



**CITY OF OAKLAND  
PUBLIC ETHICS COMMISSION**  
Special Commission Meeting  
One Frank Ogawa Plaza (City Hall)  
Hearing Room 2  
Wednesday, April 15, 2026  
6:30 p.m.

This meeting will be streamed live online at [KTOP | City of Oakland, CA](#) and via Zoom. See the [instructions](#) at the end of the agenda for how to participate in-person or remotely.

**Commissioners:**

Francis Upton IV (Chair) | Karun Tilak (Vice-Chair) | Luke Apfeld | Tanya Bayeva | L. Lawrence Brandon | Angi Fisher | Ryan Micik

**Commission Staff to attend:**

Suzanne Doran, Executive Director | Tovah Ackerman, Enforcement Chief | Alex Van Buskirk, Ethics Investigator | Jelani Killings, Ethics Analyst

**Legal Counsel:**

Christina Cameron, Partner, Devaney Pate Morris & Cameron, LLP

**PUBLIC ETHICS COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING AGENDA**

**PRELIMINARY ITEMS**

1. **Roll Call and Determination of Quorum.**
2. **Staff and Commission Announcements.**
3. **Open Forum.**
  - Open forum is a time for a member of the public to comment on any matter within the jurisdiction of the Public Ethics Commission (PEC) that is not otherwise included in tonight’s agenda. Read the Commission’s *Core Values for Inclusive Engagement (Adopted May 6, 2019)* on our [website](#).
  - Under the Sunshine Ordinance, the Commission cannot discuss the substance of any public comment made that does not pertain to an item listed on the agenda.
  - The Commission urges members of the public not to make complaints or ask the Commission to investigate alleged legal violations at public meetings since public disclosure of such complaints or requests may undermine any subsequent investigation undertaken. Contact staff at [ethicscommission@oaklandca.gov](mailto:ethicscommission@oaklandca.gov) for assistance in filing a complaint.

**ACTION ITEMS**



Special Commission Meeting  
Wednesday, April 15, 2026, 6:30 p.m.

4. **Approval of Commission Meeting Draft Minutes.**
  - a. January 21, 2026, Regular Meeting Minutes Revised. ([Attachment: Meeting Minutes](#))
  - b. March 18, 2026, Regular Meeting Minutes. ([Attachment: Meeting Minutes](#))
5. **Biennial City Attorney Salary Adjustment.** The Commission will discuss and take action to adjust the City Attorney salary in accordance with Oakland City Charter Section 401(1). ([Attachment: Staff Memorandum, Resolution 26-02](#))
6. **Biennial City Auditor Salary Adjustment.** The Commission will discuss and take action to adjust the City Auditor salary in accordance with Oakland City Charter Section 403(1). ([Attachment: Staff Memorandum, Resolution 26-03](#))
7. **In the Matter of Tovah Ackerman, Enforcement Chief, and Members of the Public Ethics Commission (PEC #26-03).** Complainant has been referred to a neighboring jurisdiction as required by the PEC Mediation and Complaint Procedures (IV(A)(4)). Staff recommend that the Commission close PEC Case No. 26-03 with no action. ([Attachment: Staff Memo](#))
8. **In the Matter of the Oakland Public Ethics Commission (PEC #26-04).** Complainant has been referred to a neighboring jurisdiction as required by the PEC Mediation and Complaint Procedures (IV(A)(4)). Staff recommend that the Commission close PEC Case No. 26-04 with no action. ([Attachment: Staff Memo](#))
9. **2025 Case Closure Plan – Form 700 Cases.** PEC staff recommend that the Commission close ten respondent-specific Annual Form 700 late- and non-filer matters from 2023 and 2024 with individual warning letters. These matters are being presented as part of PEC staff’s retroactive backlog review process described in the May 2025 Enforcement Report re: Complaint Backlog Strategy. ([Attachment: Staff Memos](#))
  - a. **Form 700 Late-Filers**
    - i. **In the Matter of Chris Jackson (PEC # 24-05.26).** Staff recommends that the Commission close PEC Case No. 24-05.26 with a Warning Letter.
    - ii. **In the Matter of Fred Mangrum (PEC # 24-05.36).** Staff recommends that the Commission close PEC Case No. 24-05.36 with a Warning Letter.
    - iii. **In the Matter of Ali Obad (PEC # 24-05.46).** Staff recommends that the Commission close PEC Case No. 24-05.46 with a Warning Letter.
    - iv. **In the Matter of Michael Wallace (PEC # 24-05.61).** Staff recommends that the Commission close PEC Case No. 24-05.61 with a Warning Letter.



Special Commission Meeting  
Wednesday, April 15, 2026, 6:30 p.m.

- v. **In the Matter of Arthur Watson, Jr. (PEC # 24-05.63).** Staff recommends that the Commission close PEC Case No. 24-05.63 with a Warning Letter.
- vi. **In the Matter of Fred Kelley (PEC # 23-16.8).** Staff recommends that the Commission close PEC Case No. 23-16.8 with a Warning Letter.

**b. Form 700 Non-Filers**

- i. **In the Matter of Tanya Boyce (PEC # 24-05.6).** Staff recommends that the Commission close PEC Case No. 24-05.6 with a Warning Letter.
- ii. **In the Matter of Demitri Taylor (PEC # 24-05.57).** Staff recommends that the Commission close PEC Case No. 24-05.57 with a Warning Letter.
- iii. **In the Matter of Taib Alaoui (PEC # 23-16.3) and In the Matter of Taib Alaoui (PEC # 24-05.1).** Staff recommends that the Commission close PEC Case Nos. 23-16.3 and # 24-05.1 with a Warning Letter.

**10. 2025 Case Closure Plan.** PEC staff are working to close older, low-level cases according to a seven-point rubric to address a severe complaint backlog. Enforcement staff recommend the following cases for closure as part of that plan. ([Attachment: Staff Memo](#))

- a. **In the Matter of David Silver (PEC # 24-02).** Staff recommends that the Commission close PEC Case No. 24-02 with a Warning Letter.
- b. **In the Matter of Cherisse Gash, et al. (PEC # 24-09.01).** Staff recommends that the Commission close PEC Case No. 24-09.01 after a referral to the FPPC.

**INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**11. Future Meeting Business.** Commissioners and staff may propose topics for action or discussion at future Commission meetings.

The meeting will adjourn upon the completion of the Commission's business.

Should you have questions or concerns regarding this agenda, or wish to review any agenda-related materials, please contact the Public Ethics Commission at [ethicscommission@oaklandca.gov](mailto:ethicscommission@oaklandca.gov) or visit our webpage at [www.oaklandca.gov/pec](http://www.oaklandca.gov/pec).

Suzanne Doran

04/03/2026

---

Approved for Distribution

Date



## **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

In addition to attending in-person, the following options for public viewing and participation are available:

### **Livestream Online**

Go to the City of Oakland's KTOP livestream page here:

<https://www.oaklandca.gov/services/ktop-tv10-program-schedule> click on "View"

### **Video Conferencing Access**

To access this meeting using Zoom, use the Zoom Meeting link:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/89169308829> . You will then be prompted to enter the following information:

- Name: This field is required to be entered; however, if you wish to remain anonymous, you may type "Public" in the name field.
- Email Address: This field is required to be entered; however, if you wish to remain anonymous, you may type "Public@public.com" in the email field.

Follow the on-screen prompts to join the meeting. You may be asked to download the Zoom application.

### **Audio Conferencing Access**

To access this meeting by phone, do the following:

- Telephone: Dial (for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location): US: +1 669 900 6833 or +1 669 444 9171 or +1 719 359 4580 or +1 253 205 0468 or +1 253 215 8782 or +1 346 248 7799 or +1 360 209 5623 or +1 386 347 5053 or +1 507 473 4847 or +1 564 217 2000 or +1 646 931 3860 or +1 689 278 1000 or +1 929 205 6099 or +1 301 715 8592 or +1 305 224 1968 or +1 309 205 3325 or +1 312 626 6799 Webinar ID: 891 6930 8829
- International numbers available: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/89169308829>

### **Public Comment**

A member of the public may speak on any item listed on the agenda either in-person or remotely. Speakers are generally limited to three minutes per item, although the Chair may adjust the time based on the number of speakers.

Members of the public may also submit written comments in advance of the meeting to



**EthicsPublicComment@oaklandca.gov.** Please indicate the agenda item # you are commenting on in the subject line of the email. All written public comments received at least 24 hours prior to the meeting will be posted on the meeting webpage prior to the meeting as part of the public record and provided at the meeting with agenda materials.

The purpose of Public Comment is for Commissioners to hear from members of the public. After the close of each Public Comment period, the Commission may address questions or concerns that were raised during the public comment period.

### **Remote Public Comment**

Ensure you are in a quiet location. Before you speak, mute the sound of any equipment around you, including television, radio, or computer. It is especially important that you reduce the volume of your computer speaker if you are watching via the Zoom link, to prevent feedback and echo when you speak.

### **Zoom**

- If you connect to the meeting via Zoom, use the **raise hand button** to indicate that you want to speak on an item and to be added to the public comment queue.
- It is your turn to speak when Zoom displays, “The host has unmuted you.”
- When you hear PEC staff say, “Welcome Caller,” you are encouraged to state your name clearly. As soon as you begin speaking you will have three minutes to provide your public comment (six minutes if you are on the line with an interpreter).
- Once your three minutes have expired, PEC staff will mute you. Zoom will display, “You’re muted.”
- Attendees who want to speak during other public comment periods may stay on the line and listen for the next public comment opportunity and should press the raise hand button to enter the public comment queue again.

### **Telephone Audio Conferencing**

- If you connect to the meeting via telephone, dial \*9 to raise your hand to indicate that you want to speak on an item and to be added to the public comment queue.
- When the system message says, “You’re unmuted,” this is your turn to speak.
- When you hear the PEC staff say, “Welcome Caller,” you are encouraged to state your name clearly. As soon as you begin speaking you will have three minutes to provide your public



comment (six minutes if you are on the line with an interpreter).

- Once your three minutes have expired, PEC staff will mute you. You will hear, “You’re muted.”
- Attendees who want to speak during other public comment periods may stay on the line and listen for the next public comment opportunity and should dial \*9 to raise their hands to enter the public comment queue again.

### **Language Access**

Do you need an ASL, Cantonese, Mandarin or Spanish interpreter or other assistance to participate? Please email [ethicscommission@oaklandca.gov](mailto:ethicscommission@oaklandca.gov) or call (510) 238-3593 Or 711 (for Relay Service) five business days in advance.

¿Necesita un intérprete en español, cantonés o mandarín, u otra ayuda para participar? Por favor envíe un correo electrónico a [ethicscommission@oaklandca.gov](mailto:ethicscommission@oaklandca.gov) o llame al (510) 238-3593 al 711 para servicio de retransmisión (Relay service) por lo menos cinco días antes de la reunión. Gracias.

你需要手語, 西班牙語, 粵語或國語翻譯服務嗎? 請在會議五天前電郵 [ethicscommission@oaklandca.gov](mailto:ethicscommission@oaklandca.gov) or 或致電 (510) 238-3593 或 711 (電話傳達服務)。

Quý vị cần một thông dịch viên Ngôn ngữ Ký hiệu Mỹ (American Sign Language, ASL), tiếng Quảng Đông, tiếng Quan Thoại hay tiếng Tây Ban Nha hoặc bất kỳ sự hỗ trợ nào khác để tham gia hay không? Xin vui lòng gửi email đến địa chỉ [ethicscommission@oaklandca.gov](mailto:ethicscommission@oaklandca.gov) or hoặc gọi đến số (510) 238-3593 hoặc 711 (với Dịch vụ Tiếp âm) trước đó năm ngày.



This meeting location is wheelchair accessible.

CITY OF OAKLAND  
PUBLIC ETHICS COMMISSION  
Regular Commission Meeting  
One Frank Ogawa Plaza (City Hall)  
Hearing Room 2  
Wednesday, January 21, 2026  
6:30 p.m.



