

From: **Darlene Matthews** [REDACTED]
Date: Mon, Apr 25, 2011 at 11:31 AM
Subject: Public Comment: [your-subject]
To: votersfirstact@crc.ca.gov

From: Darlene Matthews [REDACTED]
Subject: Region 3

Message Body:
Hello,

RE: Region 3

Please use this opportunity to end the practice of having districts that stretch from the shore to far inland. In Orange County the shoreline to approximately 405/5 could be broken up in to 2 districts if population requirements allow that.

The agendas and needs of people and land on the shore in vs big/med cites vs suburbs vs inlanders often cover far different subjects.

Politicians desires aside, IMHO, it's best to consider groupings of areas of people/land/ activities with similar needs to maximize their local voice and the effects their representation.

Examples: Newport Beach C-48 has a lot more issues/needs in common with San Clemente, San Juan Capistrano and Dana Point than it does with Irvine or Tustin or Santa Ana. The crazy CA44 means having to represent the vastly different needs of San Clemente to Riverside and rural makes it hard to focus on all the needs of too many very different areas. However adding the Nuclear facilities and some input to and from Camp Pendelton to Orange County 48 from CA 49/44 that does have many Veterans and is effected by the Nuclear Plant(50 mile radius for emergency planning and consideration of local power generation needs) would benefit all.

It would also seem that for Orange County a district with UCI, and most of the local JCC's together would be most beneficial. Maybe give CA 44 more of Riverside and give to CA 48 some of 44's and some of 49's beach areas and move CA47 to cover Irvine and Santa Ana larger city business needs and UCI, Santa Ana College, Orange Coast College Saddleback College, Irvine Valley College. It seems it would also make more sense to give the islands to CA48 or the area of Long Beach that has that ferry, whoever interacts more. I could then see Garden Grove, Stanton and Anaheim being represented well together under CA40, and lopping off the s/w leg of CA42 to go to CA40/47.

On the state level putting Santa Ana with Irvine and Costa mesa would be more compatible, and Anaheim with Garden Grove, Westminster and that area, and having the coast / park areas together where possible would make them more compatible.

Another, simplified, less political way to reshape state and federal districts might be to do the coastal cities together and then start with the most populated cities and do squares around them.

I wish I could attend and be a part of the public hearings, but I'm said to be too disabled to work and the poverty level SSI does not stretch to allow us poor folk to participate in much, especially with the rise in gas and food prices. I would appreciate a return comment if that can be done. It would be nice to have a call in mechanism for disabled individuals (and not just supply access to paid reps who mostly focus on a couple special groups) so more of us individuals are able to be heard in the future.

Thank you for your time and consideration and all your hard work. I hope the results end up best for representing all the people more equally and resolving issues, with political needs considered as a distant last. I wish you all much good luck with managing that.

Sincerely,
Darlene C Matthews
Newport Beach, CA