



**City Council Meeting**  
**Public Comments**  
**December 17, 2025**

Board or Commission for Public Comment City Council

Email [janekfleroa@choisng.org](mailto:janekfleroa@choisng.org)

Council Meeting Date 12/17/2025

Item # 1

Subject Law enforcement corruption and lack of accountability in regards to illegal alien foreign national immigrants =====

Position In Favor

First and Last Name -

Are you an Escondido Resident? Yes

Comments

Law enforcement corruption and lack of accountability in regards to illegal alien foreign national immigrants

=====

Police Corruption and Misconduct, History, Contemporary Problems, Further Readings

The violation of state and federal laws or the violation of individuals' constitutional rights by police officers; also when police commit crimes for personal gain.

Police misconduct and corruption are abuses of police authority. Sometimes used interchangeably, the terms refer to a wide range of procedural, criminal, and civil violations. Misconduct is the broadest category. Misconduct is "procedural" when it refers to police who violate police department rules and regulations; "criminal" when it refers to police who violate state and federal laws; "unconstitutional" when it refers to police who violate a citizen's CIVIL RIGHTS; or any combination thereof. Common forms of misconduct are excessive use of physical or DEADLY FORCE, discriminatory arrest, physical or verbal harassment, and selective enforcement of the law.

Police corruption is the abuse of police authority for personal gain. Corruption may involve profit or another type of material benefit gained illegally as a consequence of the officer's authority. Typical forms of corruption include BRIBERY, EXTORTION, receiving or fencing stolen goods, and selling drugs. The term also refers to patterns of misconduct within a given police department or special unit, particularly where offenses are repeated with the acquiescence of superiors or through other ongoing failure to correct them.

Safeguards against police misconduct exist throughout the law. Police departments themselves establish codes of conduct, train new recruits, and investigate and discipline officers, sometimes in cooperation

with civilian complaint review boards which are intended to provide independent evaluative and remedial advice. Protections are also found in state law, which permits victims to sue police for damages in civil actions. Typically, these actions are brought for claims such as the use of excessive force ("police brutality"), false arrest and imprisonment, MALICIOUS PROSECUTION, and WRONGFUL DEATH. State actions may be brought simultaneously with additional claims for constitutional violations.

Through both criminal and civil statutes, federal law specifically targets police misconduct. Federal law is applicable to all state, county, and local officers, including those who work in correctional facilities. The key federal criminal statute makes it unlawful for anyone acting with police authority to deprive or conspire to deprive another person of any right protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States (Section 18 U.S.C. § 241 [2000]). Another statute, commonly referred to as the police misconduct provision, makes it unlawful for state or local police to engage in a pattern or practice of conduct that deprives persons of their rights (42 U.S.C.A. 14141 [2000]).

Additionally, federal law prohibits discrimination in police work. Any police department receiving federal funding is covered by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. § 2000d) and the Office of Justice Programs statute (42 U.S.C. § 3789d[c]), which prohibit discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, and religion. These laws prohibit conduct ranging from racial slurs and unjustified arrests to the refusal of departments to respond to discrimination complaints.

Because neither the federal criminal statute nor the civil police misconduct provision provides for lawsuits by individuals, only the federal government may bring suit under these laws. Enforcement is the responsibility of the JUSTICE DEPARTMENT. Criminal convictions are punishable by fines and imprisonment. Civil convictions are remedied through injunctive relief, a type of court order that requires a change in behavior; typically, resolutions in such cases force police departments to stop abusive practices, institute types of reform, or submit to court supervision.

Private litigation against police officers or departments is difficult. Besides time and expense, a significant hurdle to success is found in the legal protections that police enjoy. Since the late twentieth century, many court decisions have expanded the powers of police to perform routine stops and searches. Plaintiffs generally must prove willful or unlawful conduct on the part of police; showing mere NEGLIGENCE or other failure of due care by police officers often does not suffice in court.

