

27 February 2026

Costa Mesa City Council
77 Fair Drive
Costa Mesa, CA 92627



RE: NB2 - 2026 Legislative Update

Dear Mayor Stephens and Members of the City Council,

[Streets For All](#) is a transportation and land use advocacy organization that is engaged in work that promotes sustainable multi-modal transportation solutions, street safety, and smart land use decision making throughout California. We are committed to crafting policies that allow communities to benefit everyone.

We respectfully request the City consider a SUPPORT position on two pieces of common-sense e-bike legislation. **SB 1167** by Senator Blakespear would tighten e-bike definitions, crack down on mislabeling and false advertising, and strengthen safety and disclosure requirements for electric motorcycles and mopeds. **AB 2284** by Assemblymember Dixon would require CHP to publish and maintain a public list of electric bicycles and products that violate state labeling and advertising laws.

These bills address a growing problem facing communities across California, including here in Costa Mesa: the proliferation of high-powered electric motorcycles being marketed and sold as “e-bikes.” These vehicles often exceed lawful speed and power limits and lack proper safety equipment. This creates confusion for consumers, enforcement challenges for local agencies, and safety risks for pedestrians and people riding bicycles.

SB 1167 would help clarify the distinctions between legitimate electric bicycles and higher-powered motor-driven cycles, ensuring that products sold as e-bikes actually meet California’s three-class e-bike framework. Clearer definitions and stronger disclosure requirements will support responsible retailers, protect consumers from misleading marketing, and improve compliance.

AB 2284 complements this effort by increasing transparency and accountability. A publicly available list of noncompliant products would provide cities, schools, retailers, and families with an accessible resource to identify vehicles that do not meet state standards. This is a practical enforcement tool that supports local jurisdictions without imposing new burdens on city staff.

Importantly, these measures do not restrict properly classified e-bikes, which remain a critical part of advancing climate goals, reducing traffic congestion, and expanding mobility options. Instead, they preserve public trust in e-bike policy by ensuring that bad actors do not undermine the benefits of safe and lawful electric bicycles.

Costa Mesa has long demonstrated leadership in active transportation and traffic safety. Supporting these bills would align with the City's commitment to safe streets, responsible innovation, and clear, enforceable standards that protect residents of all ages.

For these reasons, we respectfully request that the City Council adopt a SUPPORT position on SB 1167 and AB 2284 as part of its 2026 legislative platform.

Thank you for your consideration and for your continued work to make Costa Mesa safer and more livable for all. Please feel free to contact us with any questions.

Sincerely,

David Martinez
State Policy Manager
Streets For All

From: [debra.marsteller](#)
To: [CITY CLERK](#)
Subject: Moon Park ideas
Date: Saturday, February 28, 2026 2:26:45 PM

Dear council members,

After attending the Park commission meeting last week, I recognize the upgrade needs in all of our city parks.

Moon Park also needs some more upgrades, including a working water fountain. We have had additional fencing put in as well as a change in the lighting in the last few years, but the equipment is old as is true with a number of Park facilities. My suggestion would be to move the playground equipment over to suburbia 2 park around the corner. There would be no fencing or line of sight issues at suburbia 2 as it is already flat and fully fenced on three sides. Most of the neighbors like Moon Park and after a similar petition to take out the hills and the moon 30 years ago, the park was renamed Moon Park so we wouldn't have to go through this every few years. So maybe add a few more trees, fix the water fountain, move the playground equipment and call it good!

It is a quirky thing to have a giant cement moon in the middle of a park, but it is our quirky park and I like it -as do most of our neighbors

Thank you for your service to the city. We are lucky to have you and appreciate your time.

Debbie Marsteller
3374 California St.
Costa Mesa
714-336-3424

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities to the Information Technology Department.

From: [Jennifer Tanaka](#)
To: [CITY COUNCIL](#); [CityManager](#)
Cc: [CITY CLERK](#)
Subject: Public Comment for March 3, 2026 Meeting
Date: Tuesday, March 3, 2026 10:21:39 AM

Members of the City Council and City Manager Gallardo-Daly:

I wanted to write to you to highlight three matters that came up at the last Parks and Community Services (PACS) Commission meeting.

1. It was reported at the meeting that you received [the parks assessment conducted by DVD Creative](#). I hope that you did, because it indicates that there is a five-alarm fire with respect to our capital spending approach to parks. **Twelve neighborhood parks received a "C" rating, such that they were rated "poor" or "very poor" in at least one element.** And many of these parks received poor marks in multiple elements.

These twelve neighborhood parks represent *more than a third* of the city's total parks. Allowing this many parks to materially degrade suggests a systemic decision to underfund neighborhood park improvement and maintenance *out of the general fund*. Yes, millions of dollars of state/county funds have been concentrated in two small parks (and the skate park), and millions more of outside funds support environmental preservation at Fairview Park. Those are nice achievements. ***But no state or federal funding is coming for ordinary, work-horse neighborhood parks.***

The city's budget reflects its values. Our current funding approach says that we don't value our neighborhood parks and, by extension, the families and residents served by them. I beg you to fix this.

