



File #: 2018-406, Version: 1

Report to Mayor and City Council

Tuesday, June 05, 2018

Discussion

SUBJECT:

CONSIDER A DISCUSSION RELATED TO A LETTER RECEIVED FROM SHENKMAN AND HUGHES, PC RELATED TO THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT (CITY COUNCIL)

I. SUMMARY

Attached as Exhibit No. 1 is a letter received from attorney Kevin Shenkman dated May 22, 2018. It is attached for the Council's consideration and discussion.

II. RECOMMENDATION

DISCUSS and PROVIDE direction to staff.

III. ALTERNATIVES

IV. BACKGROUND

V. FISCAL IMPACT

VI. EXHIBITS

1. Letter dated May 22, 2018 from Attorney Kevin Shenkman

1.

Prepared by:

SHENKMAN & HUGHES, PC

Attorneys

Malibu, California

28905 Wight Road
Malibu, California 90265

(310) 457-0970

kishenkman@shenkmanhughes.com

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

May 22, 2018

Albert Robles, Mayor
Donesia L. Gause Aldana, City Clerk
Carson City Hall
701 E. Carson Street
Carson, CA 90745

Re: Violation of California Voting Rights Act

I write on behalf of our client, Southwest Voter Registration Education Project and its members. The City of Carson (“City” or “Carson”) relies upon an at-large election system for electing candidates to its City Council. Moreover, voting within Carson is racially polarized, resulting in minority vote dilution, and, therefore, the City’s at-large elections violate the California Voting Rights Act of 2001 (“CVRA”).

The CVRA disfavors the use of so-called “at-large” voting – an election method that permits voters of an entire jurisdiction to elect candidates to each open seat. *See generally Sanchez v. City of Modesto* (2006) 145 Cal.App.4th 660, 667 (“*Sanchez*”). For example, if the U.S. Congress were elected through a nationwide at-large election, rather than through typical single-member districts, each voter could cast up to 435 votes and vote for any candidate in the country, not just the candidates in the voter’s district, and the 435 candidates receiving the most nationwide votes would be elected. At-large elections thus allow a bare majority of voters to control *every* seat, not just the seats in a particular district or a proportional majority of seats.

Voting rights advocates have targeted “at-large” election schemes for decades, because they often result in “vote dilution,” or the impairment of minority groups’ ability to elect their preferred candidates or influence the outcome of elections, which occurs when the electorate votes in a racially polarized manner. *See Thornburg v. Gingles*, 478 U.S. 30, 46 (1986) (“*Gingles*”). The U.S. Supreme Court “has long recognized that multi-member districts and at-large voting schemes may operate to minimize or cancel out the voting strength” of minorities. *Id.* at 47; *see also id.* at 48, fn. 14 (at-large elections may also cause elected officials to “ignore [minority] interests without fear of political

consequences”), citing *Rogers v. Lodge*, 458 U.S. 613, 623 (1982); *White v. Register*, 412 U.S. 755, 769 (1973). “[T]he majority, by virtue of its numerical superiority, will regularly defeat the choices of minority voters.” *Gingles*, at 47. When racially polarized voting occurs, dividing the political unit into single-member districts, or some other appropriate remedy, may facilitate a minority group’s ability to elect its preferred representatives. *Rogers*, at 616.

Section 2 of the federal Voting Rights Act (“FVRA”), 42 U.S.C. § 1973, which Congress enacted in 1965 and amended in 1982, targets, among other things, at-large election schemes. *Gingles* at 37; see also Boyd & Markman, *The 1982 Amendments to the Voting Rights Act: A Legislative History* (1983) 40 Wash. & Lee L. Rev. 1347, 1402. Although enforcement of the FVRA was successful in many states, California was an exception. By enacting the CVRA, “[t]he Legislature intended to expand protections against vote dilution over those provided by the federal Voting Rights Act of 1965.” *Jauregui v. City of Palmdale* (2014) 226 Cal. App. 4th 781, 808. Thus, while the CVRA is similar to the FVRA in several respects, it is also different in several key respects, as the Legislature sought to remedy what it considered “restrictive interpretations given to the federal act.” Assem. Com. on Judiciary, Analysis of Sen. Bill No. 976 (2001-2002 Reg. Sess.) as amended Apr. 9, 2002, p. 2.

