

City of Sacramento
Ethics Commission Report
915 I Street Sacramento, CA 95814
www.cityofsacramento.org

File ID: 2026-00246

8/24/2026

Ethics Commission Complaint Log

File ID: 2026-00246

Location: Citywide

Recommendation: Pass a **Motion** approving the Ethics Commission Complaint Log.

Contact: Mindy Cuppy, City Clerk, (916) 808-5442, mcuppy@cityofsacramento.org, Office of the City Clerk

Presenter: None

Attachments:

1-Description/Analysis

2-Ethics Commission Complaint Log

Description/Analysis

Issue Detail: The purpose of the Ethics Commission is to review and consider complaints against elected and appointed City officials, as further described in Sacramento City Code section 2.112.030, to ensure that those officials are conforming their conduct to the City's laws and policies.

The Ethics Commission has the power and duty to review, investigate, and consider complaints alleging violations of the following:

- Section 35 of the Sacramento City Charter ("Limitation on future employment")
- Chapter 1.20 ("Fair Campaign Practices")
- Chapter 2.13 ("Campaign Contribution Limitations") and Chapter 2.14 ("Campaign Spending Limits and Public Campaign Financing"), if the city has not contracted with the Fair Political Practices Commission for enforcement of those chapters
- Chapter 2.15 ("Lobbyist Registration and Reporting Code")

- Chapter 2.16 (“Conflict of Interest”)
- Chapter 4.02 (“Code of Ethics”)
- Chapter 4.04 (“Transparent Government and Public Engagement”)
- Chapter 3 (“Conduct of Members”) and Rule 6.E (“Closed Sessions”) of the Council Rules of Procedure

The attached log describes complaints received to date and their respective statuses.

Policy Considerations: The Commission’s authority extends only to city elected officials, candidates for city elected office, independent expenditure committees, members of boards and commissions, the city manager, the city clerk, the city attorney, the city treasurer, the city auditor, the director of the office of public safety accountability, and lobbyists.

Economic Impacts: None.

Environmental Considerations: California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA): The proposed action is not a project under CEQA because it is an organizational or administrative activity that will not result in direct or indirect physical changes in the environment. (CEQA Guidelines §15378(b)(5).)

Sustainability: None.

Commission/Committee Action: None.

Rationale for Recommendation: None.

Financial Considerations: None.

Local Business Enterprise (LBE): None.