## REVISED DRAFT

### **Commissioners:**

Francis Upton IV (Chair) | Tanya Bayeva (Vice-Chair) | Alea Gage | Ryan Mick | Vincent Steele | Karun Tilak

### **Commission Staff in attendance:**

Suzanne Doran, Executive Director | Tovah Ackerman, Enforcement Chief | Jelani Killings, Ethics Analyst | Niels Thorsen, Ethics Analyst | Bhawna Chowdhary, Law Clerk

### **Legal Counsel:**

Oliver Luby, Deputy City Attorney

## PUBLIC ETHICS COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

### **PRELIMINARY ITEMS**

#### **1. Roll Call and Determination of Quorum.**

The meeting was called to order at 6:37 p.m.

Members present: Chair Upton, Vice Chair Bayeva, Gage, Micik, Steele, and Tilak.

Members absent: None.

Staff present: Suzanne Doran, Executive Director; Tovah Ackerman, Enforcement Chief; Jelani Killings, Ethics Analyst; Niels Thorsen, Ethics Analyst; Bhawna Chowdhary, Law Clerk.

Legal Counsel: Oliver Luby, Deputy City Attorney.

#### **2. Staff and Commission Announcements.**

Chair Upton announced that Lawrence Brandon has been selected by the Mayor to fill the mayor-appointed Commission seat. His term will begin Thursday, January 22, 2026. Chair Upton also announced that tonight's meeting was the end of Commissioners Gage and Steele's terms and thanked them for their work.

Public Comment: None.

#### **3. Open Forum.**

Public Comment: Gene Hazzard; Ralph Kanz.

CITY OF OAKLAND  
PUBLIC ETHICS COMMISSION  
Regular Commission Meeting  
One Frank Ogawa Plaza (City Hall)  
Hearing Room 2  
Wednesday, January 21, 2026  
6:30 p.m.



## REVISED DRAFT

### **ACTION ITEMS**

#### **4. Approval of Commission Meeting Draft Minutes.**

##### **a. November 19, 2025, Special Meeting Minutes**

Micik moved, and Tilak seconded, to adopt the November 19, 2025, special meeting minutes.

Public Comment: Gene Hazzard.

Ayes: Bayeva, Micik, Steele, Tilak, Upton.

Noes: None.

Abstentions: Gage (not present at the November 19, 2025 meeting).

Vote: 5-0, 1 abstention.

Motion passed.

##### **b. December 10, 2025, Special Meeting Minutes**

Tilak moved, and Upton seconded, to adopt the December 10, 2025, special meeting minutes.

Public Comment: Hazzard.

Ayes: Gage, Micik, Tilak, Upton.

Noes: None.

Abstentions: Bayeva (not present at the December 10, 2025 meeting), Steele (not present at the December 10, 2025 meeting).

Vote: 4-0, 2 abstentions.

Motion passed.

#### **5. Election of Officers (Chair and Vice-Chair) of the Commission.**

Chair Upton provided an overview of the process for election of the Chair and Vice Chair and opened nominations for Chair and Vice Chair for 2026.

Commissioner Micik nominated Commissioner Tilak for Chair. Commissioner Tilak declined the nomination.

CITY OF OAKLAND  
PUBLIC ETHICS COMMISSION  
Regular Commission Meeting  
One Frank Ogawa Plaza (City Hall)  
Hearing Room 2  
Wednesday, January 21, 2026  
6:30 p.m.



## REVISED DRAFT

Chair Upton nominated himself for Chair.

Commissioner Tilak nominated himself for Vice Chair.

Public Comment: None.

Upton moved, and Bayeva seconded, to approve the election of Commissioner Upton as Chair for 2026.

Ayes: Bayeva, Gage, Micik, Steele, Tilak, Upton.

Noes: None.

Abstentions: None.

Vote: 6-0.

Motion passed.

Gage moved, and Steele seconded, to approve the election of Commissioner Tilak as Vice Chair for 2026.

Ayes: Bayeva, Gage, Micik, Steele, Tilak, Upton.

Noes: None.

Abstentions: None.

Vote: 6-0.

Motion passed.

### 6. New Commissioner Selection.

The Commission invited Commissioner applicant finalists to appear before the full Commission for a public interview. Applicants Luke Apfeld, Angela Fisher, David Lew, and Andy McCoy each introduced themselves and answered the following questions:

- Why do you want to serve on the Public Ethics Commission?
- What skills and experience do you bring?
- What issues, projects, or goals would you like to pursue as a Commissioner?
- What else would you like the Commission to know?

Chair Upton opened the floor for members of the public to ask the candidates questions.

CITY OF OAKLAND  
PUBLIC ETHICS COMMISSION  
Regular Commission Meeting  
One Frank Ogawa Plaza (City Hall)  
Hearing Room 2  
Wednesday, January 21, 2026  
6:30 p.m.



## REVISED DRAFT

Public Comment: Gene Hazzard; Ralph Kanz.

Applicants responded to the questions.

Chair Upton asked if there was additional public comment.

Public Comment: None.

The Commission discussed and individually ranked their choices for the two Commissioner appointments. Angela Fisher and Luke Apfeld were selected as the top two candidates.

Bayeva moved, and Gage seconded, to appoint Angela Fisher and Luke Apfeld to fill the two open Commission seats for the January 22, 2026 – January 21, 2029 term.

Ayes: Bayeva, Gage, Micik, Steele, Tilak, Upton.

Noes: None.

Abstentions: None.

Vote: 6-0.

Motion passed.

Upton moved, and Tilak seconded, to add applicants David Lew and Andy McCoy to the list of applicants who were not appointed to the Commission but that the Commission considers to be well-qualified for appointment for future Commission vacancies per Article XII Section (C) of the Commission's Operations Policy.

Ayes: Bayeva, Gage, Micik, Steele, Tilak, Upton.

Noes: None.

Abstentions: None.

Vote: 6-0.

Motion passed.

Executive Director Doran requested the order of the agenda be modified by moving Item 8 - Guest Presentation – Democracy Dollars Outreach Strategy Report to Item 7 as a courtesy to guest speakers.

Chair Upton announced a meeting break at 8:20 p.m.

CITY OF OAKLAND  
PUBLIC ETHICS COMMISSION  
Regular Commission Meeting  
One Frank Ogawa Plaza (City Hall)  
Hearing Room 2  
Wednesday, January 21, 2026  
6:30 p.m.



## REVISED DRAFT

The meeting resumed at 8:28 p.m.

### 7. Guest Presentation – Democracy Dollars Outreach Strategy Report

Guests Laura Woods, Peter Zahn, and Anna Corning of [Local Policy Lab \(LPL\)](#), presented a summary of their report with recommendations for the outreach strategy for a successful Democracy Dollars program rollout in 2028. The Commissioners thanked LPL for their work and praised the comprehensiveness of the report.

Public Comment: Gene Hazzard; Ralph Kanz.

### 8. Case Closure Plan.

PEC staff are working to close older cases that meet specific criteria according to a seven-point rubric to address a severe complaint backlog. Enforcement Chief Tovah Ackerman presented staff's recommendation to close the following case under the backlog plan:

- In the Matter of Moore for Oakland City Council At-Large 2016 (PEC #19-12). Staff recommends that the Commission close PEC Case No. 19-12 with no further action.

Tilak moved, and Bayeva seconded, to adopt staff's recommendation.

Public Comment: None.

Ayes: Bayeva, Gage, Micik, Steele, Tilak, Upton.

Noes: None.

Abstentions: None.

Vote: 6-0.

Motion passed.

## **INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### 9. Enforcement Report.

Enforcement Chief Tovah Ackerman reported on a summary of the Commission's enforcement process, caseload, enforcement-related litigation, and case closures or dismissals.

CITY OF OAKLAND  
PUBLIC ETHICS COMMISSION  
Regular Commission Meeting  
One Frank Ogawa Plaza (City Hall)  
Hearing Room 2  
Wednesday, January 21, 2026  
6:30 p.m.



## REVISED DRAFT

Public Comment: Gene Hazzard.

### **10. Executive Director Report.**

Executive Director Suzanne Doran announced Mr. Killings' appointment as Ethics Analyst III. She also provided an update on overall priorities and PEC activities for the upcoming year.

Public Comment: Gene Hazzard.

### **11. Reports on Subcommittees and Commissioner Assignments.**

The two Subcommittees, Democracy Dollars Engagement Ad Hoc Subcommittee and Commissioner Recruitment and Selection of Finalists for Interviews Ad Hoc Subcommittee, have concluded their business and submitted their Termination Reports.

Chair Upton initiated a discussion of Commissioner interest in potential ad hoc subcommittees in 2026 including: 1) an ad hoc subcommittee to consider transparency-focused process and policy improvements, which could include the Sunshine Act, the PEC's public records request mediation program, and meetings with guest speakers for input; and 2) an ad hoc subcommittee to consider recommendations for Charter reform in areas of PEC-jurisdiction in anticipation opportunities to provide input on a potential ballot measure in 2026.

Executive Director Doran provided an overview of the PEC's operating policies and public meeting requirements relating to Ad Hoc Subcommittees. Deputy City Attorney Luby answered Commissioner questions and clarified that the PEC's operation policies with respect to ad hoc subcommittees do not conflict with Brown Act requirements for public meetings.

Public Comment: None.

### **12. Future Meeting Business.**

None.

Public Comment: None.

The meeting adjourned at 10:12 pm.

CITY OF OAKLAND  
PUBLIC ETHICS COMMISSION  
Regular Commission Meeting  
One Frank Ogawa Plaza (City Hall)  
Hearing Room 2  
Wednesday, March 18, 2026  
6:30 p.m.



## DRAFT

### Commissioners:

Francis Upton IV (Chair) | Karun Tilak (Vice-Chair) | Luke Apfeld | Tanya Bayeva | L. Lawrence Brandon | Angi Fisher | Ryan Micik

### Commission Staff in attendance:

Suzanne Doran, Executive Director | Tovah Ackerman, Enforcement Chief | Alex Van Buskirk, Ethics Investigator | Benjamin Mahrer, Ethics Investigator | Jelani Killings, Ethics Analyst | Niels Thorsen, Ethics Analyst | Bhawna Chowdhary, Law Clerk

### Legal Counsel:

Oliver Luby, Deputy City Attorney

## PUBLIC ETHICS COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

### PRELIMINARY ITEMS

#### 1. Roll Call and Determination of Quorum.

The meeting was called to order at 6:33 p.m.

Members present: Chair Francis Upton IV, Vice-Chair Karun Tilak, Luke Apfeld, Tanya Bayeva, L. Lawrence Brandon, Angi Fisher, and Ryan Micik.

Members absent: None.

Staff present: Suzanne Doran, Executive Director; Tovah Ackerman, Enforcement Chief; Alex Van Buskirk, Ethics Investigator; Benjamin Mahrer, Ethics Investigator; Jelani Killings, Ethics Analyst; Niels Thorsen, Ethics Analyst; and Bhawna Chowdhary, Law Clerk.

Legal Counsel: Oliver Luby, Deputy City Attorney.

#### 2. Staff and Commission Announcements.

Chair Upton announced that members of the public can now participate in meetings remotely via Zoom.

Executive Director Suzanne Doran acknowledged Benjamin Mahrer as the new Ethics Investigator.

Public Comment: None.

#### 3. Open Forum.

Chair Upton provided an overview of the rules for public comment during PEC meetings and how to participate via Zoom or phone.

CITY OF OAKLAND  
PUBLIC ETHICS COMMISSION  
Regular Commission Meeting  
One Frank Ogawa Plaza (City Hall)  
Hearing Room 2  
Wednesday, March 18, 2026  
6:30 p.m.



## DRAFT

Public Comment: 2 speakers.

### **ACTION ITEMS**

#### **4. Approval of Commission Meeting Draft Minutes.**

##### **a. January 21, 2026, Regular Meeting Minutes.**

Executive Director Doran stated that the draft minutes would be corrected to show that public comment was taken prior to actions taken by the Commission. Staff verified from the meeting recording that public comment was taken for each item; however, the minutes did not reflect the chronological order.

Public Comment: 2 speakers.

Tilak moved to adopt the January 21, 2026, regular meeting minutes.

The motion failed due to lack of a second. The minutes were held over pending a revised draft.