Most problematically of all for plaintiffs, police are protected by the defense of immunity—an exemption from penalties and burdens that the law generally places on other citizens. This IMMUNITY is limited, unlike the absolute immunity enjoyed by judges or legislators. In theory, the defense allows police to do their job without fear of REPRISAL. In practice, however, it has become increasingly difficult for individuals to sue law enforcement officers for damages for allegedly violating their civil rights. U.S. Supreme Court decisions have continually asserted the general rule that officers must be given the benefit of the doubt that they acted lawfully in carrying out their day-to-day duties, a position reasserted in *Saucier v. Katz*, 533 U.S. 194, 121 S. Ct. 2151, 150 L. Ed. 2d 272 (2001).

Email [laurahunter744@gmail.com](mailto:laurahunter744@gmail.com)

Council Meeting Date December 17, 2025

Item # 14

Subject Library Outsourcing Contract Extension

Position In Opposition

First and Last Name Laura Hunter

Are you an Escondido Resident? Yes

Comments

Dear Mayor and Council Members,

I am writing to request that the Council please remove the LS&S Contract extension from the Consent Calendar and table this item until next year. This is a critically important community issue and deserves a full public discussion.

Since none of the Council members were in office during this library nightmare, you may not know the controversy over the outsourcing of our public library. Escondido had successfully operated our library for 100 years but City Manager Epp and the Mayor Abed pushed to contract operations out to a private corporation for profit with a no-bid contract (Council members Diaz and Morasco voting no).

Over 2,000 residents signed petitions and this action was the subject of several packed room hearings and overwhelming community outrage. Here is a detailing of that time

<https://www.escondidoindivisible.com/2017/07/24/on-the-issue-escondido-public-library-privatization/> and <https://www.escondidolibrarywatchdog.org/> There were 90 speakers in opposition at the hearing <https://youtu.be/F45m1TvGMe8?t=17>

Ironically, the one issue the Council argued was so compelling was that LSS said it could provide us with a library open on Sundays. A short way into the 10-year contract, the library closed on Sundays. It is still closed on Sundays.

I am requesting that this item be withdrawn from the agenda and tabled until a public discussion is scheduled for next year. If the City cannot support it, we should be discussing operations of it with the County of San Diego Library System. There is no reason or need to continue to allow corporate interests to profit from our public asset—our precious library.

Thank you for your consideration

Laura Hunter

Board or Commission for Public Comment City Council

Email [raminelson@aol.com](mailto:raminelson@aol.com)

Council Meeting Date 12/17/25

Item # 14

Subject Renewal of private contract for library operations

Position In Opposition

First and Last Name Kathleen Nelson

Are you an Escondido Resident? Yes

Comments

As a long time patron of the Escondido public library, I noticed a profound change in the quality of library services as well as in the amount of books available, after the library was privatized. I feel that it was a great disservice to the people of the city. Since that time my husband and I have been going to the Rancho Bernardo library in order to get better library services. The library needs to go back to being operated by the city and generous funds need to be allotted to upgrade it.

I say no on renewing the existing privatized contract!

Board or Commission for Public Comment City Council

Email [enelson200@aol.com](mailto:enelson200@aol.com)

Council Meeting Date 12/17/2025

Item # 14

Subject Library privatization

Position In Opposition

First and Last Name Eric Nelson

Are you an Escondido Resident? No

Comments

the library is a sad shadow of whatit once was.  
It's embarrassing to see the lac

Board or Commission for Public Comment City Council

Email [mschmalvogl@yahoo.com](mailto:mschmalvogl@yahoo.com)

Council Meeting Date 12/17/25

Item # 14

Subject Escondido public library - request full public debate in new year

Position In Opposition

First and Last Name Michele Schmalvogl

Are you an Escondido Resident? Yes

Comments

I would request that this item regarding Escondido public library be set aside until such time in the new year that it can be addressed in a full public debate. Please allow the people to decide whether or not we want to continue with a corporate library or one designed exclusively to serve the public.

Board or Commission for Public Comment City Council

Email [joannetenney@hotmail.com](mailto:joannetenney@hotmail.com)

Council Meeting Date 12/17/2025

Item # 14

Subject Library

Position In Opposition

First and Last Name Joanne Tenney

Are you an Escondido Resident? Yes

Comments

I'm requesting this item be withdrawn from the consent agenda and be scheduled for a full public discussion next year.

