



San Francisco Ethics Commission

25 Van Ness Avenue, STE 220
San Francisco, CA 94102-6053
ethics.commission@sfgov.org
415-252-3100 | sfethics.org

February 13, 2026, Enforcement Update: Ethics Commission Fines Planning Commissioner Kathrin Moore, Film Commissioner Franco Finn, and City employees Michael Maraviglia and Ren Yu Zhang in Four Separate Cases.

February 13, 2026

For information: Michael Canning, Policy and Legislative Affairs Manager (415) 252-3100

At its regular monthly meeting on Friday, February 13, 2026, the San Francisco Ethics Commission approved four separate settlement agreements that levied a total of \$13,200 in penalties against four respondents for unrelated violations of conflict of interest, ethics, and personal financial disclosure laws.

As authorized by the City Charter, the resolution of violations through a stipulated agreement enables Respondents and the Ethics Commission to resolve enforcement matters without the need of a lengthier and costlier process involving a hearing on the merits. The Commission is authorized to assess a monetary penalty of up to \$5,000 for each violation or three times the amount that was unlawfully received.

Violations of Financial Conflicts of Interest Laws

In the Matter of Kathrin Moore - The Commission unanimously approved a [stipulated agreement](#) that levied a \$12,000 penalty against Kathrin Moore, Commissioner for the San Francisco Planning Commission, for making or participating in making governmental decisions in which Respondent had a financial interest, in violation of the Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code section 3.206(a) and the California Government Code section 87100. In the stipulation, Commissioner Moore took responsibility for the violation.

As detailed in the Stipulation, in her official capacity as Vice President of the Planning Commission, Respondent voted on four separate agenda items involving Skidmore, Owings & Merrill LLP ("SOM"). Respondent voted on these matters in violation of the Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code section 3.206(a) and the California Government Code section 87100 even though she received retirement income from SOM within twelve months prior to those decisions. The investigation determined that because SOM was explicitly involved in the projects before the Planning Commission, Respondent was prohibited from making or participating in making decisions on those projects.

Financial conflicts of interest create both the danger and the appearance that a public official may misuse their office for personal gain, thereby undermining public trust in City government. Conflict of interest laws are designed to ensure that officials act solely in the interest of the public, free from private influence or advantage. Commissioner Moore acknowledged her error in this matter and took full responsibility for her actions.



San Francisco Ethics Commission

25 Van Ness Avenue, STE 220
San Francisco, CA 94102-6053
ethics.commission@sfgov.org
415-252-3100 | sfethics.org

Violations of Ethics and Personal Financial Disclosure (Form 700) Laws

In the Matter of Franco Finn - The Commission unanimously approved a [stipulated agreement](#) fining Franco Finn, a Commissioner of the Film Commission, \$400 for failing to fulfill the annual Ethics and Sunshine Ordinance training requirement due in 2025 in violation of San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code (“SF C&GC Code”) section 3.1-102(a) and for participating in, and acting on, matters appearing on Film Commission meeting agendas while disqualified from doing so, in violation of SF C&GCC section 3.1-102.5(c).

As detailed in the Stipulation, Commissioner Finn failed to fulfill the annual Ethics and Sunshine Ordinance trainings requirement due in 2025 in violation of City ethics laws. Consequently, Commissioner Finn was disqualified from participating in, and voting on, matters appearing on Film Commission meeting agendas during the period that his trainings requirements remained unfulfilled. However, Commissioner Finn participated in matters appearing before two meetings of the Film Commission despite being disqualified from doing so. Therefore, Commissioner Finn violated City ethics laws. After being contacted by investigators, Commissioner Finn, who has no history of ethics violations with the Ethics Commission, acknowledged and took full responsibility for his mistake, completed the required trainings, and fulfilled his filing requirements. Investigators did not find any evidence that the decisions in which Commissioner Finn participated had a financial effect on any of the financial interests that he eventually reported.

In the Matter of Michael Maraviglia - The Commission unanimously approved a [stipulated agreement](#) fining Michael Maraviglia, a Manager VI with the Public Utilities Commission (“PUC”), \$400. Respondent Maraviglia failed to timely file the Annual Statement of Economic Interests (“Form 700”) and failed to fulfill the annual Ethics training requirement due in 2025 in violation of SF C&GC Code section 3.1-102(a).

As detailed in the Stipulation, Respondent Maraviglia failed to fulfill the annual Form 700 and Ethic training requirement due in 2025 in violation of City ethics laws. After being contacted by investigators, Respondent Maraviglia, who has no history of ethics violations with the Ethics Commission, acknowledged and took full responsibility for his mistake, completed the required training, and fulfilled his filing requirements. Investigators did not find any evidence that the decisions in which Respondent Maraviglia participated had a financial effect on any of the financial interests that he eventually reported.

In the Matter of Ren Yu Zhang - The Commission unanimously approved a [stipulated agreement](#) fining Ren Yu Zhang, a Permit Technician II with the Department of Building Inspection (“DBI”), \$400. Respondent Zhang failed to timely file the Annual Statement of Economic Interests (“Form 700”) and failed to fulfill the annual Ethics training requirement due in 2025 in violation of SF C&GC Code section 3.1-102(a).

As detailed in the Stipulation, Respondent Zhang failed to fulfill the annual Form 700 and Ethic training requirement due in 2025 in violation of City ethics laws. After being contacted by investigators, Respondent Zhang, who has no history of ethics violations with the Ethics Commission, acknowledged and took full responsibility for his mistake, completed the required training, and fulfilled his filing



San Francisco Ethics Commission

25 Van Ness Avenue, STE 220
San Francisco, CA 94102-6053
ethics.commission@sfgov.org
415-252-3100 | sfethics.org

requirements. Investigators did not find any evidence that the decisions in which Respondent Zhang participated had a financial effect on any of the financial interests that he eventually reported.

#

The San Francisco Ethics Commission was created directly by the City's voters with the passage of Proposition K in November 1993 and is responsible for the independent and impartial administration and enforcement of laws related to campaign finance, public financing of candidates, governmental ethics, conflicts of interests, and registration and reporting by lobbyists, campaign consultants, permit consultants, and major developers. Our mission is to practice and promote the highest standards of integrity in government. We achieve that by delivering impactful programs that promote fair, transparent, and accountable governmental decision making for the benefit of all San Franciscans. Public service is a public trust, and our aim is to ensure that San Franciscans can have confidence that the operations of the City and County and the decisions made by its officials and employees are fair, just, and made without any regard to private or personal gain.