#### **5. Oakland City Council Salary Adjustment.**

Executive Director Doran presented staff's recommendation, and Commissioners discussed the requirement for setting the Oakland City Councilmember salary level in accordance with Oakland City Charter Section 202.

Micik moved, and Fisher seconded, to approve Resolution 26-01 authorizing a 5 percent increase in the Oakland City Councilmember salary in accordance with City Charter Section 202.

Public Comment: 3 speakers.

Ayes: Tilak, Apfeld, Bayeva, Brandon, Fisher, Micik, Upton.

Noes: None.

Abstentions: None.

Vote: 7-0.

Motion passed.

#### **6. City Attorney and City Auditor Salary Adjustment Process.**

Executive Director Doran provided a summary of the salary adjustment process for the City Attorney and City Auditor and requested Commissioner input.

CITY OF OAKLAND  
PUBLIC ETHICS COMMISSION  
Regular Commission Meeting  
One Frank Ogawa Plaza (City Hall)  
Hearing Room 2  
Wednesday, March 18, 2026  
6:30 p.m.



## DRAFT

Public Comment: 1 speaker.

### **7. In the Matter of the Oakland Public Ethics Commission (PEC #25-27).**

Enforcement Chief Tovah Ackerman presented PEC Cases No. 25-27 and No. 26-01 jointly for Commission consideration and stated that the complainant has been referred to a nearby jurisdiction in accordance with the PEC Mediation and Complaint Procedures (IV(A)(4)). Staff recommended that the Commission close PEC Case Nos. 25-27 and 26-01 without further action.

Chair Upton recommended taking items 7 and 8 as one vote.

Apfeld moved, and Bayeva seconded, to close PEC Cases 25-27 and 26-01 with no action.

Public Comment was taken for item 7 and then item 8, since the items were agendized separately.

Public Comment Item 7: None.

Public Comment Item 8: 2 speakers.

Tilak made a friendly amendment to include directing Staff to forward the complaints directly to the San Francisco Ethics Commission on behalf of the complainant and to request that the San Francisco Ethics Commission disclose its decision on the complaint publicly so that it could be reported to the Commission.

Apfeld and Bayeva accepted the amendment.

Ayes: Tilak, Apfeld, Bayeva, Brandon, Fisher, Micik, Upton.

Noes: None.

Abstentions: None.

Vote: 7-0.

Motion passed.

### **8. In the Matter of Tovah Ackerman, Enforcement Chief (PEC #26-01).**

Combined with Item 7. See above for discussion and action.

CITY OF OAKLAND  
PUBLIC ETHICS COMMISSION  
Regular Commission Meeting  
One Frank Ogawa Plaza (City Hall)  
Hearing Room 2  
Wednesday, March 18, 2026  
6:30 p.m.



## DRAFT

### 9. Case Closure Plan.

PEC staff are working to close cases according to a seven-point rubric to address a severe complaint backlog. Enforcement Chief Tovah Ackerman presented, and the Commission discussed, staff's recommendation to close the following cases:

- In the Matter of Asha Reed et al. (PEC # 22-20). Staff recommend that the Commission close PEC Case No. 22-20 with no further action.
- In the Matter of Unknown (PEC # 24-01). Staff recommend that the Commission close PEC Case No. 24-01 with no further action.

Upton moved, and Apfeld seconded, to adopt staff's recommendation.

Public Comment: 1 speaker.

Ayes: Tilak, Apfeld, Bayeva, Brandon, Fisher, Micik, Upton.

Noes: None.

Abstentions: None.

Vote: 7-0.

Motion passed.

## **INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### 10. Enforcement Report.

Enforcement Chief Tovah Ackerman reported on, and Commissioners discussed, a summary of the Commission's enforcement process, caseload, enforcement-related litigation, and case closures or dismissals.

Public Comment: 1 speaker.

### 11. Executive Director Report.

Executive Director Suzanne Doran reported on overall priorities and PEC activities, such as budget, staffing, and PEC legislative and policy initiatives, since the last Commission meeting, as well as specific programs updates included as attachments.

Public Comment: 1 speaker.

CITY OF OAKLAND  
PUBLIC ETHICS COMMISSION  
Regular Commission Meeting  
One Frank Ogawa Plaza (City Hall)  
Hearing Room 2  
Wednesday, March 18, 2026  
6:30 p.m.



## DRAFT

### **12. Reports on Subcommittees and Commissioner Assignments.**

Chair Upton surveyed Commissioners about their interests generally as well as in serving on three potential ad hoc subcommittees: 1) Transparency Ad-Hoc Subcommittee, 2) Charter Reform Recommendations Ad Hoc Subcommittee, and 3) Democracy Dollars Pilot Ad Hoc Subcommittee.

Fisher, Brandon, and Tilak expressed interest in forming an Ad Hoc Subcommittee to provide input into enforcement program policies and priorities.

Chair Upton established the Transparency Ad Hoc Subcommittee chaired by Upton and appointed Commissioners Apfeld and Fisher as members.

Public Comment: 2 speakers.

### **13. Future Meeting Business.**

None.

Public Comment: There were no public speakers.

The meeting adjourned at 8:51 p.m.



Francis Upton IV, Chair  
Karun Tilak, Vice Chair  
Luke Apfeld  
Tanya Bayeva  
L. Lawrence Brandon  
Angi Fisher  
Ryan Micik

Suzanne Doran, Executive Director

---

**TO:** Public Ethics Commission  
**FROM:** Suzanne Doran, Executive Director  
**DATE:** April 3, 2026  
**RE:** Biennial City Attorney Salary Adjustment as Required by City Charter Section 401(1), for the April 15, 2026, Special PEC Meeting

---

In November 2022, Oakland voters passed Measure X, which amended Oakland City Charter Section 401(1) to include setting the City Attorney’s salary level to the duties of the Public Ethics Commission (PEC or Commission). Every two years, the Commission is responsible for adjusting the City Attorney’s salary based on criteria specified by City Charter Section 401(1). This memo explains the criteria, summarizes salary survey data, and provides a staff recommendation with options for the biennial salary increase consistent with the criteria.

## Background

The City Attorney is the department head for the [Office of the City Attorney](#) and oversees a staff of approximately 78 full-time equivalent (FTE) positions.<sup>1</sup> The current City Attorney was most recently elected in November 2024.

Prior to 2023, the City Attorney’s salary was set by the City Council. In November 2022, Oakland voters passed Measure X, which amended the process for adjusting the City Attorney’s salary and assigned the responsibility to the Commission. Measure OO, passed by voters in November 2024, further amended Section 401(1) by changing the adjustment to a biennial (every other year) adjustment rather than a yearly adjustment. Section 401(1) of the City Charter provides that:

The salary of the elected City Attorney shall be set every two (2) years by the Public Ethics Commission to provide for competitive compensation and equitable alignment and, taking into account the top of the range for the highest paid professional employee in the Office of the City Attorney and salaries for other City department heads, and shall be comparable to the salaries of City Attorneys and other comparable positions, such as County Counsel or Port Attorney, in California cities, counties and agencies selected by the Commission. The City Attorney's salary may not be reduced during the City Attorney's term of office except as part of a general reduction of salaries of all officers and employees in the same amount or proportion.

---

<sup>1</sup> This represents the number of Full Time Equivalent (FTE) positions as reported by the City’s Finance Department. Data provided by Shaleen Singh, Human Resources Operations Supervisor, Finance Department, February 23, 2026.

The Commission last adjusted the salary for City Attorney by 4.6 percent in 2024, resulting in a PEC-adjusted annual salary of **\$320,958.84**. Payroll adjustments must be included in the citywide salary schedule adopted by City Council and take effect on the first payroll period after the beginning of the new fiscal year, which begins July 1. This annual salary amount is applied across 26 bi-weekly pay periods in the City of Oakland’s financial software system, but the actual salary is **\$320,958.82** due to numerical rounding in the system.<sup>2</sup> The table above shows salary increases approved by the Commission from 2023 through 2024.

Year	PEC-Authorized Annual Salary	Percent Increase
2024	\$320,958.84	4.6
2023	\$306,990.63	26.0

## Analysis

**Highest Paid Professional Employee** – In adjusting the Attorney’s salary, the Charter requires that the Commission take into account, “the top of the range for the highest paid professional employee in the Office of the City Attorney.” The Assistant City Attorney is the highest-paid direct report for the City Attorney. The maximum annual salary for the Assistant City Attorney position is currently **\$284,676.36** per year. According to U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics data, the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U) in the San Francisco-Oakland-Hayward area rose 5.4 percent from December 2023 to December 2025.<sup>3</sup> Since the July 2024 City Attorney salary adjustment, non-sworn represented employees and most City of Oakland department heads received a salary increase of two percent effective March 1, 2025. No negotiated salary increases for 2026 or 2027 are agreed upon for non-sworn employees at the time of writing, as the contracts will expire on June 30, 2026, and the City is presently entering bargaining with all unions.

According to the City’s Human Resources Department, best practices dictate a differential of at least 15 to 20 percent between a supervisor/manager and their highest paid direct reporting employee, although among executive management this is not always achieved. For the City Attorney salary to be 15 to 20 percent above the salary of the highest direct reporting employee would be a salary between **\$327,377.81 and \$341,611.63**. The City Attorney presently makes **12.7** percent more than the highest paid professional employee, which is below that range.

**Other City Department Heads** – In adjusting the Attorney’s salary, the Charter requires that the Commission take into account “salaries for other City department heads.” The salary range for Oakland department heads is from **\$200,000.04 to \$350,792.40** (See the Appendix for complete salary survey data). The mean annual salary for a department head (excluding the City Attorney) is **\$267,209.34** per year and the median annual salary is **\$270,415.08** (see Appendix Table 1). Of Oakland’s 23 department heads, the City Attorney has the **third highest salary**.

---

<sup>2</sup> According to the City’s current Salary Ordinance, the City Attorney’s actual annual salary is \$320,958.82, \$ .02 below the PEC-authorized salary. Actual salary amounts may vary slightly from the authorized annual salary due to standard payroll system calculation and rounding when annual amounts are applied across pay periods. Salary data provided by Anjali Saxena, Payroll Manager, Finance Department. January 29, 2026.

<sup>3</sup> U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. San Francisco-Oakland-Hayward, CA Consumer Price Index. December 2023 – December 2025. Data retrieved January 28, 2026 from <https://data.bls.gov/timeseries/CUURS49BSAO>. Inflation formula: (CPI2 – CPI1) / CPI1 x 100 = \_\_\_%

In terms of staff size, the Attorney’s Office is a mid-sized City department. Of the seven departments (excluding the City Attorney’s Office) with between 50 and 150 FTE, the mean annual salary for a department head is **\$257,237.26** per year, and the median annual salary is **\$270,415.20**. Oakland’s City Attorney makes 24.8 percent above the mean and 18.7 percent above the median department head salary for comparable-size departments.

**Public Sector Attorney Positions** – In adjusting the Attorney’s salary, the Charter provides that the Attorney’s compensation shall be “comparable to the salaries of public sector Attorney positions in California cities and counties selected by the Commission.”

Based on a survey of other California cities within the four immediate higher and four lower populations compared to Oakland (see Appendix Table 2), the salary range for the City Attorney position in comparable-size California cities is from **\$285,000.00 to \$379,388.31**. The mean annual salary is **\$338,034.78** and the median annual salary is **\$339,369.29**. Oakland’s City Attorney makes 94.9 percent of the mean and 94.6 percent of the median City Attorney salary in comparable-size cities. The average salary for comparably-sized California cities has increased by 10.3 percent since the Commission’s 2024 survey, although the variability between cities is considerable (see Appendix Table 3).

In accordance with the Charter criteria, staff also surveyed City Attorney salaries for surrounding Bay Area Cities, the salary of the County Counsel for Alameda County, and the salary of the Counsel for the Oakland Port Authority (see Appendix Table 4).

The salary range for the City Attorney position in Bay Area jurisdictions is from **\$325,936.00 to \$415,625.60**. The mean annual salary is **\$367,314.73** per year and the median annual salary is **\$367,676.00**. Oakland’s City Attorney makes 87.4 percent of the mean and 87.3 percent of the median City Attorney salary in Bay Area cities. The average salary for Bay Area jurisdictions surveyed has increased by 6.1 percent since the Commission’s 2024 survey (see Appendix Table 5).