Sacramento Ethics Commission Complaint Log

Updated 07/31/2026

Complaint No.	Date Received	Method Received	Alleged Violation	Alleged Violation Details	Disposition	Referred To	Disposition Date
Pending							
2026-005	3/19/2026	Online	City Code Chapter 1.20 ("Code of Fair Campaign Practices") City Code Chapter 2.13 ("Campaign Contribution Limitations") and Chapter 2.14 ("Campaign Spending Limits and Public Campaign Financing") City Code Chapter 2.16 ("Conflict of Interest") City Code Chapter 4.02 ("Code of Ethics")	Alleged Conflict of Interest and Participation in Government Decisions Affecting Financial Contributors. This complaint alleges that a Sacramento public official participated in governmental decisions that had a reasonably foreseeable financial impact on entities and individuals who made campaign contributions to that official. This conduct raises serious concerns regarding impartial decision-making and potential violations of the City of Sacramento Code of Ethics.	Pending commission deliberation.		
Dispositioned							
2026-008	7/30/2026	Via Email	Violate constitutional rights of the members of the public.	On the week of July 20, 2026, used her public position to violate the constitutional rights of the members of the public. tried to secretly and illegally ban members of the public from public meetings. said, "If we want to ban somebody in the future, like to take them out." Another official (name and job title withheld) said, "I know the city attorney said that we cannot do that." responded and said, "We did it last time". There is a recording of saying this. The recording can be requested at the mayor's office.	City Clerk Initial Review Completed 07/31/2026 – Dismissed for Lack of Jurisdiction (5.1(B)3): Complaint alleges facts that are not subject to any provision of the Ethics Law	n/a	7/31/2026
2026-007	7/17/2026	Online	City Code Chapter 2.16 ("Conflict of Interest") City Code Chapter 4.02 ("Code of Ethics")	The manager is related to his staff and the whole staff is related to each other its been like this since before I moved	City Clerk Initial Review Completed 07/23/2026 – Dismissed for Lack of Jurisdiction (5.1(B)3): The respondent is not a person listed in City Code section 2.112.030.B.	n/a	7/23/2026
2026-004	3/19/2026	Online	City Code Chapter 2.16 ("Conflict of Interest") City Code Chapter 4.02 ("Code of Ethics")	Alleged Conflict of Interest and Participation in Government Decisions Affecting Financial Contributors. This complaint alleges that a Sacramento public official participated in governmental decisions that had a reasonably foreseeable financial impact on entities and individuals who made campaign contributions to that official. This conduct raises serious concerns regarding impartial decision-making and potential violations of the City of Sacramento Code of Ethics.	Dismissed, completely duplicative of 2026-005	n/a	3/30/2026
2026-006	3/20/2026	Online	City Code Chapter 2.16 ("Conflict of Interest") City Code Chapter 4.02 ("Code of Ethics")	I am submitting this formal complaint to report serious concerns regarding management practices at Allied Universal, specifically involving Supervisor/Manager and other site leadership. Wage and hour violations, failure to provide benefits to full-time employees, workplace safety and medical responsibility, disciplinary action without progressice process, potential retaliation concerns.	City Clerk Initial Review Completed 03/12/2026 – Dismissed for Lack of Jurisdiction (5.1(B)3): The respondent is not a person listed in City Code section 2.112.030.B.	n/a	3/25/2026
2026-003	3/8/2026	Online	City Code Chapter 1.20 ("Code of Fair Campaign Practices") City Code Chapter 2.13 ("Campaign Contribution Limitations") and Chapter 2.14 ("Campaign Spending Limits and Public Campaign Financing")	Potential Violations • California Government Code §84301 – Contribution made in the name of another • FPCC Regulation 18215.1 – Attribution of contributions from entities controlled by an individual • California Government Code §87100 – Public official participation in decisions affecting financial interests This complaint concerns campaign contributions accepted by the Mayor of Sacramento from both an individual donor connected to cannabisrelated businesses and a corporate entity that is controlled by the same individual. That individual donor controls the corporate entity; California law requires that contributions be attributed to the individual and aggregated for purposes of contribution limits and disclosure requirements. Because the City of Sacramento regulates cannabis licensing, zoning, and retail permitting, campaign contributions from individuals or entities connected to cannabis businesses may raise transparency and conflict-of-interest concerns that warrant review. Documented Contributions (FPCC Form 460 Filings) Based on publicly available California Form 460 campaign disclosure filings, the following contributions appear in the Mayor's campaign committee reports. 3 Individual Contribution Nasser Azimi Orangevale, California Occupation listed: Partner – Teranomic Contribution Date: November 1, 2024 Amount: \$4,050 Business Entity Contribution Teranomic (Teranomic Software, Inc.) Emeryville, California Contribution Date: June 25, 2025 Amount: \$2,000 These contributions appear in campaign filings associated with the Mayor's committees. Teranomic Software is controlled by the same individual donor, FPCC regulations may require attribution of both contributions to the controlling individual. Corporate Relationships and Associated Entities Public information indicates potential connections between the above-listed donor and several cannabis-related businesses and entities including: • Teranomic Software 4 • Canntinas • Ohana Cannabis • Ohana Gardens • East Bay Therapeutics These entities share common ownership or control, FPCC regulations may require contribution attribution under Regulation 18215.1. Relevant Governmental Decision On March 25, 2025, the Sacramento City Council adopted Resolution No. 2025-0067, which extended the operational deadline for certain CORE (Cannabis Opportunity Reinvestment and Equity) dispensary permits from April 1, 2025 to April 1, 2026. This council action effectively allowed certain cannabis retail permits to remain viable and maintain their economic value rather than expiring. Information available to the complainant indicates that this extension may have allowed a cannabis retail business commonly known as the Oak Park dispensary located at 3856 Stockton Boulevard to proceed toward opening. This extension vote has had economic implications for entities connected to cannabis licensing or investment in Sacramento. Requested Investigation 5 The complainant respectfully requests that the Sacramento Ethics Commission review and determine: Whether Teranomic Software, Inc. is controlled by Nasser Azimi for purposes of campaign contribution attribution under FPCC Regulation 18215.1. Whether contributions from Teranomic Software, Inc. and Nasser Azimi should be aggregated under applicable campaign finance rules. Whether any contributors connected to these entities have financial interests in cannabis businesses operating or seeking permits within the City of Sacramento. Whether the Mayor participated in governmental decisions affecting cannabis licensing, including the March 25, 2025 CORE permit extension, that could affect contributors associated with the regulated industry. Whether campaign disclosures accurately reflect the true source of contributions as required under California campaign finance law. This complaint is submitted to ensure transparency and public confidence in Sacramento's campaign finance and ethics rules. The complainant respectfully requests that the Sacramento Ethics Commission review these matters and determine whether further investigation or enforcement action is warranted	City Clerk Initial Review Completed 03/12/2026 – Dismissed for Lack of Jurisdiction (5.1(B)3): Complaint alleges facts that are not subject to any provision of the Ethics Law	Recommended to Complainant to contact the FPCC	3/12/2026

