Σ	
₹	_
တ	
ĕ	
9	
ä	
CV.	
8	
8	
ā	
õ	
Ø	
ø.	
<u>.</u>	
ö	
ညီ	
Ψ.	
€	
က္	
⋛	
ō	
⇟	
ĕ	
Ш	
_	

#### Superior Court of California County of Los Angeles 05/18/2022 LAW OFFICE OF SCOTT RAFFERTY Scott Rafferty, SBN 224389 rafferty@gmail.com 1 Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court M. Sanchez Deputy 2 1913 Whitecliff Court Walnut Creek, CA 94596 3 202.308.5525 4 Attorney for Plaintiffs Michael Cruz, Sebastian Cazares, 5 and Neighborhood Elections Now 6 GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP Kahn A. Scolnick, SBN 228686 7 kscolnick@gibsondunn.com Daniel R. Adler, SBN 306924 8 dadler@gibsondunn.com 333 South Grand Avenue 9 Los Angeles, CA 90071-3197 213.229.7000 10 Attorneys for Defendant 11 City of Santa Clarita 12 13 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 14 FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES 15 CASE NO. 21STCV47451 MICHAEL CRUZ, SEBASTIAN CAZARES, and NEIGHBORHOOD 16 [PROPOSED] CONSENT DECREE, ELECTIONS NOW, SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT, AND 17 ORDER Plaintiffs, 18 Action Filed: December 29, 2021 v. Trial Date: Not set 19 CITY OF SANTA CLARITA, 20 Defendant. 21 22 23

24

25

26

27

28

Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP

#### [PROPOSED] CONSENT DECREE,

## SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT, AND ORDER

Michael Cruz, Sebastian Cazares, and Neighborhood Elections Now (collectively, "Plaintiffs") sued the City of Santa Clarita, a California general law city and municipal corporation (the "City"), under the California Voting Rights Act. Plaintiffs and the City (the "Parties") wish to resolve their differences through a final and binding consent decree (the "Decree"), which will become effective if and when the Court enters it as an order.

## **BACKGROUND**

- A. The City presently uses an at-large electoral system for the election of its five City Councilmembers.
- B. On December 29, 2021, Plaintiffs filed a complaint against the City in Los Angeles County Superior Court, *Cruz v. City of Santa Clarita*, No. 21STCV47451 (the "Action"). They asserted one claim, for violation of the California Voting Rights Act. According to Plaintiffs, the City's at-large electoral system has reduced Latino voters' ability to influence the outcomes of Santa Clarita City Council elections and to elect Council candidates of their choice.
- C. The City has accepted service of the complaint, but its time to respond has not yet run.
- D. The Parties wish to avoid unnecessary and expensive litigation over Plaintiffs' California Voting Rights Act claim. So they have agreed to fully and finally settle the Action and any and all matters between them arising out of or relating to it, as well as any claims that could have been raised in connection with it or having anything to do with the City's system of elections for its Council, under the terms set forth in this Decree.

#### **JURISDICTION**

The Court has jurisdiction over the Parties and the subject matter of this Action, and venue is proper in this Court. Plaintiffs assert a claim that authorizes the Court to

grant the injunctive relief set forth in this Decree. And this Court will retain jurisdiction over this matter to enforce this Decree.

## TERMS OF THE DECREE

## 1. Plaintiffs' attorneys' fees and litigation expenses.

- a. The City will pay \$300,000.00 to Plaintiffs within 30 calendar days of the Court's entry of this Decree, for the past time and expenses of Plaintiffs' counsel of record, Mr. Scott Rafferty, documentation for which has been has received and is accepted.
- b. The City will also pay \$70,000 to Plaintiffs within 30 days of January 1, 2023, for the time spent (and yet to be spent) and expenses incurred (and yet to be incurred) by Mr. Rafferty in connection with the development of the final district map and the related public-hearing process.
- c. Except as otherwise provided in this Paragraph, each Party shall bear its own costs, expenses, and attorneys' fees arising out of or relating to the Action. The Parties recognize and agree that, should the City follow the terms of this Decree, no steps to enforce its terms will be necessary or give rise to a further request for attorneys' fees or expenses.
- 2. Single-member districts. The City will institute elections for the five City Council seats by single-member districts beginning with the 2024 City Council election. District-based Council elections will be held at least through the regularly scheduled November 2030 election. No later than June 30, 2023, the Council will pass an ordinance or resolution adopting a map with five Council districts.
- 3. Preparing the district map and the sequence of elections. The Parties disagree about whether Elections Code section 10010 applies when a city is adopting district-based elections only after a California Voting Rights Act lawsuit has been filed. Plaintiffs say the answer is no; the City says the answer is yes. The Court need not resolve that dispute because Plaintiffs agree that in this case some version of the public-hearing process called for by section 10010 would be beneficial, and the Court

agrees that the process outlined below will give Santa Clarita residents an adequate and meaningful opportunity to participate in the drawing of a Council districting map, such that it effectively satisfies section 10010. The City therefore may conduct a series of public hearings to promote district-based elections and adjust proposed district boundaries. Before those hearings take place, the Parties will work together in an effort to prepare a map that they will present as the joint product of Plaintiffs and the City at the first public hearing.