**Summary** – A salary adjustment of 2 percent would maintain the 15 percent differential above the top of the range for the highest paid professional employee in the City Attorney’s Office and the City Attorney’s ranking as the third highest salary for a department head established by the Commission’s 2024 salary adjustment. However, the Commission has the discretion to authorize a different amount, if it concludes that amount better meets the Charter criteria. The table below provides a summary comparison of the current City Attorney salary with the criteria identified in the City Charter as well as a comparison of three salary increase options, within the range of 15 to 20 percent of above the highest paid employee in the City Attorney’s Office.

		Current Salary	2% increase	5.4% increase	6.4% increase <sup>4</sup>
<b>City Attorney's salary</b>		\$320,958.82	\$327,377.81	\$338,290.60	\$341,611.63
	Mean	Difference (%)	Difference (%)	Difference (%)	Difference (%)
<b>Top Paid Employee</b>	\$284,676.36	12.7	15.0	18.8	20.0
<b>Other Department Heads (n=22)</b>	\$264,154.38	21.5	23.9	28.1	29.3

<sup>4</sup> For consistency, percentages are rounded to one decimal place. The exact percentage increase over the current annual salary is 6.434723 for an annual salary 20 percent above the salary for the highest paid employee.

**Item 05 - Biennial City Attorney Salary Adjustment**

Staff Memo - City Attorney Salary Adjustment – April 3, 2026

p. 4

<b>50-150 FTE Department Heads (7)</b>	\$257,237.26	24.8	27.3	31.5	32.8
<b>Comparable-Size Cities (8)</b>	\$338,034.78	-5.1	-3.2	0.1	1.1
<b>Bay Area Jurisdictions (10)</b>	\$367,314.73	-12.6	-10.9	-7.9	-7.0

**Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommend the Commission adopt a resolution at its April 15, 2026, meeting adjusting the City Attorney’s annual salary by **one** of the three options below, based on the salary survey data and criteria set forth in City Charter Section 401(1), effective in the first pay period after July 1, 2026.

	Monthly	Annual
<b>Current City Attorney salary</b>	\$26,746.57	\$320,958.82
<b>Option 1: 2.0% increase</b>	\$27,281.48	\$327,377.81
<b>Option 2: 5.4% increase</b>	\$28,190.88	\$338,290.60
<b>Option 3: 6.4% increase</b>	\$28,467.64	\$341,611.63

Following Commission approval, Commission staff will finalize and transmit the salary adjustment resolution to the City Administrator; the Department of Human Resources to amend the salary ordinance; and the Treasury Division - Payroll to implement the increase.

Attachment: Draft resolution

## APPENDIX: SALARY SURVEY DATA

**Table 1: City Department Head Salaries**

Director Title	Annual Salary	Similar-Sized Departments
Chief of Police	\$350,792.40	
Chief of Fire	\$326,699.76	
<b>City Attorney</b>	<b>\$320,958.82</b>	<b>\$320,958.82</b>
Director of Public Works	\$313,598.76	
Director of Transportation	\$313,598.76	
Director of Finance	\$289,000.08	\$289,000.08
Director of Housing & Community Dev	\$270,415.20	\$270,415.20
Director of Library Services	\$270,415.20	\$270,415.20
Director of Information Technology	\$270,415.20	\$270,415.20
Director of Animal Services	\$270,415.08	
Director of Planning & Building	\$270,415.08	\$270,415.08
Director of Human Resources Management	\$270,415.08	
Director of Economic & Workforce Dev	\$267,642.96	
Director of Workplace & Employment Stnd	\$250,957.92	
City Clerk	\$243,467.76	
EEO & Civil Rights Director	\$239,008.08	
Executive Director CPRA	\$239,007.96	
Director of Race and Equity	\$239,007.96	
Executive Director, Public Ethics Comm	\$230,000.04	
Director of Human Services	\$230,000.04	\$230,000.04
Inspector General	\$229,510.80	
City Auditor	\$226,612.10	
Director of Parks & Recreation	\$200,000.04	\$200,000.04
<b>Mean salary (Excluding City Attorney)</b>	<b>\$267,209.34</b>	<b>\$257,237.26</b>
<b>Median salary (Excluding City Attorney)</b>	<b>\$270,415.08</b>	<b>\$270,415.20</b>

Data source: Salary data provided by Anjali Saxena, Payroll Manager, City of Oakland Finance Department, January 29, 2026.

**Table 2: California Cities City Attorney Salaries**

Jurisdiction	Population	Annual Salary
City and County of San Francisco	831,703	\$325,936.00
City of Fresno	543,428	\$285,000.00
City of Sacramento	518,161	\$351,048.19
City of Long Beach	458,222	\$379,388.31
<b>City of Oakland</b>	<b>419,556</b>	<b>\$320,958.82</b>
City of Bakersfield	408,373	\$306,001.32
City of Anaheim	328,580	\$367,438.00
City of Stockton	319,731	\$327,690.38
City of Riverside	313,676	\$361,776.00
<b>Mean (Excluding Oakland)</b>		<b>\$338,034.78</b>
<b>Median (Excluding Oakland)</b>		<b>\$339,369.29</b>

Data source: Published salary schedules and/or salary information provided by public records request as of March 17, 2026.

**Table 3: Salary Trends California Cities**

Jurisdiction	2024 Survey	2026 Survey	Change (%)
City and County of San Francisco	\$308,724.00	\$325,936.00	5.6%
City of Fresno	\$240,000.00	\$285,000.00	18.8%
City of Sacramento	\$351,048.19	\$351,048.19	0.0%
City of Long Beach	\$354,540.88	\$379,388.31	7.0%
City of Bakersfield	\$227,585.28	\$306,001.32	34.5%
City of Anaheim	\$322,058.00	\$367,438.00	14.1%
City of Stockton	\$280,800.00	\$327,690.38	16.7%
City of Riverside	\$341,004.00	\$361,776.00	6.1%
<b>Mean</b>	<b>\$303,220.04</b>	<b>\$338,034.78</b>	<b>10.3%</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>\$315,391.00</b>	<b>\$339,369.29</b>	<b>7.1%</b>

**Table 4: Bay Area Jurisdictions City Attorney Salaries**

Jurisdiction	Annual Salary
County of Alameda	\$415,625.60
City and County of San Francisco	\$325,936.00
City of Alameda	\$347,400.00
City of Berkeley	\$370,406.40
City of Fremont	\$355,159.35
City of Hayward	\$366,496.00
City of Mountain View	\$362,806.86
<b>City of Oakland</b>	<b>\$320,958.82</b>
City of San Jose	\$390,000.00
City of Santa Clara	\$370,461.12
Oakland Port Authority	\$368,856.00
<b>Mean (Excluding Oakland)</b>	<b>\$367,314.73</b>
<b>Median (Excluding Oakland)</b>	<b>\$367,676.00</b>

Data source: Published salary schedules and/or salary information provided by public records request as of March 17, 2026.

**Table 5: Salary Trends Bay Area Jurisdictions**

Jurisdiction	2024 Survey	2026 Survey	Change (%)
County of Alameda	\$399,630.40	\$415,625.60	4.0%
City and County of San Francisco	\$392,718.73	\$325,936.00	-5.7%
City of Alameda	\$345,000.00	\$347,400.00	13.0%
City of Berkeley	\$336,000.08	\$370,406.40	10.3%
City of Fremont	\$352,800.00	\$355,159.35	4.6%
City of Hayward	\$335,608.00	\$366,496.00	9.2%
City of Mountain View	\$335,338.38	\$362,806.86	8.2%
City of San Jose	\$341,499.37	\$390,000.00	4.0%
City of Santa Clara	\$300,481.00	\$370,461.12	15.6%
Oakland Port Authority	\$308,724.00	\$368,856.00	5.6%
<b>Mean</b>	<b>\$344,780.00</b>	<b>\$367,314.73</b>	<b>6.1%</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>\$338,749.73</b>	<b>\$367,676.00</b>	<b>7.9%</b>

**CITY OF OAKLAND  
Public Ethics Commission**



**RESOLUTION NO. 26-02  
[Proposed 4-15-26]**

**RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING A SALARY INCREASE FOR THE OFFICE OF CITY ATTORNEY PURSUANT TO OAKLAND CITY CHARTER SECTION 401(1)**

By action of the Oakland Public Ethics Commission:

**WHEREAS**, Oakland City Charter section 401(1) provides: “The salary of the elected City Attorney shall be set every two (2) years by the Public Ethics Commission to provide for competitive compensation and equitable alignment and, taking into account the top of the range for the highest paid professional employee in the Office of the City Attorney and salaries for other City department heads, and shall be comparable to the salaries of City Attorneys and other comparable positions, such as County Counsel or Port Attorney, in California cities, counties and agencies selected by the Commission. The City Attorney’s salary may not be reduced during the City Attorney’s term of office except as part of a general reduction of salaries of all officers and employees in the same amount or proportion”; and

**WHEREAS**, Oakland City Charter section 207 charges the City Council with fixing the compensation of all City employees, officers and officials unless otherwise provided by the Charter; and

**WHEREAS**, Ordinance No. 12187 C.M.S., the “Salary Ordinance,” as amended, sets forth a salary schedule reflecting all classifications of employment within the City including those of city employees and city officers; and

**WHEREAS**, a salary adjustment to **[INSERT ADOPTED AMOUNT]** annually would provide competitive compensation and equitable alignment of the City Attorney’s salary by providing the City Attorney with a salary that is at least 15 percent above the top of the range for the highest paid professional employee in the Attorney’s Office, that is comparable with the salaries of City Attorneys in other comparable-size cities and Bay Area jurisdictions, and that also accounts for the salaries of other City department heads.

Now, therefore be it:

**RESOLVED**, that the Commission does hereby authorize an annual salary of **[INSERT ADOPTED AMOUNT]** for the office of City Attorney as mandated by City Charter Section 401(1), effective as of the first payroll period of Fiscal Year 2026-2027.

**CERTIFICATION RE: APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION**

The foregoing Resolution was presented for approval at a duly noticed meeting of the City of Oakland Public Ethics Commission held on April 15, 2026, where a quorum of the membership of the Commission was present. The Commission approved the resolution by a vote of \_\_\_ to \_\_\_.

AYES:

NOES:

**CITY OF OAKLAND**  
**Public Ethics Commission**



**RESOLUTION NO. 26-02**  
**[Proposed 4-15-26]**

ABSTAIN:  
ABSENT:

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Suzanne Doran, Executive Director  
Oakland Public Ethics Commission

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**DRAFT**



Francis Upton IV, Chair  
Karun Tilak, Vice Chair  
Luke Apfeld  
Tanya Bayeva  
L. Lawrence Brandon  
Angi Fisher  
Ryan Micik

Suzanne Doran, Executive Director

---

**TO:** Public Ethics Commission  
**FROM:** Suzanne Doran, Executive Director  
**DATE:** April 3, 2026  
**RE:** Biennial City Auditor Salary Adjustment as Required by City Charter Section 403(1), for the April 15, 2026, Special PEC Meeting

---

In November 2022, Oakland voters passed Measure X, which amended Oakland City Charter Section 403(1) to include setting the City Auditor salary level to the duties of the Public Ethics Commission (PEC or Commission). Every two years, the Commission is responsible for adjusting the City Auditor salary based on criteria specified by City Charter Section 403(1). This memo explains the criteria, summarizes salary survey data, and provides a staff recommendation with options for the biennial salary increase consistent with the criteria.

## Background

The City Auditor is the department head for the [Office of the City Auditor](#) and oversees a staff of approximately nine full time equivalent (FTE) positions.<sup>1</sup> The current City Auditor was most recently elected in March 2024.

Prior to 2023, the City Auditor’s salary was set by the City Council. In November 2022, Oakland voters passed Measure X, which amended the process for adjusting the City Auditor’s salary and assigned the responsibility to the Commission. Measure OO, passed by voters in November 2024, further amended Section 403(1) by changing the adjustment to a biennial (every other year) adjustment rather than a yearly adjustment. Section 403(1) of the City Charter provides that:

The salary of the City Auditor shall be set every two (2) years by the Public Ethics Commission, to provide for competitive compensation and equitable alignment and, taking into account the top of the range for the highest paid professional employee in the Office of the City Auditor and salaries for other City department heads, and shall be comparable to the salaries of public sector auditor positions in California cities and counties selected by the Commission. The City Auditor's salary may not be reduced during the City Auditor's term of office, except as a part of a general reduction of salaries for all officers and employees in the same amount or proportion.