Complaint No.	Date Received	Method Received	Alleged Violation	Alleged Violation Details	Disposition	Referred To	Disposition Date
2026-002	3/8/2026	Online	City Code Chapter 2.16 ("Conflict of Interest") City Code Chapter 4.02 ("Code of Ethics")	Failure to disclose financial interests, conceal ownership and potential circumvention of cannabis retail permit regulations through affiliated corporate entities. • Violation of Sacramento cannabis licensing regulations governing ownership and control of retail storefront dispensary permits. • Failure to properly disclose owners, financial interest holders, investors, or controlling persons in cannabis permit filings with the City of Sacramento. • Possible use of multiple corporate entities to conceal common ownership or operational control of more than one cannabis retail dispensary. Cannabis retail storefront dispensaries in Sacramento are regulated through the City of Sacramento Office of Cannabis Management. Cannabis permit applicants are required to disclose all owners, financial interest holders, investors, managers, and controlling persons. These disclosures are intended to ensure transparency and prevent individuals or entities from exercising control over multiple dispensaries through undisclosed ownership structures. Businesses involved 3 The following cannabis retail businesses are referenced in this complaint: • Canntinas Cannabis Co., 3600 Power Inn Road, Suite A1, Sacramento, CA • Oak Park Cannabis Dispensary, 3856 Stockton Boulevard, Sacramento, CA This complainant does not currently possess the internal ownership disclosure documents submitted to the City of Sacramento for these businesses. However, publicly observable information suggests that individuals associated with the above dispensaries may share overlapping ownership interests or operational control. Because the City of Sacramento requires cannabis permit applicants to disclose all owners and financial interest holders, the City already maintains records that would confirm or refute whether the same individuals hold ownership interests in multiple dispensaries. Requested Investigation The complainant respectfully requests that the City of Sacramento investigate and determine: 1. The full ownership structure of Canntinas Cannabis Co. and Oak Park Cannabis Dispensary. 2. Whether any individuals or entities hold ownership, financial interests, or operational control in both dispensaries simultaneously. 3. Whether all cannabis permit filings submitted to the City of Sacramento accurately disclosed owners, financial interest holders, managers, and controlling persons. 4. Whether corporate entities or affiliated companies were used to conceal common ownership or 4 control of multiple dispensaries. 5. Whether the ownership structure of these dispensaries complies with Sacramento cannabis licensing regulations. Records Requested for Review Investigators may wish to review the following records maintained by the Sacramento Office of Cannabis Management: • Cannabis Business Operating Permit applications • Financial Interest Holder disclosure forms • Ownership disclosure forms • Manager or controlling person disclosures • Any amendments or updates to ownership filings This complaint is submitted in the interest of transparency and compliance with Sacramento's cannabis regulatory framework. The complainant respectfully requests that the City of Sacramento review the ownership structures of the cannabis businesses referenced above and determine whether any violations of Sacramento cannabis licensing regulations have occurred.	City Clerk Initial Review Completed 03/12/2026 – Dismissed for Lack of Jurisdiction (5.1(B)3): The respondent is not a person listed in City Code section 2.112.030.B.	n/a	3/12/2026
2026-001	3/3/2026	Online	City Code Chapter 1.20 ("Code of Fair Campaign Practices") City Code Chapter 2.16 ("Conflict of Interest") City Code Chapter 4.02 ("Code of Ethics") City Code Chapter 4.04 ("Sunshine Ordinance") Chapter 3 ("Conduct of Members") and Rule 6.E (Closed Sessions) of the Council Rules of Procedure	Completely fabricating and lying on correction notices. Excessive charging of Fee's even when we have done the proper steps of cancelling ahead of time or trying to not waste building inspectors time. Ignoring Phone calls, not reaching back out. Not answering my calls but answering when i call from different numbers. Intentional bias against our company. Charging re-inspection fee's for things other inspectors have told us are not needed (For example, we are told we don't need to submit new SOLARAPP checklists to the city but then will be told we are failing inspections for not having submitted it. Clear bias and abuse of power. Not answering calls. No communication, or transparency. Inspectors are failing projects without even leaving their office. We had an in person Final inspection with James Gill, and he wrote us a correction for needing an MPU and he did not even show up to perform the inspection. Which we pay for.	