



STALLARD PANEBIANCO P.C. | ATTORNEYS AT LAW | SPWPI.COM

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF CONFIDENTIAL INVESTIGATION

Investigation Concerning Complaint by Town Manager Jason Ledbetter

Town of Woodside

April 20, 2026

## **CONFIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

On February 27, 2026, the Town of Woodside (“Town”) retained Stallard Panebianco P.C. to conduct an impartial investigation of a complaint brought by Town Manager Jason Ledbetter concerning Town Council Member Jennifer Wall and Town Attorney Jean Savaree. Initially the scope of the investigation was limited to Ledbetter’s complaint that Wall mistreated him due to his gender. The scope was expanded on March 21, 2026, to include Ledbetter’s “whistleblower” allegations about Town Council Members Brian Dombkowski and Paul Goeld. David Stallard was the principal investigator.

Within the scope of the investigation, the undersigned sought to answer the following questions:

1. Did Wall mistreat Ledbetter due to his gender?
2. Did Savaree fail to take reasonable action after Ledbetter reported mistreatment from Wall?
3. Did Goeld ask Ledbetter not to initiate a Request for Proposal (“RFP”) for a developer to work on the High Road housing site?
4. Did Goeld refer to Palestinians as “niggers” or “sand niggers” during a meeting with Ledbetter?
5. Did Goeld disclose confidential closed session information to Ledbetter?
6. Did Dombkowski pressure Ledbetter to delay work on a proposed housing development at the Raymundo site until December 2026?
7. Did Dombkowski make a comment about Wall’s physique, comparing it to “marbles on a billiard table?”
8. Did Dombkowski ask Ledbetter to “bury” a proposed 15 mile per hour limit in front of Woodside school, while supporting a reduction in speed for a median beautification project?
9. Did Dombkowski aggressively question Planning Commissioner Matt Garr during a Town Council meeting because Garr is a potential political opponent?
10. Did Dombkowski disclose confidential closed session information with former Council Member Chris Shaw?

Once the scope of the investigation was determined, the investigator operated with complete independence as to witness identification, interview content, and preparation of findings.

This executive summary report highlights the process and finding, but it does not capture the entirety of the information gathered or the analysis conducted in the course of the investigation.

### **II. PROCESS**

The investigator interviewed nine witnesses. The investigator also reviewed a number of documents, including emails, text messages, photographs, and a video recording.

At the beginning of each interview, each participant was advised of the following:

1. The investigator is a neutral fact finder investigating a concern on behalf of the Town.
2. The participant has a right not to be retaliated against for participating in the interview process or for making a complaint, and also a duty not to retaliate against others who participated.

## **CONFIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

3. If a participant believed or suspected retaliation was occurring, they should report that concern.

### **III. FINDINGS**

The standard of proof used by the investigator to reach a finding of fact specific in this case was a preponderance of the evidence. A preponderance of the evidence, also known as “50 percent plus a feather,” is the standard commonly applied during workplace investigations, and means that the evidence on one side outweighs, or is more than, the evidence on the other side. This is a qualitative, not quantitative, standard.

#### **1. Did Wall mistreat Ledbetter due to his gender?**

Not sustained. A preponderance of the evidence does not support a finding that Wall mistreated Ledbetter due to his gender.

Ledbetter stated Wall mistreated him due to his gender because she had preferred for the Town to hire a female candidate, and her bias against him manifested as directing him to work on her interests, frequent off-hours text messages, and aggressively questioning him over the Town’s ALPRs. Wall’s denial of the allegation is more credible than Ledbetter’s account because documents and witness accounts corroborated that her actions were all related to Town business. For this reason, this allegation is not sustained.

#### **2. Did Savaree fail to take reasonable action after Ledbetter reported mistreatment from Wall?**

Not sustained. A preponderance of the evidence does not support a finding that Savaree failed to take reasonable action after Ledbetter reported mistreatment from Wall.

Ledbetter alleged he told Savaree on several occasions that Wall bullied him, and Savaree did not appropriately address his complaint. Savaree responded that Ledbetter called Wall “a bully” on one occasion, January 27, 2026, and when Savaree questioned him about what he meant, he said he did not want to make a claim.

Ledbetter’s digital writings, which he described as a journal, supported that he reported mistreatment to Savaree on several occasions, starting in September 2025. The journal notably did not include an account of what words he said to Savaree that amounted to reporting mistreatment. Additionally, witnesses reported that Ledbetter frequently vented about his relationship with Wall and was factually inaccurate in his belief that the prior Town Manager left due to Wall’s treatment. This supports Savaree’s account that while Ledbetter talked to her about his frustrations with Wall, he did not report that he believed Wall was mistreating him. Because other information contradicted Ledbetter, and because his journal often captured his emotional response and did not mention other noteworthy facts he later complained of, Savaree’s account, that Ledbetter told her one time that Wall was a bully, not that Wall was bullying him, is considered more credible than Ledbetter’s. Therefore, this finding is not sustained.

## **CONFIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **3. Did Goeld ask Ledbetter not to initiate an RFP for a developer to work on the High Road housing site?**

Not sustained. A preponderance of the evidence does not support a finding that Goeld asked Ledbetter not to initiate an RFP for the High Road site.

Ledbetter alleged Goeld asked him not to move the RFP for the High Road site forward, which Goeld and Dombkowski contradicted. However, Ledbetter's account that Goeld only raised it the one time, along with the fact that the Council had approved the housing element, and it was a top deliverable, make it unlikely Ledbetter was pressured as alleged. Because of this, combined with other factors that resulted in Ledbetter being considered a less credible reporter of events than Goeld, this finding is not sustained.

