The report’s statement that all recommendations have been implemented or closed also needs to be understood in context. Recommendations can be marked “closed”

even when only partially completed or when the remaining work is considered no longer applicable. That designation does not measure whether the underlying problems have actually been resolved.

If this report is accepted as written, it effectively endorses the current outcomes. It accepts that puppies making up 33 percent of intake is normal, that an 11 percent increase in puppy intake is acceptable, that pregnant stray dogs continue to enter the system, that dogs can be returned repeatedly without intervention, that preventable euthanasia occurs, and that rescue organizations must carry the burden of saving animals. Those are the real-world conditions that still exist.

At this point, the City is not funding solutions. It is payrolling the problem.

Resources are being absorbed into operations while the root causes, including breeding, enforcement, prevention, and accountability, remain largely unaddressed. Until those are addressed, the system will continue to produce the same outcomes regardless of how many recommendations are marked complete.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Council not to accept this report as it relates to Animal Care and Services. Instead, I ask that the City require outcome-based reporting, including repeat RTO rates, improve due diligence and standardized adoption counseling protocols for animals with known needs, ensure transparency in euthanasia decision-making, and pursue legislative solutions to address unregulated breeding and intake drivers.

Thank you for your consideration.

Christina Callahan

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.



Fw: City council meeting agenda #3.5 - Meeting ACS audit recommendations

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Tue 3/24/2026 12:15 PM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
Main: 408-535-1260
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

From: lyne lamoureux [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2026 11:09 AM
To: The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; city.auditor <city.auditor@sanjoseca.gov>
Cc: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: City council meeting agenda #3.5 - Meeting ACS audit recommendations

[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. Learn more <<https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>>]

Note: apologies for not meeting the 8am deadline to add to #3.5 Status of Open Audit Recommendations Report on the City Council agenda today.

Dear Members of the San Jose City Council and City Auditor,

I want to commend Joe Rois and his team for delivering a thorough audit of the San Jose Animal Care Center. That work matters. However, though all recommendations are claimed to have been implemented and therefore closed, the shelter still lacks communication, documented SOPs, and policies.

As a regular volunteer at SJACS, I have a first-hand view of operations, and I observe the same patterns:

policies that are absent or unenforced, and a lack of supervision. Making things worse is a near-total lack of communication from management to volunteers. When operational decisions are made, such as changes to where cats will be kenneled, volunteers are given incomplete information after the fact. This leaves us unable to plan or adapt our work, socializing and enriching the lives of the cats in our care. We cannot be effective partners in animal welfare if we are kept in the dark. The lack of respect is obvious.

Three times in the past month alone, I have had to escalate the same issue: an unsterilized cat being moved from intake directly into adoption rooms. This most recent incident occurred this past weekend. Introducing an unvetted animal into the healthy adoption population significantly increases the risk of cross-contamination and disease transmission. This recurring lapse should have been resolved through documented SOPs and consistent staff training.

SJACS is claiming that they are following ASV guidelines, and yet the temperatures in some of the cat rooms dipped below 64°F for weeks, if not months, this winter. I have escalated this issue for years now with proof. The situation was made even more urgent as one of the rooms housed a medically fragile cat. These same rooms are scorching hot in the summer. The ASV guidelines clearly state that temperatures in cat housing must be maintained between 64°F and 80°F.

Monday brought another alarming incident: a community member retrieving a TNR cat was given the wrong animal. This has often happened before, and in one prior occasion, the cat was released into a foreign territory, a potentially fatal mistake. Are staff still using Post-it notes to track cats and traps? If so, that practice must end immediately.

I could go on and on. About the total focus on length of stay, with no regard to the needs of the animal, including releasing friendly cats, and putting healthy cats on the needs rescue list simply to help the shelter's numbers. Delay in moving cats - as little as there are right now - to the adoption floor. About the absence of cats. I have never seen it so empty in March in my 10 years. Management considers the intake diversion a success, but the community is left without assistance.

I welcome the shelter's new electronic log for tracking intake diversions. But this raises a larger question. For years, SJACS has publicly stated it only accepts pregnant, sick, or injured cats. That messaging has effectively driven the public away, pushing the burden onto under-resourced rescue organizations. Without accurate intake data reflecting actual community needs, how can shelter leadership or the Council make sound policy decisions?

I urge the Council to request a follow-up review, not of whether recommendations were technically implemented, but whether they have produced real, measurable change in shelter operations. In addition, a serious audit of the financial situation is desperately needed.

- Lyne Lamoureux

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.



Fw: Agenda item 3.5. Concerns Regarding Acceptance of SJ Animal Shelter Audit Recommendations

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Tue 3/24/2026 12:37 PM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José
200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
Main: 408-535-1260
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

From: Valentina Martynchik <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2026 12:31 PM
To: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: Agenda item 3.5. Concerns Regarding Acceptance of SJ Animal Shelter Audit Recommendations

[**External Email.** Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Council Members,

My name is Valentina Martynchik, and I am writing regarding the audit recommendation report for San José Animal Care & Services (SJACS) being presented today. While the report may appear to validate current shelter practices, available data shows serious gaps in animal welfare, data integrity, and transparency — reasons the report should not be accepted in its current form.

Key Concerns

1. Juvenile Animal Welfare:

- 1,607 cats returned to the field in 2025, up from 5 in 2021 — a 28,300% increase.
- Kittens as young as 4 weeks are released, and 2–3 month olds which released to the wild, spent weeks in the shelter without learning the skills they need to survive.
- By contrast, wildlife rehabilitation standards release juveniles only when physically and behaviorally ready (4–6+ months).

2. Data Gaps and Manipulation:

- Thousands of records were retroactively altered, reducing reported deaths and inflating live-release rates.
- Critical fields, such as OutcomeSubtype, were removed from public reporting, obscuring cause of death, rescue transfers, and true outcomes.
- Found animals left in public care are untracked, unsterilized, and excluded from public data. This data is also removed from public view.

3. Intake Practices Shift Responsibility:

- Individuals bringing found animals are often refused intake or required to assume full legal, medical, and financial responsibility.
- Many animals are never assigned shelter IDs or guidance, creating untracked “ghost populations” and increasing overpopulation risk.

Impact on Audit Recommendations

- The report’s metrics may reflect procedural compliance or statistical improvements, but do not match the reality faced by animals.
- Accepting the report as-is risks normalizing practices that compromise welfare, transparency, and accountability.

Thank you for your attention. I am available to provide further data and clarification to support informed decision-making.

Sincerely,
Valentina Martynchik

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.