**Year PEC-Authorized Percent**

---

<sup>1</sup> This represents the number of Full Time Equivalent (FTE) positions as reported by the City’s Finance Department. Data provided by Shaleen Singh, Human Resources Operations Supervisor, Finance Department, February 23, 2026.

The Commission last adjusted the salary for City Auditor by 6.3 percent in 2024, resulting in a PEC-adjusted annual salary of **\$226,612.19**. Payroll adjustments must be included in the citywide salary schedule adopted by City Council and take effect on the first payroll period after the beginning of the new fiscal year, which begins July 1. This annual salary amount is applied across 26 bi-weekly pay periods in the City of Oakland’s financial software system, but the actual annual salary is **\$226,612.10** due to numerical rounding in the system.<sup>2</sup> The table above shows salary increases approved by the Commission from 2023 through 2024.

	<b>Annual Salary</b>	<b>Increase</b>
2024	\$226,612.19	6.3
2023	\$213,137.51	17.6

## **Analysis**

**Highest Paid Professional Employee** – In adjusting the Auditor’s salary, the Charter requires that the Commission take into account, “the top of the range for the highest paid professional employee in the Office of the City Auditor.” The Assistant City Auditor is the highest paid direct report for the City Auditor. The maximum annual salary for the Assistant City Auditor position in the Office of the City Auditor currently is **\$192,620.28** per year. According to U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics data, the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U) in the San Francisco-Oakland-Hayward area rose 5.4 percent from December 2023 to December 2025.<sup>3</sup> Since the July 2024 City Attorney salary adjustment, non-sworn represented employees and most City of Oakland department heads received a salary increase of two percent effective March 1, 2025. No negotiated salary increases for 2026 or 2027 had been agreed upon for non-sworn employees at the time of writing as the contracts will expire on June 30, 2026, and the City is presently entering bargaining with all unions.

According to the City’s Human Resources Department, best practices dictate a differential of at least 15 to 20 percent between a supervisor/manager and their highest paid direct reporting employee, although among executive management this is not always achieved. For the City Auditor salary to be 15 to 20 percent above the salary of the highest direct reporting employee would be a salary between **\$221,513.32 and \$231,144.34**. The City Auditor presently makes **17.6** percent more than the highest paid professional employee, which is within that range.

**Other City Department Heads** – In adjusting the Auditor’s salary, the Charter requires that the Commission take into account “salaries for other City department heads.” The salary range for Oakland department heads is from **\$200,000.04 to \$350,792.40** (See the Appendix for complete salary survey data). The mean annual salary for a department head (excluding the City Auditor) is **\$271,702.04** per year and the median annual salary is **\$270,415.08**. Of Oakland’s 23 department heads, the City Auditor salary is **the second lowest salary**.

---

<sup>2</sup> According to the City’s current Salary Ordinance, the City Auditor’s actual annual salary is \$226,612.10, \$ .09 below the PEC-authorized salary. Actual salary amounts may vary slightly from the authorized annual salary due to standard payroll system calculation and rounding when annual amounts are applied across pay periods. Salary data provided by Anjali Saxena, Payroll Manager, Finance Department. January 29, 2026.

<sup>3</sup> U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. San Francisco-Oakland-Hayward, CA Consumer Price Index. December 2023 – December 2025. Data retrieved January 28, 2026 from <https://data.bls.gov/timeseries/CUURS49BSA0>. Inflation formula: (CPI2 – CPI1) / CPI1 x 100 = \_\_\_%

In terms of staff size, the Auditor’s Office is a small City department. Of the five departments (excluding the City Auditor’s Office) with under 20 FTE, the mean annual salary for a department head is **\$240,488.33** per year and the median annual salary is **\$239,007.96**. Oakland’s City Auditor makes 94.2 percent of the mean and 94.8 percent of the median department head salary for comparable-size departments.

**Public Sector Auditor Positions** – In adjusting the Auditor’s salary, the Charter provides that the Auditor’s compensation shall be “comparable to the salaries of public sector Auditor positions in California cities and counties selected by the Commission.”

The Commission surveyed other California cities within the four immediate higher and four lower populations compared to Oakland. However, only three cities have comparable positions, Sacramento, Long Beach, and Stockton. The salary range for the City Auditor position in those comparable-size California cities is from **\$159,978.20 to \$282,281.90** (see Appendix Table 2). The mean annual salary is **\$222,420.03** and the median annual salary is **\$225,000.00**. Oakland’s City Auditor makes 101.9 percent of the mean and 100.7 percent of the median City Auditor salary in comparable-size cities.

In accordance with the Charter criteria, staff also surveyed City Auditor salaries for surrounding Bay Area cities and the salary of the Auditor-Controller for Alameda County (see Appendix Table 3). The salary range for comparable Auditor positions in Bay Area jurisdictions is from **\$209,278.58 to \$312,575.38**. The mean annual salary is **\$273,656.42** per year and the median annual salary is **\$286,385.86**. Oakland’s City Auditor makes 82.8 percent of the mean and 79.1 percent of the median City Auditor salary in Bay Area jurisdictions.

**Summary** – A salary adjustment of 2 percent would maintain the 20 percent differential above the top of the range for the highest paid professional employee in the City Auditor’s office set by the Commission’s 2024 salary adjustment. However, the Commission has the discretion to authorize a different amount, if it concludes that amount better meets the Charter criteria. The table below provides a summary comparison of the current City Auditor salary with the criteria identified in the City Charter as well as a comparison of three salary increase options. The first option is a 2 percent increase which maintains the City Auditor salary at 20 percent of above the highest paid employee in the City Auditor’s office. Options 2 and 3 show higher increases based on the increase in the Consumer Price Index since the last salary adjustment.

		Current Salary	2% increase	5% increase	5.4% increase
<b>City Auditor salary</b>		\$226,612.10	\$231,144.34	\$237,942.71	\$238,849.15
	Mean	Difference (%)	Difference (%)	Difference (%)	Difference (%)
Top Paid Employee	\$192,620.28	17.6	20.0	23.5	24.0
Other Department Heads (n=22)	\$271,702.04	-16.6	-14.9	-12.4	-12.1
20 FTE or less Department Heads (5)	\$240,488.33	-5.8	-3.9	-1.1	-0.7
Comparable-Size Cities (3)	\$222,420.03	1.9	3.9	7.0	7.4
Bay Area Jurisdictions (4)	\$273,656.42	-17.2	-15.5	-13.1	-12.7

## Staff Recommendation

Staff recommend the Commission adopt a resolution at its April 15, 2026, meeting based on the salary survey data and criteria set forth in City Charter Section 403(1), adjusting the City Auditor’s annual salary by **one** of the three options below, effective in the first pay period after July 1, 2026.

	Monthly	Annual
<b>Current City Auditor salary</b>	\$18,884.34	\$226,612.10
<b>Option 1: 2.0% increase</b>	\$19,262.03	\$231,144.34
<b>Option 2: 5.0% increase</b>	\$19,828.56	\$237,942.71
<b>Option 3: 5.4% increase</b>	\$19,904.10	\$238,849.15

Following Commission approval, Commission staff will finalize and transmit the salary adjustment resolution to the City Administrator, the Department of Human Resources to amend the salary ordinance, and the Treasury Division - Payroll to implement the increase.

Attachment: Draft resolution

## APPENDIX: SALARY SURVEY DATA

**Table 1: City Department Head Salaries**

Director Title	Annual Salary	Similar-Sized Departments
Chief of Police	\$350,792.40	
Chief of Fire	\$326,699.76	
City Attorney	\$320,958.82	
Director of Public Works	\$313,598.76	
Director of Transportation	\$313,598.76	
Director of Finance	\$289,000.08	
Director of Housing & Community Dev	\$270,415.20	
Director of Library Services	\$270,415.20	
Director of Information Technology	\$270,415.20	
Director of Animal Services	\$270,415.08	
Director of Planning & Building	\$270,415.08	
Director of Human Resources Management	\$270,415.08	
Director of Economic & Workforce Dev	\$267,642.96	
Director of Workplace & Employment Stnd	\$250,957.92	\$250,957.92
City Clerk	\$243,467.76	\$243,467.76
EEO & Civil Rights Director	\$239,008.08	
Executive Director CPRA	\$239,007.96	\$239,007.96
Director of Race and Equity	\$239,007.96	\$239,007.96
Executive Director, Public Ethics Comm	\$230,000.04	\$230,000.04
Director of Human Services	\$230,000.04	
Inspector General	\$229,510.80	
<b>City Auditor</b>	<b>\$226,612.10</b>	<b>\$226,612.10</b>
Director of Parks & Recreation	\$200,000.04	
<b>Mean salary (Excluding City Auditor)</b>	<b>\$271,702.04</b>	<b>\$240,488.33</b>
<b>Median salary (Excluding City Auditor)</b>	<b>\$270,415.08</b>	<b>\$239,007.96</b>

Data source: Salary data provided by Anjali Saxena, Payroll Manager, City of Oakland Finance Department, January 29, 2026.

**Table 2: California Cities City Auditor Salaries**

Jurisdiction	Population	Annual Salary
City and County of San Francisco	831,703	N/A
City of Fresno	543,428	N/A
City of Sacramento	518,161	\$225,000.00
City of Long Beach	458,222	\$282,281.90
<b>City of Oakland</b>	<b>419,556</b>	<b>\$226,612.10</b>
City of Bakersfield	408,373	N/A
City of Anaheim	328,580	N/A
City of Stockton	319,731	\$159,978.20
City of Riverside	313,676	N/A
<b>Mean (Excluding Oakland)</b>		<b>\$222,420.03</b>
<b>Median (Excluding Oakland)</b>		<b>\$225,000.00</b>

Data source: Published salary schedules and/or salary information provided by public records request as of March 17, 2026.

**Table 3: Salary Trends California Cities**

Jurisdiction	2024 Survey	2026 Survey	Change (%)
City of Sacramento	\$233,228.03	\$225,000.00	-3.5%
City of Long Beach	\$263,791.90	\$282,281.90	7.0%
City of Stockton	\$150,794.88	\$159,978.20	6.1%
<b>Mean</b>	<b>\$215,938.27</b>	<b>\$222,420.03</b>	<b>2.9%</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>\$233,228.03</b>	<b>\$225,000.00</b>	<b>-3.7%</b>

**Table 4: Bay Area Jurisdictions City Auditor Salaries**

Jurisdiction	Annual Salary
County of Alameda	\$292,448.00
City and County of San Francisco	N/A
City of Alameda	N/A
City of Berkeley	\$209,278.58
City of Fremont	N/A
City of Hayward	N/A
City of Mountain View	N/A
<b>City of Oakland</b>	<b>\$226,612.10</b>
City of San Jose	\$312,575.38
City of Santa Clara	\$280,323.72
<b>Mean (Excluding Oakland)</b>	<b>\$273,656.42</b>
<b>Median (Excluding Oakland)</b>	<b>\$286,385.86</b>

Data source: Published salary schedules and/or salary information provided by public records request as of March 17, 2026.

