

RECEIVED JUN 27 REC'D

Alex Behzadi

June 24, 2011

Citizens Redistricting Commission

[REDACTED]  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Greetings! After you published your first set of draft maps, this commission asked California citizens to weigh in and give suggestions on how to finalize the maps and boundaries.

There are few portions of the draft maps that I believe need to be acknowledged.

- First, the proposed boundaries for the congressional district comprising Imperial County include a slice into the southern San Diego area. In my humble opinion, the rural farming areas of Imperial County, which contain no large cities and only contains small towns with populations of less than 50,000 individuals, should not contain a slice into the urban San Diego area. To preserve the community of interest, I believe that Imperial County should be joined with more rural portions of Riverside County and San Diego County.
- Another pressing concern is of the urban and suburban areas of San Diego County. In the current districts, several suburban areas, such as Coronado and Chula Vista, are paired with more urban areas in the center of the city. This is not a sensible idea, since the suburban communities are outnumbered by the more urban constituents, then their interests will not be represented. My suggestion would be to combine most of urban San Diego into one district and join the suburban areas to the two other suburban districts surrounding San Diego.
- The next point concerns the Los Angeles area. In the proposed map, certain affluent portions of Los Angeles, Orange and San Bernardino Counties are paired with middle and lower class areas, solely based on geographic and racial patterns. This is ill-advised namely because economic concerns are more important to keep contiguous than other demographic factors. The affluent populations of northern Los Angeles County should not be paired with the more urban areas such

as Pomona and Glendale. Also, the coastal areas of Rancho Palos Verdes and Long Beach should have their own district, separate of the areas of Torrance and areas north of Long Beach. To summarize, economic similarities should have a higher priority than racial and geographic issues.

- My next issue concerns coastal Los Angeles County and Ventura and Santa Barbara Counties. The economies and demographics of the coastal towns (such as Malibu, Oxnard and Santa Barbara) are completely different than inland towns (such as Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks). The coastal areas are more affluent with tourism as a major industry, while inland areas are more middle class and more industrial. My belief is that the interest of the coastal areas should be separated from the inland areas. My proposal would be to place the coastal areas of Ventura County with western Santa Barbara County and include parts of San Luis Obispo County and/or the coastal areas around Malibu to meet population requirements. The inland areas of Ventura County and eastern Santa Barbara County should be combined with northwestern parts of Los Angeles County and parts of the southwestern areas of Kern County to preserve their economic and demographic similarities.
- Another issue is the southern San Joaquin Valley. This area is one of the most fertile farming regions in the United States. Areas such as northern Kern County, Kings County and western Fresno County depend on agriculture. The economic interest of these areas contrast sharply with the urban and suburban areas around Bakersfield and Fresno. The congressional district comprising of the aforementioned counties has long tendrils snaking into urban Bakersfield and Fresno to combine them with the agricultural areas. I believe this is a major travesty. My proposal would be to place the rural areas in one district and place the urban areas of Fresno and Bakersfield into the district that are comprised mostly of urban and suburban areas to the east and the south. This would unite the communities of interest and allow the farming areas of the San Joaquin Valley not to be overlooked by the urban centers dominating the district.
- Another region of pressing concern is the San Francisco exurbs, namely San Joaquin County. San Joaquin County is composed of one large city, Stockton. The rest of the county is mostly semi-rural areas similar to that of Stanislaus County to the south. The proposed

district map shifts San Joaquin County to urban areas in eastern Contra Costa County. To preserve the community of interest, I believe that San Joaquin County should remain wholly in a district of its own and, if it needs more population, then it should be included in other exurban/rural areas to the north or south. In addition, I am concerned about the Bay Area Counties of Contra Costa, Alameda, and Santa Clara. Each of these counties has major urban centers along the coast of San Francisco Bay and suburban areas further inland. To meet the interests of the residents, I believe that these suburban areas should be in districts separate from the more urbanized areas along the Bay.

- My final issue concerns northern California. The proposed map places several San Francisco and Sacramento exurban areas with rural inland areas to the north. I believe that this would not serve the communities well. It would be better for the residents of northern California to keep the San Francisco exurbs from Solano County to Marin County in its own district while keeping the coastal areas from Sonoma County to Del Norte County in a different district. The rest of northern California, namely the inland areas, could keep its two-district configuration, which would serve the interest of the communities there.

Regards,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Alex Behzadi".

Alex Behzadi

Ending Minority Rule Gerrymanders 1 Feb 2011 E

NONSTOP ANTI-DEMOCRACY minority rule gerrymanders in the U.S.A. since 4 July 1776.