Item 14

I support Laura Hunter's reasonable request that this item be withdrawn from the agenda and tabled until a public discussion is scheduled for next year. The library is an important community asset and the management of it needn't be outsourced.

Gregg Oliver

Board or Commission for Public Comment City Council

Email [jcrone@jamescrone.com](mailto:jcrone@jamescrone.com)

Council Meeting Date 12-17-25

Item # 19

Subject Lot 1 downtown specific plan

Position In Opposition

First and Last Name James Crone

Are you an Escondido Resident? Yes

Comments

Please review the letter I sent to Ivan and the city attorney dated today as my concerns that you are violating our previous settlement as well as taking away valuable parking.

**December 16, 2025**

**City Council Item 19 Dec 17 2025**

**Public Hearing: PL24-0091/PL24-0092/PL24-0093/PL24-0094/PL24-0095/PL25-0324-The Maple-Downtown Specific Plan Amendment, Development Agreement, Planned Development Permit, and Design Review Permit.**

Dear Escondido City Council, City Staff and City Attorney,

I'm addressing this letter to you regarding the above public hearing. This letter is submitted since I cannot personally attend the hearing and want to voice my opinion for the record.

A little background even though you all should be aware of the history of this parking lot to render a ruling on the proposed plans of development. Parking lot number 1 is a key parking lot for the downtown businesses that do not have their own parking lots. You have seen and heard over the past three decades' considerable complaints about the lack of parking in downtown. We finally received some additional parking on Grand with diagonal parking. When Maple St., Plaza was approved and built approximately 25 parking spaces were taken away from on street parking. Lot 1 was previously used by the public as a 2-hour lot. Business had to purchase parking permits from the city to park all day and the permits were limited to ensure that the entire lot was not taken by employees. After much complaints the parking permit process was eliminated and the lot was free all day to anyone. Please refer to the parking studies the city conducted over the years that showed a need for additional parking. Lot 1 was changed slightly after a public review and input, to limit the first row on the alley to less than all day. This proposed development is now asking the town to consider taking away the 118 parking spaces and not replacing them as part of the development and not providing even 1 space of each unit.

**Exemption of CEQA:**

This is not a little infill development or something that should be done without an environmental impact report. It should **not** be exempt from CEQA. This project will have an incredible impact on the businesses on Grand Avenue from a financial loss of business during construction with no allocation as to how to compensate for the losses that will occur by the reduction of available free parking. The reduction of available convenient parking will further be reduced and eliminated. This project should be pulled off the approval for a full EIR. As a developer, I understand the construction process. Having an agreement to shuttle in the workforce and park elsewhere does not work. They work out of their truck and need it nearby for tools and supplies.

**Parking issue:**

There will be a reduction of all of the parking spaces at the completion of the project to the public which is very significant to the businesses relying on that parking. In the late 1980s and early 1990 the city of Escondido required businesses that located in Downtown that had an increased parking requirements above retail CG zoning code of 1 space per every 250 sf of rentable space, to pay a fee to the city of Escondido at \$7,200.00 per parking space needed or provide additional parking on-site or as an option,

rent space in close proximity to that business. Bank of America is a prime example of this when they expanded on 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave and Broadway. B of A needed additional parking so they rented the property on Grand Avenue in a vacant lot west of 232 W. Grand Ave. They have been paying around \$1,500.00 per month since to provide additional parking to meet the zoning code. They have been paying to rent that space for over 25 years. One of our past Planning Commissioners, Tom DE Agosta a past council member and sold to Jack Campbell a past Planning Commissioner, owned a building on Kalmia and Broadway, when developed by the Sadah Brothers, if my memory serves me, paid the city over \$273,000 for parking to develop that property. Other business did the same thing when required. This was in reliance that the city would provide the parking to support the uses in that and other buildings. The city also turned the property the city bought with money for parking into a park on Juniper and Grand. Reducing more parking. There may be legal options to anyone who paid that \$7,200 per space for required public parking and now they see it being sold off and not replace at least 1 for 1.