**Table 5: Salary Trends Bay Area Jurisdictions**

Jurisdiction	2024 Survey	2026 Survey	Change (%)
County of Alameda	\$253,323.20	\$292,448.00	15.4%
City of Berkeley	\$189,839.26	\$209,278.58	10.2%
City of San Jose	\$264,311.28	\$312,575.38	18.3%
City of Santa Clara	\$259,198.92	\$280,323.72	8.2%
<b>Mean</b>	<b>\$241,668.17</b>	<b>\$273,656.42</b>	<b>11.7%</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>\$256,261.06</b>	<b>\$286,385.86</b>	<b>10.5%</b>

**CITY OF OAKLAND  
Public Ethics Commission**



**RESOLUTION NO. 26-03  
[Proposed 4-15-26]**

**RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING A SALARY INCREASE FOR THE OFFICE OF CITY AUDITOR PURSUANT TO OAKLAND CITY CHARTER SECTION 403(1)**

By action of the Oakland Public Ethics Commission:

**WHEREAS**, Oakland City Charter section 403(1) provides: “The salary of the City Auditor shall be set every two (2) years by the Public Ethics Commission, to provide for competitive compensation and equitable alignment and, taking into account the top of the range for the highest paid professional employee in the Office of the City Auditor and salaries for other City department heads, and shall be comparable to the salaries of public sector auditor positions in California cities and counties selected by the Commission. The City Auditor's salary may not be reduced during the City Auditor's term of office, except as a part of a general reduction of salaries for all officers and employees in the same amount or proportion”; and

**WHEREAS**, Oakland City Charter section 207 charges the City Council with fixing the compensation of all City employees, officers and officials unless otherwise provided by the Charter; and

**WHEREAS**, Ordinance No. 12187 C.M.S., the “Salary Ordinance,” as amended, sets forth a salary schedule reflecting all classifications of employment within the City including those of city employees and city officers; and

**WHEREAS**, a salary adjustment to **[INSERT ADOPTED AMOUNT]** annually would provide competitive compensation and equitable alignment of the City Auditor’s salary by providing the City Auditor with a salary that is at least 15 percent above the top of the range for the highest paid professional employee in the Auditor’s Office, that is comparable with the salaries of City Auditors in other comparable-size cities and Bay Area jurisdictions, and that also accounts for the salaries of other City department heads.

Now, therefore be it:

**RESOLVED**, that the Commission does hereby authorize an annual salary of **[INSERT ADOPTED AMOUNT]** for the office of City Auditor as mandated by City Charter Section 403(1), effective as of the first payroll period of Fiscal Year 2026-2027.

**CERTIFICATION RE: APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION**

The foregoing Resolution was presented for approval at a duly noticed meeting of the City of Oakland Public Ethics Commission held on April 15, 2026, where a quorum of the membership of the Commission was present. The Commission approved the resolution by a vote of \_\_\_ to \_\_\_.

AYES:

**CITY OF OAKLAND  
Public Ethics Commission**



**RESOLUTION NO. 26-03  
[Proposed 4-15-26]**

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Suzanne Doran, Executive Director  
Oakland Public Ethics Commission

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**DRAFT**



Francis Upton IV, Chair  
Karun Tilak, Vice Chair  
Luke Apfeld  
Tanya Bayeva  
L. Lawrence Brandon  
Angi Fisher  
Ryan Micik

Suzanne Doran, Executive Director

---

**TO:** Public Ethics Commission  
**FROM:** Tovah Ackerman, Enforcement Chief  
**DATE:** March 23, 2026  
**RE:** Case No. 26-03; In the Matter of Tovah Ackerman et al., prepared for the April 15, 2026 Special Commission meeting.

---

**Requested Commission Action:** Approve recommendation to close PEC No. 26-03 with no action in accordance with the referral process under PEC Mediation and Complaint Procedures § IV(A)(4) for complaints made against the Commission, Commission members, or Commission staff.

**FACTS AS STATED IN COMPLAINT**

On March 13, 2026, the Public Ethics Commission (PEC) received a formal complaint submission from Gene Hazzard. The complaint, which was assigned PEC No. 26-03 at intake, alleges that PEC staff and “members of the Oakland Public Ethics Commission” did not follow applicable procedures and/or otherwise acted improperly in connection with PEC staff’s Intake/Preliminary Review dismissals of PEC Nos. 25-30, 25-33, and 25-37. The complainant’s PEC No. 26-03 submission references the Oakland Campaign Reform Act and Oakland Government Ethics Act.

The dismissals referenced in the PEC No. 26-03 complaint relate to prior complaints filed by the same complainant regarding City Council meeting procedure and open meetings compliance, including:

1. Meeting call authority and the scope of Special Meeting agendas and agenda additions (PEC No. 25-30);
2. City Council tied vote/Mayor tie-break procedure and an assertion that City Council suspended City Council Rules illegally in order to effectuate a vote for File # 26-0028 (PEC No. 25-33); and
3. City Council tied vote/Mayor tie-break procedure and an assertion that City Council illegally suspended City Council Rules with regard to a tied vote on October 16, 2025, and subsequent inaction by the mayor to break the tie on November 25, 2025 (PEC No. 25-37).

In substance, PEC No. 26-03 challenges the procedural propriety of PEC staff’s Intake/Preliminary Review dismissals in PEC Nos. 25-30, 25-33, and 25-37.

### **ADDITIONAL INFORMATION GATHERED BY STAFF**

During Intake/Preliminary Review, PEC staff determined that PEC No. 26-03 is a complaint made against PEC staff and members of the Public Ethics Commission arising from PEC staff's Intake/Preliminary Review dismissals of PEC Nos. 25-30, 25-33, and 25-37. In light of that posture, PEC staff proceeded under the PEC's established referral process under PEC Mediation and Complaint Procedures § IV(A)(4) for complaints made against the Commission, Commission members, or Commission staff.

Consistent with that process and in accordance with a motion passed by the Commission at the March 18, 2026 commission meeting,<sup>1</sup> PEC staff have transmitted the complaint (and supporting materials) to the San Francisco Ethics Commission (SFEC)<sup>2</sup> for review, along with a request to share the resolution with the PEC and complainant. PEC staff have also provided the complainant with a referral notice including the name and address of the SFEC and indicating that the complaint has already been referred to the SFEC as a courtesy. The referral notice also informed the complainant of the right to pursue any claims through a civil action and stated that the referral is an administrative step that does not constitute a determination by the PEC on the merits of the allegations.

### **APPLICABLE LAWS AND ANALYSIS**

PEC Mediation and Complaint Procedures § IV(A)(4) ("Complaints Against the Public Ethics Commission") governs the PEC's process when a complaint is made against the Commission, Commission members, or Commission staff. PEC Mediation and Complaint Procedures § IV(A)(4) directs PEC staff, within 90 days of receiving such a complaint, to respond to the complainant with the name and address of entities with concurrent or overlapping jurisdiction and to inform the complainant of the right to file a civil action.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> On March 18, 2026, the PEC adopted a motion in response to agenda items 7 and 8 directing PEC staff to forward complaints and associated materials directly to the entity selected for review when referring matters outward under PEC Mediation and Complaint Procedures § IV(A)(4) for complaints made against the Commission, Commission members, or Commission staff. As part of the same motion, the Commission stated that referrals should include a request for the reviewing entity to inform the PEC and complainant of any determinations made on the matter.

<sup>2</sup> Specifically, instruction to provide any complaint submission to the San Francisco Ethics Commission to "ATTN: Director of Enforcement; 25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 220, San Francisco, CA 94102; ethics.commission@sfgov.org".

<sup>3</sup> Specifically, under PEC Mediation and Complaint Procedures § IV(A)(4), when "a complaint is made against the Commission, Commission members, or Commission staff," PEC staff responds by providing the complainant with the name and address of entities that have concurrent or overlapping jurisdiction and by informing the complainant of the right to file a civil action. See [PEC Mediation and Complaint Procedures § IV\(A\)\(4\)](#): "Complaints Against the Public Ethics Commission. Within 90 days of receiving a complaint against the Commission, Commission members, or Commission staff, Commission staff will reply to the complainant with the name and address of the entities that have concurrent or overlapping jurisdiction and inform the

PEC Mediation and Complaint Procedures § IV(A)(4) further provides: “In most instances, the Commission will close the complaint.” The Procedures also note a limited exception: where a single respondent Commissioner or PEC staff member can be fully walled off from the investigation and approval process, the Commission may continue adjudicating the complaint in addition to making a referral to an alternate entity.

Here, PEC No. 26-03 is directed at PEC staff conduct in connection with Intake/Preliminary Review dismissals in PEC Nos. 25-30, 25-33, and 25-37. PEC staff has issued the PEC Mediation and Complaint Procedures § IV(A)(4) referral response directing the complainant to an external entity and advising civil remedies. The PEC has also referred the matter directly to the SFEC as a courtesy and in accordance with the motion passed at the March 18, 2026 commission meeting and asked that the SFEC notify the PEC with the outcome of any decision on the matter. The referral step is administrative and does not constitute a determination by the PEC on the merits of the allegations. Because the alleged respondent includes PEC staff and members of the Public Ethics Commission, the PEC Mediation and Complaint Procedures § IV(A)(4) exception (regarding continued adjudication if staff can be walled off) is not applicable. Accordingly, consistent with PEC Mediation and Complaint Procedures § IV(A)(4), PEC staff does not open an investigation and submits PEC No. 26-03 to the Commission for approval of administrative closure with no further action.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Consistent with PEC Mediation and Complaint Procedures § IV(A)(4) and with the motion adopted by the PEC on March 18, 2026, PEC staff has:

1. Sent the complaint and related materials to the San Francisco Ethics Commission for review;
2. Requested that the San Francisco Ethics Commission share the resolution with the PEC and complainant; and
3. Provided the complainant with a referral notice that includes the name and address of the San Francisco Ethics Commission and indicates that the complaint has been transmitted to the San Francisco Ethics Commission. The referral notice also informs the complainant of the right to pursue any claims through a civil action.

PEC Mediation and Complaint Procedures § IV(A)(4) states that on matters being referred outwards for review (such as this one), “In most instances, the Commission will close the complaint.”

---

*complainant that they have the right to file a civil action. In most instances, the Commission will close the complaint. However, where a single respondent Commissioner or staff can be walled off entirely from the investigation and approval process, the Commission may continue adjudicating the complaint, in addition to making a referral to an alternate entity.”*

**Item 07 - In the Matter of Tovah Ackerman, PEC #26-03**

RE: CASE NO. 26-03; IN THE MATTER OF TOVAH ACKERMAN ET AL.

P. 4

**In alignment with these procedures, and having taken the above steps to resolve the matter via referral, PEC staff recommends that the Commission close PEC No. 26-03 with no further action.**



Francis Upton IV, Chair  
Karun Tilak, Vice Chair  
Luke Apfeld  
Tanya Bayeva  
L. Lawrence Brandon  
Angi Fisher  
Ryan Micik

Suzanne Doran, Executive Director

---

**TO:** Public Ethics Commission  
**FROM:** Tovah Ackerman, Enforcement Chief  
**DATE:** March 27, 2026  
**RE:** Case No. 26-04; In the Matter of the Oakland Public Ethics Commission, prepared for the April 15, 2026 Special Commission meeting.

---

**Requested Commission Action:** Approve recommendation for administrative closure of PEC No. 26-04 with no further action in accordance with the referral process under PEC Mediation and Complaint Procedures § IV(A)(4) for complaints made against the Commission, Commission members, or Commission staff.

#### **FACTS AS STATED IN COMPLAINT**

On March 17, 2026, the PEC received a formal complaint submission from Ralph Kanz. The complaint was assigned PEC No. 26-04 at intake. It alleges that, related to a Commission (PEC) meeting held on January 21, 2026, the PEC violated procedural requirements in the following instances:

1. The description for Item 11 provided in the agenda did not meet the standard set forth in the Sunshine Ordinance, and;
2. Related materials for the same item (a memo written by the complainant and a PEC staff report detailing a staff position on the matter) were not provided in the agenda packet for the Commission and members of the public to review.

Specifically, the complaint alleges that the occurrences listed above constitute a failure to meet the definition of “Agenda” provided in Section 2.20.030(A) of the Oakland Sunshine Ordinance, which states that, “A description of an item on the agenda is adequate if it is sufficiently clear and specific to alert a person of average intelligence and education whose interests are affected by the item that he or she may have reason to attend the meeting or seek more information on item.”

#### **ADDITIONAL INFORMATION GATHERED BY STAFF**

During Intake/Preliminary Review, PEC staff determined that PEC No. 26-04 is a complaint made against the PEC arising from alleged failures to meet the standards set forth for information included in Commission meeting agendas and agenda packets, as articulated in Section 2.20.030(A) of the

Oakland Sunshine Ordinance. In light of that posture, PEC staff proceeded under the PEC's established referral process under PEC Mediation and Complaint Procedures § IV(A)(4) for complaints made against the Commission, Commission members, or Commission staff.