Gerrymanders (based on prior election results) =

(A) The most political enemies possible are PACKED into the fewest gerrymander districts possible = political concentration camps.

(B) The rest of the area is CRACKED into friendly gerrymander districts --- with the friendly party hack candidates trying to get a majority / plurality of the votes in such districts --- at least 55 percent to be in a \*safe seat\* district -- i.e. a \*safe\* 10 percent winning margin [NOT so safe after the 2006-2008-2010 \*wave\* elections ???].

Results --

1. Half [a plurality - near 1/2] of the votes in a bare majority [1/2 plus 1] of the gerrymander districts [political concentration camps] for 1 party control = about 25 percent ANTI-Democracy indirect MINORITY RULE in EVERY State.

$1/2 \times 1/2 = 1/4$  = pre-school STONE AGE minority rule math.

MUCH worse with primary math.

2. UNEQUAL votes for each gerrymander district winner -- i.e. a de facto POWERMAD legislative monarch in each political concentration camp.

3. UNEQUAL total votes in each gerrymander district -- i.e. political concentration camp.

See ALL of the MORON gerrymander math opinions in Vieth v. Jubertier, 541 U.S. 267 (2004) [PA] and L.U.L.A.C. v. Perry, 548 U.S. 399 (2006) [TX] due to MANY, MANY, MANY lawyer and amicus prof MORONS -- unable to detect the above 3 math items in their New Age ignorant MORON brains -- and especially the AREA FIXATION in gerrymanders.

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gerrymandering>

Each gerrymander is an Act of W-A-R against REAL Democracy.

The persons making the gerrymanders are ANTI-Democracy W-A-R criminals.

Result -- the nonstop brain dead ANTI-Democracy gerrymander \*politics\* in ALL State regimes in the U.S.A. since 4 July 1776.

INSIDE a State -- Electors-Voters elect public officers -- NOT census persons -- legal and illegal inhabitants.

SCOTUS totally screwed up the point in the 1964 gerrymander cases.

The census stats are obviously instantly OBSOLETE for electing legislative bodies INSIDE a State -- see the census stats of the 2000 and 2010 populations of the various gerrymander districts - U.S.A., State and local -- all changed - up or down.

The U.S.A. can not and will not survive by having worse and worse ANTI-Democracy gerrymander MONSTERS in the Congress, State legislatures and local govts. -- see the circa \$ 17 TRILLION in current U.S.A./State/local govt debts since 1929 -- with trillions more in UN-funded coming liabilities.

Computerized minority rule gerrymanders 2010 Census

<http://www.caliper.com/mtredist.htm>

[http://www.caliper.com/Redistricting/state\\_edition.htm](http://www.caliper.com/Redistricting/state_edition.htm)

Anything new and different since the 1964-1966, 1972, 1982, 1992 and 2002 minority rule gerrymanders -- except even better and better ANTI-Democracy computerized gerrymander programs to even better and better identify the political prisoners (i.e. Electors-Voters) in each political concentration camp (i.e. gerrymander district) using the 2010 Census stats in 2011-2012 ???

ATTACK the ANTI-Democracy gerrymander systems in the media and the courts.

U.S.A. Const. Art. IV, Sec. 4 [Republican Form of Government -- NO monarchy / oligarchy (minority rule) regimes allowed to control a State directly or indirectly] and 14th Amdt, Sec. 1 [Equal Protection Clause].

REAL Democracy begins at home.

\*\*\*\*\*

Major Democracy Reforms --

1. Proportional Representation in all legislative body elections --

Total Votes / Total Seats = EQUAL votes needed for each Seat Winner -- see below.

A-L-L voters get represented with both majority rule and minority representation = REAL DEMOCRACY.

2. NONPARTISAN nominations and elections of all elected executive officers and all judges.

# GENERAL

## Basic Democracy Election Reforms 14 May 2010

Sec. A. All candidates for the same office in the same area shall have the same nominating petition requirements to get on the [general] election ballots.

Sec. B. (1) The Electors shall elect the members of each legislative body (odd number at least 5) in each year for 1 year terms.

(2) Each legislative body election area shall have between 2 and 5 times the total number of Electors at the last [general] election in all election areas divided by the total members in the body.

(3) As nearly as possible, each election area shall consist of 1 or more local governments or part of 1 local government and be contiguous and square.

Sec. C. (1) Each legislative body candidate shall get a list of all candidates for the body in all election areas at least [7] weeks before the [general] election.