City Clerk Initial Review Completed 03/12/2026 – Dismissed for Lack of Jurisdiction (5.1(B)3): The respondent is not a person listed in City Code section 2.112.030.B.	Chief Building Official	3/12/2026
2025-015	12/1/2025	Online	City Code Chapter 4.04 ("Sunshine Ordinance") Chapter 3 ("Conduct of Members") and Rule 6.E (Closed Sessions) of the Council Rules of Procedure	Felonies including grand theft, criminal mischief, hate crimes and two counts of aggravated sexual assault; sexual, racial and ageist discrimination; conspiracy (while on the clock at the City of Sacramento) to commit criminal mischief; defiance of direct orders from Director Beecham not to commit felonies as committed by Messrs.' Frederickson & Aylesworth, along with a self-described special needs person whom they exploited. Exploitation of a self-described special needs person to commit a hate crime and to exact premeditated and coordinated execution of criminal mischief weaponized as a hate crime; lying to a citizen and long-time resident of Sacramento to protect and to care for the remaining specimens of horticulture, when no such care (ostensibly) was apparently forthcoming; refusal to divulge name of the alleged person(s) caring for specimens; Refusal to discuss suggested solutions by victim of these crimes and violations of civil and Constitutional rights, being dismissed out-of-hand as "a tall order" by employee Sara (peer of Mr. Aylesworth). Instead, victim received the penalty that (must needs) rightfully be levied against the co-conspirators who lease plot 25 and 12. Alleged, prohibited sexual relationships between manager and employee (and that relationships ostensibly or purportedly a motivating factor for Mr. Aylesworth to protect the perp (Mr. Frederickson) at the expense of the victim; slander of victim committed by Mr. Frederickson (in public in front of witnesses), even after victim pleaded for Mr. Frederickson to cease his slander. Dereliction of duty by Mr. Frederickson and then retaliation against the victim who refused his unwanted and unwarranted sexual harassment and two counts of sexual abuse: forming a cabal with leases of plots 12 and 25 to retaliate against victim who rebuffed said sexual abuse and harassment.	City Clerk Initial Review Completed 12/01/2025 – Dismissed for Lack of Jurisdiction (5.1(B)3): Complaint alleges facts that are not subject to any provision of the Ethics Law	YPCE	12/1/2025
2025-013	9/10/2025	Online	City Code Chapter 2.16 ("Conflict of Interest") City Code Chapter 4.02 ("Code of Ethics")	and about the above dates asking about the Burgess V City lawsuit, my deposition and statements, using her position power to intimate and prevent me from speaking with the plaintiff's counsel. On or about March 17, 2025 and May 23, 2025 used her official position as City Manager to improperly interfere with ongoing litigation involving the City of Sacramento. Specifically: 1. Improper Influence on Litigation: attempted to influence the outcome of a lawsuit filed against the city by contacting a witness directly. 2. Witness Intimidation: Leyne Milstein instructed the witness not to communicate with the plaintiff's counsel and engaged in conduct that appeared to intimidate or discourage the witness from cooperating. 3. Misuse of Position: By using her position as used her authority to influence what testimony, statements, and depositions are made public and how the city will proceed. My complete deposition including my email, and personal identifying information is public and I and my daughter are receiving harrasing calls and I fear for our safety. I presume the purpose in making my deposition public is to further intimate, harass, and cause harm. Leyne Milstein violated ethical standards requiring public employees to act with impartiality, integrity, and respect for the law.	10/27/25 - No Cause Report adopted and complaint dismissed by the Ethics Commission	n/a	10/27/2025