The California Legislature dispensed with the requirement in *Gingles* that a minority group demonstrate that it is sufficiently large and geographically compact to constitute a “majority-minority district.” *Sanchez*, at 669. Rather, the CVRA requires only that a plaintiff show the existence of racially polarized voting to establish that an at-large method of election violates the CVRA, not the desirability of any particular remedy. See Cal. Elec. Code § 14028 (“A violation of Section 14027 *is established* if it is shown that racially polarized voting occurs ...”) (emphasis added); also see Assem. Com. on Judiciary, Analysis of Sen. Bill No. 976 (2001–2002 Reg. Sess.) as amended Apr. 9, 2002, p. 3 (“Thus, this bill puts the voting rights horse (the discrimination issue) back where it sensibly belongs in front of the cart (what type of remedy is appropriate once racially polarized voting has been shown).”)

To establish a violation of the CVRA, a plaintiff must generally show that “racially polarized voting occurs in elections for members of the governing body of the political subdivision or in elections incorporating other electoral choices by the voters of the political subdivision.” Elec. Code § 14028(a). The CVRA specifies the elections that are most probative: “elections in which at least one candidate is a member of a protected class or elections involving ballot measures, or other electoral choices that affect the rights and privileges of members of a protected class.” Elec. Code § 14028(a). The CVRA also makes clear that “[e]lections conducted prior to the filing of an action ... are more probative to establish the existence of racially polarized voting than elections conducted after the filing of the action.” *Id.*

Factors other than “racially polarized voting” that are required to make out a claim under the FVRA – under the “totality of the circumstances” test – “are probative, but not necessary factors to establish a violation of” the CVRA. Elec. Code § 14028(e). These “other factors” include “the history of discrimination, the use of electoral devices or other voting practices or procedures that may enhance the dilutive effects of at-large elections, denial of access to those processes determining which groups of candidates will receive financial or other support in a given election, the extent to which members of a protected class bear the effects of past discrimination in areas such as education, employment, and health, which hinder their ability to participate effectively in the political process, and the use of overt or subtle racial appeals in political campaigns.” *Id.*

The City of Carson’s at-large system dilutes the ability of Latinos (a “protected class”) – to elect candidates of their choice or otherwise influence the outcome of the City’s Council elections. According to the 2010 Census, the City of Carson had a population of 91,714, and Latinos comprised approximately 39% of the City’s population. The Latino proportion of Carson has likely increased since 2010. However, Latinos within the City have demonstrated an inability to usually elect their preferred candidates. Furthermore, the City’s elections have been held on varying cycles – in March and November of both even and odd years. These off-cycle elections have exacerbated the dilutive effect of at-large elections in the past, but even in elections held in November of even years Latino candidates preferred by the Latino electorate lose.

The City’s recent election history is illustrative. In 2016, Raul Murga emerged as the sole Latino candidate for Carson City Council during that election cycle but still lost despite significant support from Latino voters. In the City’s June 2015 special election, Jesus-Alex Cainglet lost his effort to secure a seat on the Council despite garnering significant support from the local Latino community. Earlier that same year, during the prior election held in March 2015, both Latino candidates, Margaret Hernandez and Elisa Gonzalez were unable to win their respective campaigns for Carson City Council, though they received significant support from the Latino community. The inability of Latino candidates preferred by the Latino electorate to emerge victorious in Carson’s elections is not just a recent phenomenon -- in 2004 both Joe Martinez and Michael Aguirre lost their respective council campaigns despite significant support from Latino voters.

As you may be aware, in 2012, we sued the City of Palmdale for violating the CVRA. After an eight-day trial, we prevailed. After spending millions of dollars, a district-based remedy was ultimately imposed upon the Palmdale city council, with districts that combine all incumbents into one of the four districts.

Given the historical lack of Latino representation on the Carson City Council in the context of racially polarized elections, we urge the City to voluntarily change its at-large

system of electing City Council members. Otherwise, on behalf of residents within the jurisdiction, we will be forced to seek judicial relief. Please advise us no later than July 18, 2018 as to whether you would like to discuss a voluntary change to your current at-large system.

We look forward to your response.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'K. Shenkman', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Kevin I. Shenkman