(2) Each candidate shall rank the other candidates in all election areas (using 1 (highest), 2, etc.) and file such list not later than [4] P.M. [6] weeks before the [general] election.

(3) The lists shall be made public immediately at such deadline.

(4) If a valid list is not filed, then the candidate's name shall be removed from the ballots.

[Equal Votes per winner P.R.]

Sec. D. (1) Each Elector may vote for 1 candidate for each legislative body.

(2) The Average shall be the Total Votes for all candidates in all election areas divided by the Total Members to be elected in all election areas, dropping fractions. Ave = TV/TM.

(3) A candidate who gets the Average shall be elected.

(4) The most excess votes above the Average shall be repeatedly moved to 1 or more unelected candidates in all election areas, using the elected candidate's rank order list.

(5) Only the votes needed to get the Average shall be moved to any 1 unelected candidate.

(6) If all members are not elected, then the candidate with the least votes in all election areas shall lose.

(7) The loser's votes shall be moved to 1 or more unelected candidates in all election areas, using the original elected and/or loser candidate rank order list(s) and subject to (5).

(8) Steps (6) and (7) shall repeat until all members are elected.

(9) Example- 100 Votes / 5 Members = 20 Average

A 26 - 6 = 20 Elected

B 20 Elected

C 18 + 2 = 20 Elected

D 16

E 9

F 7 + 4 = 11

G 4

Excess A votes moved.

-----

A 20 Elected

B 20 Elected

C 20 Elected

D 16

F 11 + 4 = 15

E 9

G 4 - 4 = 0 Loses

-----

A 20 Elected

B 20 Elected

C 20 Elected

D 16 + 4 = 20 Elected

F 15 + 5 = 20 Elected

E 9 - 9 = 0 Loses

Sec. E. (1) A legislative body candidate or member may file a written rank order list of persons to fill his/her vacancy, if any.

(2) The qualified person who is highest on the list shall fill the vacancy.

(3) If the preceding does not happen, then the legislative body shall fill the vacancy with a person of the same party (if any) immediately at its next meeting.

[i.e. NO more vacancy special elections.]

Sec. F. (1) All elected executive officers and all judges shall be nominated for and elected at nonpartisan [general] elections.

(2) Each Elector may vote for 1 or more candidates for each elected executive office or judge (including 1 write-in for each position).

(3) The candidate(s) getting the most votes shall be elected (for the longest terms respectively in the case of 2 or more positions with different terms).

[This is the Approval Voting method.]

-----

The above has modified parts of a Model State Constitution -- available on request.

NO caucuses, primaries and conventions are needed.

NO gerrymander commissions are needed.

NO citizens' assemblies are needed [with \*experts\* controlling the amateurs].

NO vetoes -- a part of the EVIL divine right of kings era from the Dark Age.

REAL Democracy NOW via 100 percent Proportional Representation -- before it is too late.



**Subject:** Public Comment: General Comment

**From:** Robert Chandler <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Mon, 27 Jun 2011 18:13:23 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: Robert Chandler <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Shape

Message Body:

I know from my local newspaper that most of your complaints have to do with dividing areas, cities, counties, etc. I realize that this has to happen in order to give the required number of voters per district (congressional, senate, assembly).

My question has more to do with the general shape of the proposed districts. I thought that your mandate had more to do with eliminating the bizarre shapes (Gerrymanders) of districts, rather than attempting to make the districts competitive, or to keep communities intact, because the latter is not going to happen in every instance.

I live in Ventura. When I look at the shapes of my proposed districts, they do not appear to be any less odd-shaped than they did before. Rather than trying to please everyone, why not use a straight-edge and draw the lines where they fall to include the required population?

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission

**Subject:** Public Comment: General Comment

**From:** Dean Andal <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** Mon, 27 Jun 2011 23:05:06 +0000

**To:** [REDACTED]

From: Dean Andal <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Board of Equalization Districts - Ventura Co/San Fernando Valley

Message Body:

The commission did a very fine job with the Board of Equalization districts on your draft map, with one exception:

Moving Ventura County into the LA district and the San Fernando Valley into District 2 clearly violates the large agricultural vs. urban community of interest in the area. Ventura County is heavily agricultural and should be linked with the central valley. The San Fernando Valley should be kept together with the obvious community of interest it has with the City of Los Angeles and their urban issues. This matter could be easily rectified by switching the Ventura County and San Fernando Valley portions which are approximately the same population. Please offer motion and correct this for the 2nd draft map. Please correct this community of interest violation.

Dean Andal

Former Board of Equalization Member District 2.

--

This mail is sent via contact form on Citizens Redistricting Commission