2. I was somewhat perplexed by two procedural matters that came up during the PACS meeting. First, at the end of the meeting, Chair Kelly Brown attempted to make a motion to continue the park assessment item. Director Gruner then chimed in, saying that the park assessment **"was not an actual item, just an informational item, it's a special meeting where there's no action really actually to be taken by the Commission."** Chair Brown responded asking, "So, this has been a study session?" And Director Gruner responded, "Correct." [The exchange can be viewed here](#).

With all due respect to Director Gruner, the PACS Commission meeting was labeled as a special meeting, not a study session, and historically this distinction has had meaning (at least in the City Council context). Additionally, the agenda report had a clear recommendation of an *action* it wished the Commission to take, which was to receive and file. If it were a true study session, there would be no action to take at all. Additionally, labeling the agenda as a "special meeting" and inviting the Commission to "act", even in a limited way, set up the expectation for the public *and for the Chair, clearly*, that motions could be debated and voted on.

I would encourage city staff to be clearer in meeting agendas whether or not action is expected to be taken, in accordance with the Brown Act and the city's own practices.

3. I would also draw your attention to the fact that [the agenda report for the parks assessment](#) contained the curious statement that "there are no alternatives to be considered for this item."

That is almost *never* the case. If the meeting were "merely informational," shouldn't the Commission have been allowed to provide direction regarding next steps or how the assessment might be improved? And if action could be taken, certainly the Commission could have *declined* to receive and file it?

Providing agenda reports with "no alternative" to staff recommendation seems like a bad practice even in the Study Session context. Even where there is no advisable alternative, the City Council (and by extension the PACS Commission) retains authority to debate and discuss alternatives within the scope of the agenda item. The agenda report should affirm, rather than passively deny, that authority.

In this case, neither of these latter two procedural matters make a substantive difference, and I think Director Gruner and his staff produced the agenda report in good faith. Additionally, I am under the impression that transparency, communication and adherence to the spirit of the Brown Act has markedly improved in the last few months. But I would like to continue to see that improvement by making allowable actions by the PACS Commission and other bodies much clearer in the future.

Sincerely,
Jenn Tanaka
321 Broadway

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities to the Information Technology Department.



RESILIENCE ORANGE COUNTY
info@resilienceoc.org

2790 Harbor Blvd. Suite 208, Costa Mesa, CA 92626
www.resilienceoc.org



March 2nd, 2026

Dear Mayor Stephens and Costa Mesa City Council,

Following the City Council's vote on Tuesday, September 9th, 2025, to research the expansion of protections for tenants in the City of Costa, the majority of the council supported directing city staff to research the following:

1. Updating the 2024 Tenant Protection Ordinance to require notice to the City on any evictions
2. Develop a proposal for a Costa Mesa Rental Registry to systematically track all evictions
3. Establish a Network for Renters' Solutions with a focus on improving outreach communication to the renter/landlord population

Combined, these three actions together expand the pool of those **who** could be protected, give staff direction on **how** to apply these protections, and create a network for landlords and tenants to seek resources and information on the latest laws and best practices.

We call on the Mayor and the Costa Mesa City Council to take action and **pass a rental registry** to address data gaps and transparency on evictions occurring in the City. Now is the moment to act! Ongoing ICE raids in the city and greater Orange County are having a negative economic impact not only on immigrant communities but on all businesses.

This is leading to loss of work, which amounts to a loss of income. And in some cases, families are facing a complete loss of income due to family members being detained, at times including a household member who contributes to paying rent. Others, out of safety, no longer work to avoid the anxiety and possibility of being detained out in public.

Fears of losing one's housing has been a real issue here in the City of Costa Mesa for years. Now immigrant families face the additional anxiety and reality of cutting other costs to meet the rising rent. At worst, tenants fear landlords might exploit their immigration status for choosing to exercise their rights as tenants.

And sadly, unlawful evictions continue to exist where landlords either knowingly or unknowingly circumvent existing state and local tenant protections, including the City's Just Cause Residential Tenant Protection Ordinance. We have seen community members fall through the cracks of the City's current tenant protection ordinance, something that could have been prevented with better oversight.

In a City that is made up of over 60% of renters, the city has a duty to be at the forefront and be proactive in addressing these issues. A Rental Registry will support with the **systematic tracking of all evictions** so that residents



RESILIENCE ORANGE COUNTY
info@resilienceoc.org

2790 Harbor Blvd. Suite 208, Costa Mesa, CA 92626
www.resilienceoc.org

Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, YouTube, LinkedIn icons followed by ResilienceOC

of Costa Mesa no longer have to face unlawful evictions. As it is, all of the data the City has collected has been self-reported data. In order to support with the tracking of evictions, the City must implement a Rental Registry.

A strong Rental Registry would provide overall better **data** and **transparency** to the public and City Council, and improve communication channels for both tenants and landlords, allowing the city to better provide updates on resources, policies, and best practices that may impact either.

We call on the Mayor and Costa Mesa City Council to pass a rental registry to systemically track all evictions, including at-fault evictions, and create a Network for Renters' Solutions.

###

Roberto Herrera

Leadership Development Director
Resilience Orange County

Christian Lopez

Tenant Rights Organizer
Resilience Orange County

Costa Mesa Unidos



Changing Hearts And Minds of Youth (CHAMOY)