### **4. Did Goeld refer to Palestinians as "niggers" or "sand niggers" during a meeting with Ledbetter?**

Not sustained. A preponderance of the evidence does not support a finding that Goeld referred to Palestinians as "niggers" or "sand niggers" during a meeting with Ledbetter.

Ledbetter's allegation was contradicted by Goeld and Dombkowski. Additionally, their account of the setting supported it was implausible that Goeld would use such language as it was a public place where a public figure using such language could have been heard by others and would have been noticeable due to it being an upscale restaurant. Given these facts, accounts from other witnesses that Goeld did not speak in that fashion, and the fact that Ledbetter did not mention such memorable comments in his journal, his allegation is less credible than Goeld's denial. Therefore, this finding is not sustained.

### **5. Did Goeld and/or Dombkowski make jokes about "goyim?"**

Not sustained. A preponderance of the evidence does not support a finding that Goeld or Dombkowski made jokes about goyim.

Ledbetter's allegation that Goeld and Dombkowski referred to Ashkenazi Jews and joked about goyim was contradicted by Goeld and Dombkowski, who, as in Finding 4, noted the implausible circumstances for that kind of discussion. Other facts, like Dombkowski's assertion he did not know prior to the complaint what goyim meant, Ledbetter incorrectly pronouncing "Ashkenazi," and the lack of mention of the comments in Ledbetter's journal, along with Ledbetter's reduced credibility, outweigh Ledbetter's allegation. Therefore, this finding is not sustained.

### **6. Did Goeld disclose confidential closed session information to Ledbetter?**

Sustained. A preponderance of the evidence supports a finding that Goeld told Ledbetter that Wall raised concerns about the Town Manager hiring process, a discussion that happened during closed session.

Ledbetter alleged that Goeld told him he was not Wall's first choice for Town Manager, and that Wall complained of misogyny in the hiring process. Goeld admitted telling Ledbetter that Wall had accused Goeld of gender discrimination, while discussing the hire. Because Goeld admitted relating that account to Ledbetter, it is more likely than not that Goeld shared the information about the closed session discussion of gender in the hiring process as Ledbetter alleged. Therefore, this finding is sustained.

## **CONFIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **7. Did Dombkowski pressure Ledbetter to delay work on a proposed housing development at the Raymundo site until December 2026?**

Not sustained. A preponderance of the evidence does not support a finding that Dombkowski pressured Ledbetter to delay work on the Raymundo site until December 2026.

Ledbetter's allegation was contradicted by Dombkowski, who observed that the Council passed the housing element, and the RFP was due before the November 2026 election, undercutting Ledbetter's assertion that a delay would benefit Dombkowski politically. This was indirectly corroborated by two witnesses who stated they did not believe Dombkowski intended to run for reelection, including one witness who heard that in 2025. For those reasons, and the same reasons covered in Finding 3, this finding is not sustained.

### **8. Did Dombkowski make a comment about Wall's physique, comparing it to "marbles on a billiard table?"**

Not sustained. A preponderance of the evidence does not support a finding that Dombkowski said the phrase "marbles on a billiard table" in reference to Wall's physique.

Ledbetter's allegation that Dombkowski made the comment "commonly" and "popularized" it was contradicted by Dombkowski, Goeld, and another witness. Further, three other witnesses, including two who showed a bias against Dombkowski, further corroborated they had never heard him speak in that fashion.

Similar to Finding 4, it is noteworthy that the phrase "marbles on a billiard table" does not appear in Ledbetter's journal. Therefore, because no witnesses corroborated the remark, combined with Ledbetter's reduced credibility, this finding is not sustained.

### **9. Did Dombkowski ask Ledbetter to "bury" a proposed 15 mile per hour limit in front of Woodside school, while supporting a reduction in speed for a median beautification project?**

Not sustained. While it is uncontested that Dombkowski supported a speed reduction related to a median beautification project, a preponderance of the evidence does not support a finding that he asked Ledbetter to "bury" a proposed 15 miles per hour speed limit in front of Woodside Elementary School.

Ledbetter's allegation that Dombkowski asked him to bury a speed limit reduction was denied by Dombkowski. Further, Dombkowski's account of how he would have expected the background work to have been completed before it was brought to Council was corroborated by a witness. Further, Ledbetter's assertion that Dombkowski's motion to change the Sheriff's traffic reporting from the Circulation Committee to the Council was an act of petty retribution was not corroborated by witnesses, and in fact passed by a vote of the Council. This undercut Ledbetter's credibility on this point. Therefore, this finding is not sustained.

**CONFIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**10. Did Dombkowski aggressively question Planning Commissioner Matt Garr during a Council meeting because Garr is a potential political opponent?**

Not sustained. A preponderance of the evidence does not support a finding that Dombkowski questioned Garr in an aggressive manner because Garr is a potential political opponent.

Ledbetter's allegation that politics motivated Dombkowski to aggressively question Garr was contradicted by Dombkowski and three witnesses. Further, the questioning was done in a public meeting, where Garr's appointment was confirmed by a 5 to 0 vote, undercutting the assertion that anything untoward was taking place. Therefore, this finding is not sustained.

**11. Did Dombkowski share confidential closed session information with former Council member Chris Shaw?**

Not sustained. A preponderance of the evidence does not support a finding that Dombkowski shared confidential closed session information with Shaw.

Ledbetter's allegation did not include specific information that Dombkowski leaked to Shaw, significantly undercutting the credibility of the allegation. Rather, Ledbetter's allegation relied on Dombkowski and Shaw's admittedly close relationship. However, pure innuendo alone, without more, is insufficient to sustain the allegation. Therefore, this finding is not sustained.

This executive summary is respectfully submitted.



David Stallard