Consistent with that process and in accordance with a motion passed by the Commission at the March 18, 2026 commission meeting,<sup>1</sup> PEC staff have transmitted the complaint to the San Francisco Ethics Commission (SFEC),<sup>2</sup> along with a request to share the resolution with the PEC and complainant. PEC staff have also provided the complainant with a referral notice including the name and address of the SFEC and indicating that the complaint has already been referred to the SFEC as a courtesy. The referral notice also informed the complainant of the right to pursue any claims through a civil action and stated that the referral is an administrative step that does not constitute a determination by the PEC on the merits of the allegations.

### **APPLICABLE LAWS AND ANALYSIS**

PEC Mediation and Complaint Procedures § IV(A)(4) ("Complaints Against the Public Ethics Commission") governs the PEC's process when a complaint is made against the Commission, Commission members, or Commission staff. PEC Mediation and Complaint Procedures § IV(A)(4) directs PEC staff, within 90 days of receiving such a complaint, to respond to the complainant with the name and address of entities with concurrent or overlapping jurisdiction and to inform the complainant of the right to file a civil action.<sup>3</sup>

PEC Mediation and Complaint Procedures § IV(A)(4) further provides: "In most instances, the Commission will close the complaint." The Procedures also note a limited exception: where a single

---

<sup>1</sup> On March 18, 2026, the PEC adopted a motion in response to agenda items 7 and 8 directing PEC staff to forward complaints and associated materials directly to the entity selected for review when referring matters outward under PEC Mediation and Complaint Procedures § IV(A)(4) for complaints made against the Commission, Commission members, or Commission staff. As part of the same motion, the Commission stated that referrals should include a request for the reviewing entity to inform the PEC and complainant of any determinations made on the matter.

<sup>2</sup> Specifically, instruction to provide any complaint submission to the San Francisco Ethics Commission to "ATTN: Director of Enforcement; 25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 220, San Francisco, CA 94102; ethics.commission@sfgov.org".

<sup>3</sup> Specifically, under PEC Mediation and Complaint Procedures § IV(A)(4), when "a complaint is made against the Commission, Commission members, or Commission staff," PEC staff responds by providing the complainant with the name and address of entities that have concurrent or overlapping jurisdiction and by informing the complainant of the right to file a civil action. See [PEC Mediation and Complaint Procedures § IV\(A\)\(4\)](#): "Complaints Against the Public Ethics Commission. Within 90 days of receiving a complaint against the Commission, Commission members, or Commission staff, Commission staff will reply to the complainant with the name and address of the entities that have concurrent or overlapping jurisdiction and inform the complainant that they have the right to file a civil action. In most instances, the Commission will close the complaint. However, where a single respondent Commissioner or staff can be walled off entirely from the investigation and approval process, the Commission may continue adjudicating the complaint, in addition to making a referral to an alternate entity."

respondent Commissioner or PEC staff member can be fully walled off from the investigation and approval process, the Commission may continue adjudicating the complaint in addition to making a referral to an alternate entity.

Here, PEC No. 26-04 is directed at the PEC in connection with an alleged violation of Section 2.20.030(A) of the Oakland Sunshine Ordinance. PEC staff have issued the PEC Mediation and Complaint Procedures § IV(A)(4) referral response directing the complainant to an external entity (the SFEC) and advising civil remedies. The referral step is administrative and does not constitute a determination by the PEC on the merits of the allegations. Because the alleged respondent is the PEC as a whole, the PEC Mediation and Complaint Procedures § IV(A)(4) exception (regarding continued adjudication if staff can be walled off) is not applicable. Accordingly, consistent with PEC Mediation and Complaint Procedures § IV(A)(4), PEC staff does not open an investigation and submits PEC No. 26-04 to the Commission for approval of administrative closure with no further action.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Consistent with PEC Mediation and Complaint Procedures § IV(A)(4) and with the motion adopted by the PEC on March 18, 2026, PEC staff has:

1. Sent the complaint to the SFEC;
2. Requested that the SFEC share the resolution with the PEC (who will forward the resolution to the complainant); and
3. Provided the complainant with a referral notice that includes the name and address of the SFEC and indicates that the complaint has been transmitted to the SFEC as a courtesy. The referral notice also informs the complainant of the right to pursue any claims through a civil action.

PEC Mediation and Complaint Procedures § IV(A)(4) states that on matters being refferred outwards (such as this one), “In most instances, the Commission will close the complaint.”

**In alignment with these procedures, and having taken the above steps to resolve the matter via referral, PEC staff recommends that the Commission close PEC No. 26-04 with no further action.**



Francis Upton IV, Chair  
Karun Tilak, Vice Chair  
Luke Apfeld  
Tanya Bayeva  
L. Lawrence Brandon  
Angi Fisher  
Ryan Micik

Suzanne Doran, Executive Director

---

**TO:** Public Ethics Commission  
**FROM:** Tovah Ackerman, Chief of Enforcement  
Alex Van Buskirk, Ethics Investigator  
**DATE:** April 2, 2026  
**RE:** Recommendation for Closure with Respondent-Specific Warning Letter Dispositions for Select Backlog Form 700 Late-Filer Matters under May 2025 Backlog Review Framework (PEC Nos. 24-05.26, 24-05.36, 24-05.46, 24-05.61, 24-05.63, and 23-16.8), for the April 15, 2026 Special PEC Meeting

---

**This memorandum** presents PEC staff’s recommendation that the Commission close six Form 700 late-filer matters involving six respondents with warning letter dispositions. These matters are being presented as part of the PEC staff’s retroactive backlog review process described in the May 2025 Enforcement Report regarding the Complaint Backlog Strategy.<sup>1</sup> Staff is submitting this as a separate memorandum because, although these matters involve the same general violation type and the same recommended disposition, staff believed fuller written explanation was appropriate when recommending that the Commission close multiple Form 700-related matters in a single item.

## Requested Commission Action

Approve PEC staff’s recommendation that the Commission approve closure of PEC Nos. 24-05.26, 24-05.36, 24-05.46, 24-05.61, 24-05.63, and 23-16.8 with warning letter dispositions.

## Background

These matters arose from proactive PEC staff review of annual Form 700 filing compliance. Each matter concerns late filing of a required annual Form 700 (Statement of Economic Interests), under the City’s Conflict of Interest Code, enforceable through O.M.C. § 2.25.040(B).

---

<sup>1</sup> [“Enforcement Report re: Complaint Backlog Strategy for the May 21, 2025, PEC Meeting,” as Reflected in Item 9 of May 21, 2025 Meeting Agenda, Authored May 9, 2025.](#)

The matters before the Commission are as follows:

- PEC No. 24-05.26, Respondent Chris Jackson (then-Housing, Residential Rent and Relocation Board member still in Board/Commission service as of March 2026);
- PEC No. 24-05.36, Respondent Fred Mangrum (then-Bicyclist and Pedestrian Advisory Commission member);
- PEC No. 24-05.46, Respondent Ali Obad (then-Sugar Sweetened Beverages Community Advisory Board member still in Board/Commission service as of March 2026);
- PEC No. 24-05.61, Respondent Michael Wallace (then-Public Safety and Services Violence Prevention Oversight Commission member);
- PEC No. 24-05.63, Respondent Arthur Watson, Jr. (then-Public Works Supervisor); and
- PEC No. 23-16.8, Respondent Fred Kelley (then-Department of Transportation Director).

In each of these matters, the required annual Form 700 was ultimately filed, but only after the applicable deadline.<sup>2</sup> Five of these matters pertain to filing obligations that became overdue in spring 2024, and one matter, PEC No. 23-16.8, pertains to a filing obligation that became overdue in spring 2023.

All filing-related violations at issue in these matters were ultimately cured through late filing. These matters remain open because Commission action is required to approve closure and the proposed warning letter disposition.

## Backlog Review Context

These matters are being presented under PEC staff's retroactive backlog review process for older covered enforcement matters. As explained in the May 2025 Enforcement Report regarding the Complaint Backlog Strategy, PEC staff undertook that process in response to a severe and unsustainable caseload and to allow limited enforcement resources to be redirected toward higher-impact and more current investigations.

Staff is presenting this group of matters in a separate memorandum because, although these matters share a common violation type and a common recommended disposition, the Commission and the public may benefit from a more complete written explanation of why warning letter dispositions are the recommended outcome for this set of older late-filer matters.

---

<sup>2</sup> City filing records reflect the following Form 700 filing dates: Jackson filed on February 24, 2025; Mangrum filed on April 17, 2024; Obad filed on January 12, 2025; Wallace filed on March 20, 2025; Watson, Jr. filed on April 11, 2024; and Kelley filed on March 11, 2024.

## Applicable Law and Analysis

O.M.C. § 2.25.040(B) requires timely filing of Form 700 disclosures by covered officials and employees. The PEC's Mediation and Complaint Procedures provide that, upon review of staff's written report and recommendation, the Commission may close a matter, request further investigation, request that staff seek a stipulated settlement, or proceed in another authorized manner. The Procedures further provide that the Commission may issue a warning letter at any phase of its review, either in conjunction with another remedy or as a stand-alone resolution. The PEC's Enforcement Penalty Guidelines likewise recognize warning letters as an available enforcement option in appropriate matters.

PEC staff recommend warning letter closure here because these are real disclosure violations, but they are older, cured, disclosure-only violations for which more punitive enforcement would provide limited additional public benefit. In some instances, the delays were substantial, and several respondents held positions carrying clear annual Form 700 obligations. For that reason, closure with no action would understate the seriousness of the compliance failures. At the same time, all required annual disclosures are now on file, the public disclosure objective has already been achieved, and the remaining practical remedy is limited.

On the current record, these matters do not involve allegations of concealment, self-dealing, false statements, bribery, misuse of office, or other substantive ethics misconduct. Rather, they concern untimely disclosure, with varying lengths of delay and varying degrees of responsiveness before the filing deficiencies were cured. They are therefore best understood as cured reporting violations, not public corruption or misuse-of-office matters.

This recommendation is also consistent with the May 2025 backlog review framework. These are older cases. All filing deficiencies related to these matters have already been cured. Four of the six respondents appear no longer to be serving the City, whether as employees or as City board or commission members. Although PEC No. 23-16.8 involved a City official in a senior City position (then-Director of the Department of Transportation) at the time of filing, that matter likewise concerns a cured reporting violation and does not present suspicion of self-dealing, misuse of office, or other substantive breach of the public trust warranting retention outside the general backlog-review framework.

PEC staff recommends warning letters as the most proportionate and administratively fitting enforcement response under these circumstances. They formally record the violations, preserve deterrent value for future enforcement matters, maintain a documented accountability measure for these respondents, and avoid diverting limited PEC enforcement resources away from higher-priority matters. In staff's assessment, renewed pursuit of more punitive outcomes in these older, cured late-filer matters would consume scarce PEC resources while offering only limited incremental transparency or deterrent value.

*This recommendation is specific to the Commission's retroactive backlog review process. It should not be understood as altering or stating PEC staff's prospective enforcement approach to future Form 700 late-filer matters.*

## **Recommendation**

For the reasons set forth above, **PEC staff recommends that the Commission approve closure of PEC Nos. 24-05.26, 24-05.36, 24-05.46, 24-05.61, 24-05.63, and 23-16.8 with warning letter dispositions.** If the Commission approves this closure recommendation, PEC staff will issue respondent-specific warning letters for each relevant matter.



Francis Upton IV, Chair  
Karun Tilak, Vice Chair  
Luke Apfeld  
Tanya Bayeva  
L. Lawrence Brandon  
Angi Fisher  
Ryan Micik

Suzanne Doran, Executive Director

---

**TO:** Public Ethics Commission  
**FROM:** Tovah Ackerman, Chief of Enforcement  
Alex Van Buskirk, Ethics Investigator  
**DATE:** April 2, 2026  
**RE:** Recommendation for Closure with Respondent-Specific Warning Letter Dispositions for Select Backlog Form 700 Non-Filer Matters under May 2025 Backlog Review Framework (PEC Nos. 24-05.6, 24-05.57, 23-16.3, and 24-05.1), for the April 15, 2026 Special PEC Meeting

---

**This memorandum** presents PEC staff’s recommendation that the Commission close four Form 700 non-filer matters involving three respondents with warning letter dispositions. These matters are being presented as part of the PEC staff’s retroactive backlog review process described in the May 2025 Enforcement Report regarding the Complaint Backlog Strategy.<sup>1</sup> Staff is submitting this as a separate memorandum because, although these matters involve the same general violation type and the same recommended disposition, staff believed fuller written explanation was appropriate when recommending that the Commission close multiple Form 700-related matters in a single item.