Complaint No.	Date Received	Method Received	Alleged Violation	Alleged Violation Details	Disposition	Referred To	Disposition Date
2025-014	9/14/2025	Online	City Code Chapter 2.16 ("Conflict of Interest") City Code Chapter 4.02 ("Code of Ethics") City Code Chapter 4.04 ("Sunshine Ordinance") Chapter 3 ("Conduct of Members") and Rule 6.E (Closed Sessions) of the Council Rules of Procedure	Said employee is online publicly, mocking the assassination of Charlie Kirk.	City Clerk Initial Review Completed 09/15/2025 – Dismissed for Lack of Jurisdiction (5.1(B)3): The respondent is not a person listed in City Code section 2.112.030.B.	n/a	9/15/2025
2025-012	8/18/2025	Email	Code of Ethics	has violated various ethical guidelines by subjecting me to a unfair, partial, biased application process including suppressing evidence to support my application and obstructing my application to be presented to the board of the bureau of security and Investigative Services for a formal decision with rights to appeal.	City Clerk Initial Review Completed 09/02/2025 – Dismissed for Lack of Jurisdiction (5.1(B)3): The respondent is not a person listed in City Code section 2.112.030.B.	n/a	9/2/2025
2025-011	7/31/2025	Email	Conflict of Interest	I am submitting this formal ethics complaint concerning of the City of Sacramento. I have serious concerns regarding recent policy decisions and votes related to cannabis legalization and land use policies, particularly in proximity to youth and vulnerable populations. Information I have obtained indicates a potential conflict of interest involving these officials. Public campaign finance records show that received multiple cannabis related campaign contributions in March, April, May, and June of this year from a group affiliated with former Sacramento City Councilmember reportedly has an ownership interest in the cannabis industry as a legal and equity advisor.	08/25/25 - No Cause Report adopted and complaint dismissed by the Ethics Commission	Independent Evaluator on 08/04/25.	8/25/2025
2025-010	7/21/2025	Via Email	Misrepresentation by staff	Since city staff members fall outside the jurisdiction of the Ethics Commission, and cannot be held directly accountable under Sacramento City Code § 2.112.030, we are directing this complaint toward , who is responsible for overseeing staff conduct and public presentations. We believe the City Manager must be held accountable for the misrepresentation of a formally recorded vote, which misled both the Law and Legislative Committee and the public, and undermined public trust in the policymaking process.	08/25/25 - No Cause Report adopted and complaint dismissed by the Ethics Commission	Independent Evaluator on 07/22/25.	8/25/2025
2025-008	7/16/2025	Via Email	Sacramento City Code	I am filing this formal complaint to report potential violations of the California Political Reform Act and the Sacramento City Code by Councilmember . The basis of this complaint is her receipt of political contributions from cannabis industry-affiliated entities and individuals, followed by her participation in votes and policymaking that directly benefited those same parties.	08/25/25 - No Cause Report adopted and complaint dismissed by the Ethics Commission	Independent Evaluator on 07/16/25 (after 5PM).	8/25/2025
2025-007	7/16/2025	Via Email	Code of Ethics	This complaint is submitted concerning Sacramento City Councilmember and potential violations of the Political Reform Act and City of Sacramento's Code of Ethics. The issue arises from campaign contributions received from cannabis-affiliated business leaders and the possibility of subsequent involvement in related legislative or land-use decisions.	08/25/25 - No Cause Report adopted and complaint dismissed by the Ethics Commission	Independent Evaluator on 07/16/25 (after 5PM).	8/25/2025
2025-006	7/16/2025	Via Email	Code of Ethics	I am submitting this formal complaint concerning Sacramento City Councilmember for potential violations of the Political Reform Act and the City of Sacramento's Code of Ethics. The basis of this complaint involves campaign contributions from cannabis-affiliated individuals and entities, followed by potential participation in cannabis-related land use, licensing, or zoning decisions within the 12-month conflict window defined by California Government Code §87100 and FPPC Regulation 18700 et seq.	08/25/25 - No Cause Report adopted and complaint dismissed by the Ethics Commission	Independent Evaluator on 07/16/25 (after 5PM).	8/25/2025
2025-005	7/13/2025	Via Email	Campaign Contributions	accepted campaign contributions from individuals with direct financial interests in Sacramento cannabis businesses, including: - Jacob Schmidt – Director of INTER-STA / The Sanctuary dispensary (C10 0000678 LIC) - Nasser Azimi – Executive associated with Canninas Cannabis Company (C10 0000762 LIC), Ohana Growers, East Bay Therapeutics, and Teranomic Software, Corp. Despite receiving these contributions, did not recuse himself from voting on or participating in decisions regarding cannabis zoning, licensing, and policy—creating the appearance of bias, favoritism, and regulatory capture. These actions raise serious concerns under: - City of Sacramento Ethics Code, including standards related to conflicts of interest, preferential treatment, and undermining public confidence in impartial governance. - City Charter provisions and Ethics Commission Guidelines prohibiting city officials from using public office for private advantage or favoring campaign contributors in regulatory matters.	08/25/25 - No Cause Report adopted and complaint dismissed by the Ethics Commission	Independent Evaluator on 07/15/25.	8/25/2025
2025-001	1/23/2025	Online	City Code Chapter 2.16 ("Conflict of Interest") City Code Chapter 4.02 ("Code of Ethics") City Code Chapter 4.04 ("Sunshine Ordinance") Chapter 3 ("Conduct of Members") and Rule 6.E (Closed Sessions) of the Council Rules of Procedure	, along with other individuals employed by the City Clerk's office, have consistently since January 16, 2025, refused me access to the City Clerk's office to file claims in person and to inspect original documents during the City Clerk's posted business hours which are maintained during the regular course of business by the City Clerk. I need to inspect these original documents to investigate and support a pending civil lawsuit arising out of a public nuisance created by a City of Sacramento homeowner, as well as numerous civil rights and writ of mandate pending suits against the City of Sacramento.	08/25/25 - No Cause Report adopted and complaint dismissed by the Ethics Commission	Independent Evaluator on 07/15/25.	8/25/2025