With the city changing the ordinance or code that would permit any use that would fit into the zoning to be permitted to locate downtown, it became much easier to fill vacancies adding much-needed restaurants, pubs and other viable businesses. Those businesses located in this area knowing the available parking was there for their customers and employees and relied upon it as did those who paid \$7,200.00 per space.

Just after the last two years of construction on Grand and the Downtown, we will see another interruption in business. I have one tenant who just moved out after ten plus years based in part on their loss over that time frame and one tenant that still owes me \$40,000.00 in back rent due to the inability to do proper business. During the 1-2-year construction period for this project, you can guarantee there will be no convenient parking available for the businesses that continue to rely Lot 1 parking for their employees and customers. Construction workers and their vehicles will park in what on-street parking is left since they will be arriving early in the morning before businesses open when parking on the street is not a problem. Streets will be closed during construction at various times for utilities and large material delivery. There will be no available staging area on site and may be loaded or stored in what is now a traffic lane. This will impact traffic significantly.

Walker Study indicated that there are available parking spaces. They included in the report private parking. Private parking is just that and should not be considered. Available parking is not easily accessible to business. Having to drive around to park is not something people like to repeat and losing employee parking makes it hard to employee people that don't want to walk 5 blocks to work and leave their car in an area to be vandalized.

**Tandem Parking:**

This project anticipates tandem spaces. Tandem spaces in a parking developer to build the project. They do not work for residents that have two cars per family. This would require one family member to park in front of the other if they are in the same unit. Try this at home for a month. Uncoordinated, people will be backing out into the drive aisle and parking in that drive aisle while they change the car ahead of them. This will block traffic and could obstruct emergency vehicles. There will also be visitors coming to the project that will take away public parking. I did not see in the notice any visitor parking that was once required by code. I understand the new requirements from Sacramento about reducing parking near a transit station. Nice in a big city possibly, but not here. People will be street parking after work or school and taking what is left on the streets and blocking parking needed for restaurants and business.

**Scale and Massing:**

The project is going to be 65 feet in height which will tower over and shadow the buildings on Grand Avenue. The scale and massing of this project is too large for the surrounding area. The tower for the Arts Center is approximately 75 feet, however, it is surrounded by other larger buildings and therefore does not look completely out of place. This size building should not be located on lot 1 at this height.

**Conclusion:**

I may suggest you discuss this project with the City Attorney to first and foremost determine if this development will violate the Settlement Agreement on my past lawsuit. I will be doing the same with my attorney. In conclusion, I am not opposed to additional residential development in the downtown area, however, I am opposed to any development that significantly impacts other businesses rather than enhance them. This project is no different than the one that was previously proposed by Craig Clark when he was attempting to develop the hotel behind City Hall. That project was never built for good reason and a settlement was arrived at during a lawsuit that I was involved in with not only Craig Clark but jointly with the City of Escondido. That settlement restricted the city employees from parking on Lot 1, which as stated in the Walker Study, is currently in violation and the proposed development is not providing their own adequate parking. This development is not providing any replacement for the spaces they are removing. The new law allowing no parking by a transit platform does not negate the replacement of the public spaces it is taking away to develop a project. When I was developing Signature Pavilion, which is in downtown, I had to meet the parking requirements of the planning department adding over 500 new spaces for a project of less square footage than this apartment project. If I still owned it, it would appear that I can now remove the spaces that were required and build a residential project with also no parking? That's what you're planning. Lot 1 meet the needs of grand retail parking need. That will be gone and an apartment project with less than 1 space per unit will replace it.

May I suggest this developer build his project in the parking lot on the north side of the California Center for the Arts. That parking lot is much bigger and a parking structure could be built above ground that would house the parking required under the zoning code for the city employees and the without squeezing in the tandem parking. There is plenty of land, so additional parking could be built to make it more convenient to the owners. Height is not an issue over there.

As the owner of the property on the corner of Grand and Broadway, the previous owner of many downtown properties and developer of Signature Pavilion, a past DRB Board Member of 14 year, a past CFO and board member of the DBA, a Commercial Real Estate Broker in Escondido for 45 years, and a property manager of commercial property with over 1.5 million SF, I strongly oppose this project at this location. My objections are based on my years of business experiences and the impacts not only to my buildings, but those other owners, tenants and business owners that invested in Downtown who relied upon the city of Escondido to provide the adequate and convenient parking lot to sustain those businesses.