## Requested Commission Action

Approve PEC staff’s recommendation that the Commission close PEC Nos. 24-05.6, 24-05.57, 23-16.3, and 24-05.1 with warning letter dispositions.

## Background

These matters arose from proactive PEC staff review of annual Form 700 filing compliance. Each matter concerns failure to file a required annual Form 700 (Statement of Economic Interests), under the City’s Conflict of Interest Code, enforceable through O.M.C. § 2.25.040(B).

---

<sup>1</sup> [“Enforcement Report re: Complaint Backlog Strategy for the May 21, 2025, PEC Meeting,” as Reflected in Item 9 of May 21, 2025 Meeting Agenda, Authored May 9, 2025.](#)

The matters before the Commission are as follows:

- PEC No. 24-05.6, Respondent Tanya Boyce (then-Cannabis Regulatory Commission Commissioner);
- PEC No. 24-05.57, Respondent Demitri Taylor (then-Housing Residential Rent and Relocation Board member);
- PEC No. 23-16.3, Respondent Taib Alaoui (then-Cannabis Regulatory Commission Commissioner); and
- PEC No. 24-05.1, Respondent Taib Alaoui (then-Cannabis Regulatory Commission Commissioner).

In each of these matters, the required annual Form 700 remains unfiled. Three of these matters pertain to filing obligations that became overdue in spring 2024, and one matter, PEC No. 23-16.3, pertains to a filing obligation that became overdue in spring 2023.

One respondent (Taib Alaoui) is before the Commission in two annual non-filer matters. However, in light of the age and backlog-review posture of those matters, the lack of timely resolution to the first non-filing matter, and the limited practical value of renewed escalation at this stage, staff determined that warning letter dispositions remain the proportionate resolution (PEC No. 23-16.3 and PEC No. 24-05.1).

Unlike the late-filer matters presented separately to the Commission, the filing-related violations at issue here were never cured through filing. These matters remain open because Commission action is required to approve closure and the proposed warning letter dispositions.

## **Backlog Review Context**

These matters are being presented under PEC staff's retroactive backlog review process for older covered enforcement matters. As explained in the May 2025 Enforcement Report regarding the Complaint Backlog Strategy, PEC staff undertook that process in response to a severe and unsustainable caseload and to allow limited enforcement resources to be redirected toward higher-impact and more current investigations.

Staff is presenting this group of matters in a separate memorandum because, although these matters share a common violation type and a common recommended disposition, the Commission and the public may benefit from a more complete written explanation of why warning letter dispositions are the recommended outcome for this set of older non-filer matters.

## Applicable Law and Analysis

O.M.C. § 2.25.040(B) requires timely filing of Form 700 disclosures by covered officials and employees. The PEC's Mediation and Complaint Procedures provide that, upon review of staff's written report and recommendation, the Commission may close a matter, request further investigation, request that staff seek a stipulated settlement, or proceed in another authorized manner. The Procedures further provide that the Commission may issue a warning letter at any phase of its review, either in conjunction with another remedy or as a stand-alone resolution.

The PEC's Enforcement Penalty Guidelines likewise recognize warning letters as an available enforcement option in appropriate matters and emphasize proportionality, timeliness, focus on serious violations, and preservation of resources for more serious matters. In applying these authorities here, staff has considered the totality of the circumstances presented by the age, nature, and backlog-review posture of these matters.

PEC staff recommends warning letter dispositions here because these are real disclosure violations, but they are older, disclosure-only non-filer matters. These violations are more serious than cured late-filer matters because the required disclosures were never filed, and closure with no action would therefore understate the continuing non-filing and the importance of Form 700 filing obligations. Even so, in this retroactive backlog context, staff concludes that warning letter dispositions remain proportionate and that pursuing more punitive enforcement would likely consume substantial PEC resources without yielding commensurate additional transparency or deterrent value.

At the same time, these matters do not involve allegations of concealment, self-dealing, false statements, bribery, misuse of office, or other substantive ethics misconduct. Rather, they concern failure to file required disclosures, with variation in PEC staff's success establishing contact, confirming contact information, and/or resolving questions relating to filing mechanics of non-PEC processes, tenure dates, or onboarding practices. None of the respondents appears to have served in a high-level City role. Each respondent also appears no longer to hold the City-appointed board or commission position that gave rise to the Form 700 obligation.

A warning letter is consistent with the May 2025 backlog review framework, in particular the retroactive triage rationale for respondents who no longer hold the City-appointed board or commission positions that gave rise to the Form 700 obligations. These are older cases. The required filings remain absent. None of the respondents served in a high-level City role warranting retention outside the general backlog-review framework.

One respondent, Taib Alaoui, is before the Commission in two annual non-filer matters, and staff has considered that circumstance while still concluding that warning letter dispositions remain the proportionate response under the retroactive backlog-review framework. Staff does not discount the significance of repeated non-filing. However, PEC No. 23-16.3 was not brought to a completed enforcement outcome before the later annual filing obligation arose. Had PEC No. 23-16.3 been timely

brought to resolution, a stronger case for a stiffer penalty in the later matter might exist. However, because the PEC did not conclude that earlier matter before the subsequent annual filing obligation arose, the usual deterrent rationale for escalating sanctions is substantially diminished here. Additionally, in staff's assessment, more punitive enforcement would require substantial additional PEC resources while offering uncertain practical return in these older matters.

PEC staff recommends warning letter dispositions as the most proportionate and administratively fitting enforcement response under these circumstances. They formally record the violations, make clear that the respondents failed to satisfy required disclosure obligations, preserve deterrent value for future enforcement matters, maintain a documented accountability measure for respondents who appear no longer to be serving the City, and avoid diverting limited PEC enforcement resources away from higher-priority matters. In staff's assessment, renewed pursuit of more punitive outcomes in these older non-filer matters would consume scarce PEC resources while offering only limited incremental transparency or deterrent value.

*This recommendation is specific to the Commission's retroactive backlog review process. It should not be understood as altering or stating PEC staff's prospective enforcement approach to future Form 700 non-filer matters.*

## **Recommendation**

For the reasons set forth above, **PEC staff recommends that the Commission approve closure of PEC Nos. 24-05.6, 24-05.57, 23-16.3, and 24-05.1 with warning letter dispositions.** If the Commission approves this closure recommendation, PEC staff will issue respondent-specific warning letters in each relevant matter, with Respondent Alaoui's warning letter disposition implemented through a single warning letter identifying for both PEC No. 23-16.3 and PEC No. 24-05.1.



Francis Upton IV, Chair  
Karun Tilak, Vice Chair  
Luke Apfeld  
Tanya Bayeva  
L. Lawrence Brandon  
Angi Fisher  
Ryan Micik

Suzanne Doran, Executive Director

---

**TO:** Public Ethics Commission  
**FROM:** Tovah Ackerman, Enforcement Chief  
**DATE:** April 1, 2026  
**RE:** Recommendations for Closures under the 2025 Complaint Backlog Strategy for the April 15, 2026, Special PEC Meeting

---

**This memorandum** presents abbreviated summaries of proposed case closures under the Complaint Backlog Strategy plan. Enforcement Staff carefully assessed each case according to a seven-point rubric and recommend the Commission approve closure.

## Background

At the May 21, 2025, Commission meeting, Enforcement Staff presented a case closure plan based on a seven-point rubric to address a severe, longstanding complaint backlog and restore a functioning program with a sustainable caseload. (See [Enforcement Report re: Complaint Backlog Strategy for the May 21, 2025, Regular Meeting](#)).

The seven-point rubric used for assessing these cases for closure includes:

- Severity of the alleged violation;
- Impact of a Commission decision;
- Timing of alleged misconduct;
- Availability of a meaningful remedy;
- Level of investigative resources needed to substantiate a violation;
- Probability of substantiating allegations; and
- Availability of enforcement resources.

Under the Commission's [Mediation and Complaint Procedures](#), Commission staff may recommend closure of a complaint if it falls within the Commission's jurisdiction but there is reason to support

closure. Unlike dismissals after preliminary review, which are within Staff's discretion, the Commission must take formal action in order to close these complaints.

## Staff Recommendation

Based on case analysis under the rubric criteria, Staff recommend the following case(s) to the Commission for closure as part of the 2025 Complaint Backlog Strategy:

1. ***Proposed Closure with Warning Letter: In the Matter of David Silver (PEC # 24-02).*** In February 2024, PEC staff initiated a proactive investigation against David Silver for self-reporting the receipt of gifts totaling \$500 from the Golden State Warriors (GSW)--in the form of five game tickets valued at \$100 each--in a 2022 filing, in violation of the Government Ethics Act (GEA) gift limit. Staff were also concerned about the possibility that the GSW were a restricted source since they were engaged in a settlement and release agreement with the city in 2022, which would further restrict the gift limit. Additionally, staff was concerned that, if the GSW were a restricted source, they may have violated the gift limit numerous times in 2022 by frequently providing tickets to city employees in violation of the restricted source limit. PEC staff determined that the over the limit gift amount was low-level and that the restricted source issue was too speculative and too stale to pursue.

**Accordingly, PEC Staff recommends that the Commission close PEC Case No. 24-02 with a Warning Letter.**

2. ***Proposed Closure with Formal Referral to FPPC: In the Matter of Cherisse Gash, et al. (PEC # 24-09.01).*** In May 2024, PEC staff initiated a proactive investigation against Cherisse Gash and members of her campaign team for Cherisse Gash For Oakland School Board District 3 2020. The matter concerns alleged failures to timely file required campaign finance statements by a candidate-controlled committee and its responsible officers in violation of the Oakland Campaign Reform Act and the state's Political Reform Act (PRA). Because state law and local law overlap in this instance, and as suggested in the May 21, 2025 meeting case closure plan, a referral to the Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC) would be appropriate because it would trigger a PRA investigation and a possible administrative termination where appropriate.

**Accordingly, PEC staff recommends that the Commission close PEC Case No. 24-09.01 with a formal referral to the FPPC.**

**Dismissals** – Under the Commission’s Mediation and Complaint Procedures, Commission staff may dismiss a complaint after preliminary review if the allegations do not warrant further action. The Commission must be notified of all dismissals by reporting the information on the next enforcement program report. The following complaints under review as part of 2025 Case Closure Plan have been dismissed after preliminary review (No Commission action required):

- ***In the Matter of The Oakland Redistricting Commission (PEC # 21-09).*** On December 28, 2021, the PEC received a formal complaint alleging that on December 13, 2021, the Redistricting Commission (ORC) held a meeting that failed to take public comment before adoption of their final proposed maps, that written comments received by the deadline were not posted on the website prior to the meeting, and that the ORC caused harm due to the lack of language access. PEC staff dismissed this complaint for lack of PEC enforcement jurisdiction as well as lack of any available or appropriate remedy under the Oakland Sunshine Ordinance.
- ***In the Matter of Kyra Mungia et al. (PEC # 22-15).*** On October 4, 2022, the PEC received a formal complaint alleging that Respondent’s campaign sent unsolicited emails to OUSD District 6 constituents requesting donations in a misuse of City resources, that Respondent's committee did not report receiving an over-the-limit contribution, and raising concerns about public disclosure of the Respondents source of income at the time she was working for the Oakland Mayor’s Office. PEC staff dismissed this complaint for lack of evidence a violation occurred.
- ***In the Matter of Michae Legault and Public Works Employee Jennifer Stern (PEC # 23-33).*** On September 25, 2023, the PEC received a formal complaint alleging that Michae Legault was dumping hazardous material into the storm gutter and that Public Works employee Jennifer Stern delayed responding to the complainant’s complaint to the Public Works Department. PEC staff dismissed this complaint for lack of PEC enforcement jurisdiction.