Complaint No.	Date Received	Method Received	Alleged Violation	Alleged Violation Details	Disposition	Referred To	Disposition Date
2024-010	11/25/2024		City Code Chapter 4.04 ("Sunshine Ordinance") Chapter 3 ("Conduct of Members") and Rule 6.E (Closed Sessions) of the Council Rules of Procedure	Sacramento alleged failure to complete mandatory "Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging (DEIB) Training for all City Elected Officials, Council Staff, and Appointed Officers" would constitute a violation of Chapter 3 of the Council Rules of Procedure, per the adopted Resolution 2023-0113": Approving Mandatory Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging Training for all City Elected Officials, Council Staff, and Appointed Officers. Racial Equity Committee Report File ID: 2024-01812*, "Report on Completed Mandatory Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging (DEIB)/Racial Equity (RE) Training for City Elected Officials, Council Staff, and Appointed Officers and Next Steps" fails to identify attendance and status of completion of individuals for whom the training is required. However, city spokeswoman is on record in the Sacramento Bee stating that "Council leadership and the Human Resources Director are aware that the City Manager attended one of three sessions... Beyond that, I cannot comment as this is a personnel matter" (https://www.sacbee.com/opinion/article294895754.html). This publicly indicates that City Manager Howard Chan failed to complete this mandatory training, and constitutes conduct that should be investigated by the Sacramento Ethics Commission in case of violation of Chapter 3 of the Council Rules of Procedure. *Resolution 2023-0113 is contained as an attachment to Racial Equity Committee Report File ID: 2024-01812, both available at: https://sacramento.granicus.com/MetaViewer.php?view_id=68&clip_id=6091&meta_id=800888	08/25/25 - No Cause Report adopted and complaint dismissed by the Ethics Commission	Independent Evaluator on 7/15/25.	8/25/2025
2025-009	7/16/2025	Via Email	Misrepresentation	I am submitting this formal ethics complaint to bring to your attention a serious misrepresentation that occurred following the Planning and Design Commission's March 13, 2025 vote concerning cannabis zoning policy. At the March 13 meeting, the Commission voted to preserve the current Conditional Use Permit (CUP) requirements and maintain the existing sensitive use buffer zones for cannabis dispensaries and cultivation operations. This decision was affirmed and clearly stated on the record by Deputy City Attorney Kourtney Burdick on three separate occasions during the meeting. However, during the April 8 Law and Legislative Committee meeting, staff members presented a version of the policy that was inconsistent with what was actually voted on. Their presentation, which claimed to reflect the Commission's recommendation, did not align with the public record or the legal clarifications provided by the City Attorney. This misrepresentation appears to have influenced the Committee's action and misled both the public and Council regarding the Commission's intentions. This matter raises significant concerns about transparency, accountability, and the integrity of the city's legislative process. Staff knowingly or negligently mischaracterizing a Commission vote to advance an alternative policy direction undermines public trust and may constitute a violation of ethics guidelines governing honest and accurate representation of governmental actions. Furthermore, the mischaracterization of protections for K-12 schools, youth-oriented facilities, after-school programs, churches, and parks—all of which serve the same vulnerable population—erodes critical safeguards for Sacramento communities. These uses deserve equal treatment and full protection under our zoning code. I respectfully request that the Ethics Commission investigate this matter and hold any responsible parties accountable for the misrepresentation and breakdown in transparency. The public deserves a truthful and accurate reflection of the Planning and Design Commission's decisions.	City Clerk Initial Review Completed 07/21/2025 – Dismissed for Lack of Jurisdiction (5.1(B)3): The respondents are not a people listed in City Code section 2.112.030.B.	Community Development Department	7/21/2025
2025-004	7/11/2025	Online	City Code Chapter 4.04 ("Sunshine Ordinance") Chapter 3 ("Conduct of Members") and Rule 6.E (Closed Sessions) of the Council Rules of Procedure	over the course of the last month, my vehicles have been aggressively targeted by these officials and their subordinates for apparent code violations. i've made contact with these senior officers to show that they are incorrect in their findings. i've made visits to their office on 4 different occasions attempting to present my information and to express my better understanding of the code, than the actual officers themselves and i've yet to be given the opportunity to disprove them. i've expressed to these officers that i have evidence showing that my vehicles are not in violation of the 72 hour rule and that the onslaught of violation notices is becoming harassment. they have consistently misrepresented code 10.24.070 by stating that a vehicle can solely not be parked in a location for longer than 72 hours. what they have failed to acknowledge based on what i've shared and have been trying to share, is that 10.24.070 states that a vehicle can not remain parked in a location for more than 72 hours, nor can it be parked within 300 feet of the initial parking spot within those 72 hours, "...unless such vehicle is maintained in an operable condition and driven within the 72 consecutive hours mentioned above." i have shared with all 3 of these officers that my vehicles are maintained, registered, operable and have been constantly driven during the times that claim, but yet they claim that does not matter and they will tow my vehicle anyway. based on the code, my vehicles are not subject to tow and would only be subject to tow because these officers have not acknowledged the latter part of 10.24.070 that clearly states i am within my rights. they have consistently taken away a part of that code given to me by the city so that they can justify their wrongdoings. and if they are allowed to proceed with misrepresenting the code, they are putting people and their belongings in jeopardy wrongfully.	City Clerk Initial Review Completed 07/15/2025 – Dismissed for Lack of Jurisdiction (5.1(B)3): The respondent is not a person listed in City Code section 2.112.030.B. Referred to another city department - Code Enforcement (5.1(B)2)	Code Enforcement	7/15/2025
2025-003	5/14/2025	Online	City Code Chapter 2.16 ("Conflict of Interest") City Code Chapter 4.02 ("Code of Ethics")	My name is , and I serve as the President of Sacramento Masters Swimming. I am writing to formally file a complaint regarding the City of Sacramento's failure to uphold the terms of our signed rental agreement for the use of the North Natomas Aquatic Center. Per our executed contract, the agreed-upon rental terms are clearly stated as follows: "Organization shall pay \$10.00 per lane, per hour for 25-yard lanes and \$20.00 per lane, per hour for 50-meter lanes ("Rental Fee")." However, the City of Sacramento is currently imposing billing requirements that exceed those stipulated in the contract. Specifically, Sacramento Masters is being charged with a mandatory minimum of 10 lanes for a minimum of 2 hours, regardless of our actual lane usage. These additional requirements and costs are not included in the signed agreement. Furthermore, the contract does not distinguish between the competition pool and the recreational pool, nor does it include any language establishing minimum lane or time obligations. This deviation from the agreed-upon terms has resulted in Sacramento Masters being overcharged by approximately \$1,200 per month. Despite raising this issue directly with City representatives and , our request for compliance with the contract has been denied. We respectfully request the following: That the City of Sacramento immediately cease the imposition of any minimum lane or time requirements not included in the signed agreement. That all future charges reflect the exact terms stated in the executed contract. That Sacramento Masters be credited for past overcharges, calculated based on the contractual rates. We hope to resolve this matter promptly and amicably. However, we are prepared to pursue all necessary administrative and legal remedies to ensure the integrity of our agreement is upheld	Formstack/Online Submittal error and complaint not received until 07/15/2025.	Youth, Parks, and Community Enrichment Department	7/15/2025