Please consider this decision you are making seriously because the decision that you make at this hearing may have such an adverse effect on Grand Avenue that business will fail financially during the 2-

year construction phase of this project, leaving once again vacant buildings all over downtown. With no future plan for parking, new business will not choose Escondido as their next or new location. You can't possibly plan that the addition of apartments will generate sufficient income on a daily basis to the Downtown replacing the income that customers and employee's parking in Lot #1 generated annually. This project has too many issues to let it slip through without an Environmental review. Please refer this back to a full EIR so conditions can be imposed to provide the necessary development requirements that will not have a negative impact to anyone or as you can act as a representative of the public that voted you into office to represent the citizens of Escondido and the business who rely on sound judgment from you to deny this project entirely.

Sincerely



James Crone

General Partner, Grandway Properties, LP  
CEO James Crone and Associates, Inc

I submit formal opposition to this proposal (The Maple) to allow increased density, height increase, transfer of 50 du from Downtown Density Credit Pool, reduction of open space, use of tandem parking, which often cause parking shortages,

Based on personal observation, the proposed entitlements and overly lenient standards will result in unsatisfactory streetscape, overcrowding in area made less walkable, by introducing massive structures which are incompatible with the dominant 2 story Downtown profile. The proposed Reduction of Open Space is an unacceptable giveaway, which degrades community character, diminishes appearance, and causes adverse impacts on adjacent properties. Downtown Escondido already suffers from excessive parking shortage, and allowance of extra units w/reliance on tandem parking is expected to make conditions far worse because it is often inconvenient to use.

Regardless of superficial review and approval by Planning Commission, I am among other Escondido citizens who want, and urge the City Council to **uphold, retain and apply** the standards from the **approved Downtown Specific Plan** to retain the vision. and compatibility guardrails that make our local Downtown unique, and special. Especially at this landmark entry location. and proximity to City Hall, many think more care and concern is deserved than usual, (not less, by default by considering it as just another automatic approval reflex that won't cause harm) . Just because automatic approvals may have become an unfortunate norm in the past, each action must consider trade-offs more carefully than in the past, because **aggregated mistake patterns do not merit repetition** ,

We've already seen far too many inferior projects approved, and built Downtown with exceptions to allow excessive density by relaxed standards that actually degrade the area, in appearance, and the comfort and safety of pedestrians by setback encroachments, or by massive buildings that are offensive to drivers passing by. **Inferior projects do not deserve automatic approval, or superficial review.**

I am among others, who expect more, deserve more, and want more from elected officials. I am unwilling to apologize for submittal of objective comments, or maybe having bigger aspirations for the future of Escondido than our elected officials have.

I urge you to examine results of prior high density projects already built in Escondido, and recognize when massive buildings adjacent to a dominant 2-story profile actually do cause adverse impacts, understand how certain avoidable mistakes were made, which are permanent, instead of merely theoretical. Although project denials on major projects are rare, it is fully within City Council scope and duty to weigh applicant and consultant PR, and weight of public feedback before taking action. At least it seems maybe a public meeting with the Downtown Committee is necessary to examine the project again carefully, and the Specific Plan. **I urge you to DENY this application. , We don't need, or want to see more mistakes. Please apply your best judgement and discretion.**

Thank you for thoughtful consideration.

Patricia Borchmann

Board or Commission for Public Comment City Council

Email [joannetenney@hotmail.com](mailto:joannetenney@hotmail.com)

Council Meeting Date 12/17/2025

Item # 24

Subject Homelessness Subcommittee

Position In Favor

First and Last Name Joanne Tenney

Are you an Escondido Resident? Yes

Comments

I support the Escondido Neighbors for Solutions letter dated 12/14/2025 and hope the four action items stated in the letter will be included.

