

I. Demand Letter

SHENKMAN & HUGHES

ATTORNEYS

MALIBU, CALIFORNIA

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

kshenkman@shenkmanhughes.com

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

May 28, 2025

Wendy Reicher - Clerk of the Board
Dr. John Nickerson - Superintendent
Acalanes Union High School District
1212 Pleasant Hill Rd
Lafayette, CA 94549

Re: Violation of California Voting Rights Act

I write on behalf of Southwest Voter Registration Education Project and its members residing in the Acalanes Union High School District. The Acalanes Union High School District (“AUHSD” or “District”) relies upon an at-large election system for electing candidates to its governing board. Moreover, voting within the District is racially polarized, resulting in minority vote dilution, and therefore AUHSD’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. In *Pico Neighborhood Association v. City of Santa Monica* (August 24, 2023) 15 Cal.5th 292, the California Supreme Court recently confirmed this commonsense reading of the CVRA. *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.*

AUHSD’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 District’s board elections.

According to the U.S. Census, AUHSD has a population of 119,241, with Latinos comprising approximately 12% of the District’s population. Yet, Latino representation on AUHSD’s governing board has been non-existent. With such a large electorate, campaigning in an at-large election is prohibitively expensive for most potential candidates. The contrast between the significant Latino proportion of the electorate and the complete absence of Latinos elected to the AUHSD Board is outwardly disturbing and fundamentally hostile towards participation from members of this protected class.

In light of the District’s underrepresentation of Latinos, and the daunting task of campaigning to 119,241 people, it is no wonder why Latino residents do not emerge as candidates. Opponents of fair, district-based elections may attempt to attribute the lack of candidates within the protected class to a lack of interest from their respective communities within the District. On the contrary, the virtual absence of Latino candidates reveals vote dilution. *See Westwego Citizens for Better Government v. City of Westwego*, 872 F. 2d 1201, 1208-1209, n. 9 (5th Cir. 1989).

Still, “elections involving ballot measures, or other electoral choices that affect the rights and privileges of members of a protected class” (Elec. Code §14028(b)) reveal racially polarized voting in AUHSD. For example, Latino voters’ preferences within AUHSD on Propositions 187 (1994), 209 (1996), 227 (1998) and 16 (2020) were drowned out by those of non-Hispanic white voters. In each instance, those elections within AUHSD evidence racially polarized voting, which, combined with the District’s at-large election system, results in vote dilution.

Over the past few years, AUHSD has been plagued by racial incidents – from multiple reports of students shouting or texting racial slurs, to the segregation of teachers’ events, to the racially-tinged decision to end interdistrict transfers. While AUHSD’s responses to these incidents has, at times, been commendable, the District also seems to place superficial statements of support for minority groups over meaningful substantive reforms to improve the racial climate of AUHSD for its minority students. For example, while the AUHSD Board adopts statements and policies concerning racial equity, it fails to examine its own electoral structure that prevents Latino students from having co-ethnic role models on their school board.

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 racially polarized voting in elections in AUHSD and resulting vote dilution, we urge the District to voluntarily change its at-large system of electing governing board members. Otherwise, on behalf of residents within the jurisdiction, we will be forced to seek judicial relief. Please advise us no later than July 17, 2025 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 be 'KS' or similar, written over a horizontal line.

Kevin I. Shenkman