Complaint No.	Date Received	Method Received	Alleged Violation	Alleged Violation Details	Disposition	Referred To	Disposition Date
2025-002	2/23/2025	Online	City Code Chapter 1.20 ("Code of Fair Campaign Practices") City Code Chapter 2.16 ("Conflict of Interest") City Code Chapter 4.02 ("Code of Ethics") City Code Chapter 4.04 ("Sunshine Ordinance") Chapter 3 ("Conduct of Members") and Rule 6.E (Closed Sessions) of the Council Rules of Procedure	I called Sacramento non-emergency line to report that my stolen vehicle license plate number [redacted] report number [redacted] was spotted on heritage Lane on heritage Lane and exposition boulevard on the right hand side and and officer Becker gave me the third degree about what I was doing since I had found out this information in the morning and why didn't I call right then and I had to explain to her I was taking a shower I had to get something to eat I changed I did chores I did my makeup and this was only after she refused to send somebody just drive by out there to see if there was a stolen vehicle there she wanted me to drive by there to check on a stolen vehicle then I told her it wasn't safe for me to do so these people stole my vehicle they're not going to be happy to see me. So then I called back and asked her if she could just make a note of it so when the officers had time they could just swing by there cuz it is a non-emergency I was calling the non-emergency line so then at that point I asked her for the complaint telephone number and she transferred me over officer [redacted] at that point she said she would have a supervisor her supervisor which I thought officer Ronnie was a supervisor but I guess I was wrong so a supervisor check and see if they're able to send the officer to just drive by there to see if the vehicle was there stolen vehicle... I think the way they went about questioning me was unconstructive and unethical I mean I'm calling in about a stolen vehicle and they were totally unwilling to help me. And only after I called two times they put it to they said I don't even know if they're going to do it have a supervisor look at it but their conduct is unethical unconstructive and intrusive.. thank you	Formstack/Online Submittal error and complaint not received until 07/15/2025.	OPSA	7/15/2025
2024-008	9/25/2024	Online	City Code Chapter 4.02 ("Code of Ethics")	I recieved yesterday a notice of Assignment from a company called Professional Account Management, LLC. concerning a parking violation. I have never heard of this organization and am suspecting SCAM. Could you please forward this email to someone that could verify that the violation is legitate and that I have not previously paid it? Thanks	Dismissed by City Clerk-Lack of Jurisdiction. Complaint was not about an individual and issue cited was not under the jursdiction of the commission.	City Parking Division	9/25/2024
2024-007	9/7/2024	Online	City Code Chapter 1.20 ("Code of Fair Campaign Practices") City Code Chapter 4.02 ("Code of Ethics")	Campaign sign placed in roadway center divider, contrary to camaign and zoning ordinances. Located at the westbound intersection of H and J streets near SacState.	Dismissed by City Clerk-Lack of Jurisdiction. 1.20 and 4.02 do not cover political signage. Complainant was referred to city code chapter 15.148.310 and to the 311 website link regarding signage complaints.	311	9/10/2024
2024-006	7/18/2024	Online	Chapter 2.15 ("Lobbyist Registration and Reporting Code")	[redacted] has been the District Director for almost two decades. He has NEVER filed an annual form 700 disclosure form. He is working as a lobbyist for the Building Industry Association (BIA) and has never disclosed this. He is embedded on the 5th floor with all of the council members and the Mayor and has the opportunity to influence legislation around housing and development that comes before the council.	Dismissed by City Clerk-Lack of Jurisdiction. Respondent is not under the jurisdiction of the Ethics Commission.	n/a	7/18/2024
2024-005	6/28/2024	Email, Online, and Dropbox	City Code Chapter 4.02 ("Code of Ethics")	[redacted] for breaking "Public Trust" of their powers and authorities to protect the benefits of public but protect the benefits of Sacramento Police Officers.	Dismissed by City Clerk-Lack of Jurisdiction		7/5/2024