## Escondido Neighbors for Solutions

December 14, 2025

Mayor White and City Council Members  
City of Escondido  
Via Email

### **RE: Requests to Improve City's Homelessness Subcommittee and Address Homelessness in Escondido, Agenda item #24, December 17, 2025 meeting**

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers,

Like many Escondido residents, members of Escondido Neighbors for Solutions (ENSOL) are deeply concerned about the well-being, health, and safety of our unhoused neighbors. Many of us have lived in this community for decades, and we are seeing a great increase in needs that require both short-term attention and long-term planning. We believe the City has an important role to play in shaping a coordinated and compassionate response.

One of the key venues for this work is the City's Homelessness Subcommittee which you will act on at the next meeting. According to the information available on the City website, the Subcommittee has met only twice this year, with the most recent meeting taking place six months ago. We also have noted an absence of regular updates during City Council meetings regarding progress or next steps, despite homelessness being identified as a major priority and receiving dedicated Measure I funding.

Despite this funding and priority, the Council has yet to publicly articulate a vision statement describing what "handling homelessness" truly looks like for Escondido. Is the goal to provide sustainable shelter and resources, or is it simply to move people out of sight? This distinction matters because the strategy dictates the outcome, and the public has a right to know how Measure I funds are and can be used and how the City plans to move forward in addressing your unhoused priority.

We are confident that improved communication and opportunities for more community involvement would strengthen this effort. Specifically, we request that the Council commit to the following in your action related to the Homelessness Subcommittee :

- Provide regular public updates through Subcommittee reports at Council meetings so residents can stay informed about current actions and future plans.
- Hold a town hall or similar public forum to share information, discuss challenges in greater depth, and invite community feedback and collaboration.
- Expand the Subcommittee membership to include a representative number of residents, business owners, and rental housing representatives who may offer valuable on-the-ground perspectives.

- Ensure that the Subcommittee develops and adopts an annual work plan which, in addition to the items above, includes a commitment to a meaningful Citizen Participation Program to ensure full and effective use of HUD HOME funds in a manner that results in real, measurable improvements in housing affordability and homelessness outcomes.

As addressing the problem with shelter beds alone is also not a complete fix, we also request the City to explore potential opportunities for additional shelter, service, or transitional space. For example, the City-owned property at Ash and Washington could be evaluated as a possible site for centralized services, a permitted encampment with basic facilities, or future low-income housing. Its proximity to transit and businesses may make it a feasible option while minimizing neighborhood conflict.

Recent experience also demonstrates what happens when the strategy is focused solely on clearance. For example, while the recent vegetation clearance and law-enforcement-led encampment removals may have mitigated fire risk in certain areas, the community cost was significant. The result was to simply displace our vulnerable neighbors onto city streets without clear alternatives available. We share the concerns voiced by residents at the last Council meeting who are now experiencing increased impacts. If this displacement and transfer of the problem is the only current strategy in Escondido, we need to immediately rethink our approach. We believe that with more coordinated planning and transparent communication, the City can take meaningful steps that support both housed and unhoused residents.

Finally, we want to emphasize that we know that homelessness is a complex, community-wide challenge that affects people from all backgrounds, many of whom are only a few setbacks, or even paychecks, away from crisis themselves. Solutions grounded in dignity, compassion, and long-term stability are not only humane; they are broadly supported by Escondido residents who want to see thoughtful progress.

ENSOL was founded in 2024 specifically to encourage constructive community involvement on this issue. At this point, we feel compelled to share with you our significant frustration and concern that the actions of the city have not yielded progress on the results our community needs and deserves, especially when some solutions are available. We believe that a better constituted and transparent Homelessness Subcommittee would help to make progress.

We plan to attend the Council meeting on December 17, 2025, when Subcommittee appointments are made, and we hope our four action items above will be included as part of that decision. For questions or further information, please contact Lisa Richards at [lrichards111@yahoo.com](mailto:lrichards111@yahoo.com).

Thank you for your consideration,

*Lisa Richards  
Bonnie Sealy  
Victoria Nayak  
Suzanne Cook  
Ann McSwain  
Brenda Townsend  
Kathryn Rulon  
Joanne Tenney*

*Michele Schmalvogel  
Laura Hunter  
Kate Barba  
Denise Rolan  
Gregg Oliver  
Ron Forster  
Pam Albergo*