



28905 Wight Road
Malibu, California 90265
(310) 457-0970
kshenkman@shenkmanhughes.com

RECEIVED

JUL 17 2017

**CITY OF SANTA ROSA
CITY CLERK'S OFFICE**

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

July 14, 2017

Daisy Gomez
City Clerk
City of Santa Rosa
100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 10
Santa Rosa, CA 95404

Re: Violation of California Voting Rights Act

I am writing on behalf of Southwest Voter Registration Education Project. The City of Santa Rosa ("Santa Rosa") relies upon an at-large election system for electing candidates to its City Council. Moreover, voting within Santa Rosa is racially polarized, resulting in minority vote dilution. Therefore, Santa Rosa'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

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.*

Santa Rosa’s at-large system dilutes the ability of Latinos (a “protected class”) – to elect candidates of their choice or otherwise influence the outcome of Santa Rosa’s council elections.

The council’s recent election history is illustrative. Caroline Bañuelos, a Latino candidate running in both 2004 and 2006, explicitly advocated for Latinos and other marginalized peoples; however, she was unable to garner enough votes in either year to attain a City Council seat. Juan Hernandez, Latino president of the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce and the bilingual public radio show, *KBBF*, lost the 2010 City Council Election. Latino constituents preferred both Ms. Bañuelos and Mr. Hernandez to non-Latino representatives, but were unable to successfully counteract the power of the non-Latino majority voting as a bloc.

In 2012, Santa Rosa’s Charter Review Committee proposed Measure Q to the City Council. Measure Q, if passed, would require that Santa Rosa switch from its current at-large voting scheme to a district-based scheme, which would—among other positive effects—allow for more geographically and demographically representative candidates to attain office. However, despite strong support from the Latino community, the electorate turned down the measure due to the propagation of unfounded criticism against district-based elections (spread by both

the local media and certain government representatives). Under the current at-large voting scheme, minority candidates are not given an adequate chance to represent the underserved Latino minority at the governmental level.

According to recent data, Latinos comprise approximately 28.6% of the population of Santa Rosa. Historically, the majority of City Council members have come from the Northeast quadrant of Santa Rosa, while citizens of Latino descent quantitatively dominate the western regions, with an 87% Latino population in the Apple Valley Lane/Papago Court region. If the City of Santa Rosa were to establish district lines around the aforementioned region and others like it, Latino constituents would have better and fairer access to the City Council. Under the current at-large voting scheme, however, Ernesto Olivares remains the only Latino candidate ever to earn a seat on the Santa Rosa City Council.

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 city council in the context of racially polarized elections, we urge Santa Rosa to voluntarily change its at-large system of electing 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 29, 2017 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,



Kevin I. Shenkman