2024-009	5/30/2024	Email	Chapter 2.16 ("Conflict of Interest")	Recently, the City Council considered whether your commission should have subpoena power. Attached is a document outlining why it is essential for your commission to have subpoena power and to use that power to subpoena financial records and the client list related to her practice as an attorney. There was a Sacramento Bee article discussing this situation and even surfaced an attempt by her office to interfere with city code enforcement on behalf of her client. The City CPRA process is inadequate and Kaplan has not provided documentation related to her client list. This is being sent to you anonymously because she has clearly demonstrated capacity to retaliate against people. Please take action and hold a hearing to investigate [redacted] financial conflicts of interest. Please see attached statement of fact. The complaint includes official Natomas Unified School District meeting minutes identifying a voting pattern by that resulted in \$183 million dollars in no bid contracts being awarded to Vanir LLC and various contractors with campaign finance ties to [redacted]. Further, it is demonstrated that [redacted] understood her need to recuse herself in these proceedings yet later she voted in affirmation of awarding her client and donors millions of dollars in public money, including but not limited to a 'blank check' contract. It is further alleged that [redacted] and her Council staff have inappropriately interfered in City code and compliance investigating complaints related to 601 J street, the future home of Vanir Tower, a property Vanir LLC acquired prior to the construction of the Golden One Center. Vanir LLC's Dorene Dominguez is also minority owner of the Sacramento Kings	City Clerk Initial Review Completed 02/18/2025 – Dismissed for Lack of Jurisdiction (5.1(B)3): Complaint alleges facts that are not subject to any provision of the Ethics Law. The complaint alleges violations that occurred prior to when respondant was an elected city official.	n/a	2/18/2025
2024-002	2/12/2024	Online	Chapter 3 ("Conduct of Members") and Rule 6.E (Closed Sessions) of the Council Rules of Procedure	I am writing to kindly request your attention to a matter that constitutes an act of violation by [redacted], of the City of Sacramento Council Rules and Procedures, of the Rosenberg's Rules of Order and of the Ralph. M. Brown Act. The City of Sacramento Council Rules and Procedures stipulates that "The [redacted] is considered a member of the council" and "possesses no veto power over actions of the council". The City of Sacramento Council Rules and Procedures also establishes a process for Council member Proposal Requests that "modulates the agenda requests of individual council members by referring those requests to the relevant city council standing committee for review" (see attached Flowchart). The Rosenberg's Rules of Order stipulate that "A motion to table an item (or to bring it back to the body) requires a simple majority vote". The Ralph. M. Brown Act Code stipulates that "Each agenda for a regular public meeting must provide the public with an opportunity to address the legislative body on any item on the agenda, before or during the legislative body's consideration of the item, and on any item of interest to the public that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the legislative body." In violation of the City of Sacramento Council Rules and Procedures, [redacted] vetoed on 1/26/24, the inclusion in the Council's Agenda of a Ceasefire Resolution introduced by [redacted] on 1/24/24. The [redacted] also failed to follow the established Council Member Proposal Request Flowchart by unilaterally giving himself the power to obstruct the resolution referring to it as a "foreign policy issue" despite writing in an official letter on 1/23/24 (attached): "Some ask why the city council should get involved in these difficult and controversial issues. It is a fair question. I do not believe we have a real choice". In Violation of the Rosenberg's Rule of Order, the [redacted] has tabled the Ceasefire Resolution without referring to a majority vote. In violation of the Ralph Brown M. Act, Mayor Steinberg prevented on 2/9/24, more than 50 members of the public from making public comments during the Sacramento City Council Public Meeting despite submitting Speakers slips and despite Sacramento providing \$7M in funding to Israel according to the USPCR- US Campaign for Palestinian Rights (see attached infographic).	Dismissed by Ethics Commission-Complaint Unfounded		6/24/2024
2024-004	5/17/2024	online	City Code Chapter 4.02 ("Code of Ethics")		Dismissed by City Clerk-Lack of Jurisdiction		5/28/2024
2024-003	5/15/2024	online	City Code Chapter 4.02 ("Code of Ethics")	Ethics complaint of [redacted]	Dismissed by City Clerk-Lack of Jurisdiction		5/15/2024

Complaint No.	Date Received	Method Received	Alleged Violation	Alleged Violation Details	Disposition	Referred To	Disposition Date
2024-001	1/2/2024	Online	City Code Chapter 4.02 (Code of Ethics)	I continually have my car ticketed (parking). I have and pay for a parking permit to park where I am parking. I have to contest the parking ticket even though I have a parking permit; This is harassment. I pay for a parking permit and I am still ticketed. I have to dispute the ticket and then the "violation" will be dismissed. I have received over \$1000 worth of parking ticket by the City of Sacramento and they all have been dismissed because of errors on the side of the City of Sacramento Parking division. This is harassment.	Dismissed by City Clerk-Lack of Jurisdiction	Public Works	1/3/2024