

SHENKMAN & HUGHES

ATTORNEYS

MALIBU, CALIFORNIA

28905 Wight Road
Malibu, California 90265
(310) 457-0970

kshenkman@shenkmanhughes.com

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

November 10, 2017

Esther Beime, City Clerk
City of San Rafael
1400 Fifth Ave., Rm. 209
San Rafael, CA 94901

Re: Violation of California Voting Rights Act

I write on behalf of our client, Southwest Voter Registration Education Project. The City of San Rafael (“San Rafael”) relies upon an at-large election system for electing candidates to its City Council. Moreover, voting within San Rafael is racially polarized, resulting in minority vote dilution, and therefore San Rafael’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.*

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

The entire election history of San Rafael over several decades is illustrative: not a single Latino candidate competed in any of the council contests. Opponents of fair, district-based elections may attribute the lack of Latinos vying for City Council positions to a lack of Latino interest in local government. On the contrary, the alarming absence of Latino candidates seeking election to the San Rafael City Council reveals vote dilution. *See Westwego Citizens for Better Government v. City of Westwego*, 872 F. 2d 1201, 1208-1209, n. 9 (5th Cir. 1989).

According to recent data, Latinos comprise approximately 30% of the population of San Rafael. However, there are currently no Latino representatives on the San Rafael City Council. This lack of Latino representation is perpetuated by the City of San Rafael -- it appears that only *one* of the City’s 82 appointed officials is Latino, and city council candidates often get their start in municipal government through such appointed positions. Not only is the contrast between the significant Latino proportion of the electorate and the total absence of Latinos to be elected to the City Council outwardly disturbing, it is also fundamentally hostile towards Latino participation.

The overwhelming majority of San Rafael's Latinos reside in the Canal Area, which is located in the central part of the city. As of 2013, a substantial 80% of residents in the Canal Area were Latino. Housing in the Canal Area has not increased, nor has it become any less expensive than other areas in San Rafael; however, in the Canal Area, overcrowding goes largely ignored and unregulated, and so low-income, Latino families are all but forced to live there. The Canal Area has been largely neglected and, as a result, is ranked the lowest in community well-being in Marin County (*Marin County Human Development Report 2012*). The City Council is simply not reflective of the people of the Canal Area, the majority of whom work low-income, service-industry jobs in order to support their families and afford overcrowded homes in the poorest part of San Rafael.¹ Canal Area residents and the Latino community that largely resides there would greatly benefit from a district-based election, which would allow them to elect candidates that understand the issues facing their neighborhood.

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 San Rafael 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 December 31, 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

¹ Councilman Andrew McCullough apparently resides in East San Rafael, the eastern portion of the Canal Area; however, East San Rafael comprises the small, *affluent* portion of the Canal Area, which is culturally and socially different from the rest of the Canal Area.