- a. Counsel for Plaintiffs and the City will use their best efforts to reach agreement on a proposed joint map no later than November 8, 2022. If, as expected, the Parties are able to agree on a proposed joint map, the Council will present it as a joint initial map at the first public hearing. If the Parties are unable to reach agreement on an initial map, two maps will be proposed at the first public hearing (one from the City and one from Plaintiffs).
- b. The Parties will use their best efforts to reach agreement on necessary changes, if any, to their proposed joint map based on updated official data.
- c. The first hearing will take place after November 8, 2022, and before March 3, 2023. At this hearing, the public will be invited to provide input regarding the composition of the five districts.
- d. Within 30 days of the initial hearing, counsel for the Parties will meet and confer and use their best efforts to reach an agreement on a revised proposed joint map. If they are able to do so, as they expect they will be, the Council will approve and publish a revised proposed joint map in advance of the second public hearing. If the Parties are unable to reach agreement on a revised proposed map, two maps will be proposed at the second public hearing (one from the City and one from Plaintiffs).
- e. At least seven and no more than 30 days after the publication of the revised version(s) of the proposed map, the City will hold a second hearing at which the public will be invited to provide input regarding the content of the

revised version(s) of the proposed map and the proposed sequence of elections. Plaintiffs and Mr. Rafferty will have an opportunity to speak about the revised version(s) of the proposed map at the hearing.

- f. Even if the hearings are held in person, there will be an option for City residents, including Plaintiffs, and Mr. Rafferty to join the hearings virtually. Interpretation will be available in Spanish.
- g. Although the remedial district has not yet been finalized, Plaintiffs expect it will be one in which Latinos have a history of consistent support from minority coalition and cross-over voters. The remedy will be tailored to promote voter participation in Council elections, especially among protected classes, and give Latinos (possibly in coalition with other protected classes) the best opportunity to influence the outcome of City Council elections. All districts will comply with state and federal law, including respect for natural boundaries and the integrity of the communities of interest, as Elections Code section 21601 requires.
- h. If a revised version of the proposed map presented for public comment at the second hearing is further revised during or after that hearing, it will be published and made available to the public at least seven days before being adopted.
- i. In the event that Plaintiffs are dissatisfied with the map that emerges from their discussions with the Council and/or the two public hearings described above, they may file a motion to set aside the map in favor of a proposal of their own. Briefing on the question whether the City should adopt its preferred map or Plaintiffs' preferred map will be limited by design (to keep costs low and to ensure that the Parties' disagreement does not jeopardize the timely adoption of a final district map). Plaintiffs may file a motion and supporting brief of up to 10 pages, the City may file an opposition brief of up

to 10 pages, and Plaintiffs may file a reply brief of up to five pages, exclusive of exhibits. There will be no evidentiary hearing.

- j. The district map will be finalized as soon as is practicable, and it will adopted no later than June 30, 2023, unless the parties are litigating a dispute about the final map under the procedure outlined in Paragraph 3(i). In that event, the Council may not adopt a map until one is approved by this Court.
- k. The City shall establish, and maintain for at least 10 years after the adoption of Council district boundaries, an internet web page dedicated to districting. The web page may be hosted on the City's existing internet website or another internet website maintained by the City. The web page shall include, or link to, all of the following information: (1) a general explanation of the redistricting process for the city in English and applicable languages; (2) the procedures for a member of the public to testify during a public hearing or to submit written testimony directly to the Council in English or Spanish; (3) a calendar of all public hearing and workshop dates; (4) the notice and agenda for each districting-related public hearing; (5) the video recording and transcript or written summary of each districting-related public hearing; (6) each draft map considered by the Council at a public hearing; (7) the adopted final map of Council district boundaries.
- 4. Sequence of elections. The seat representing the remedial district will be up for election in November 2024. Though this district has not yet been finalized, Plaintiffs expect it will be one in which Latinos have a history of consistent support from minority coalition and cross-over voters, such that it will be the district that gives Latinos the most opportunity to influence the outcome of City Council elections.
- 5. Tesoro annexation. The population of Tesoro del Valle will be accounted for in the final districting map if possible. If the contemplated annexation of Tesoro Del Valle does not happen in time for it to be added to the final district map (which will be

adopted no later than June 30, 2023), Tesoro Del Valle will be added to the closest district after it is annexed.

- 6. Vacancies. Vacancies on the Council will be filled according to the Government Code, except insofar as the Council will have the discretion to (1) call for a special election in as few as 60 days (rather than 114), on any Tuesday of the year (rather than the two Tuesdays set aside for elections) and (2) to hold a special election by mail only.
  - a. These modifications of the normal procedures for filling vacancies are warranted to give residents the ability to choose their preferred candidates as soon as possible after the opening of a vacancy, to avoid undue delays in bringing the Council to its full strength, and to save the City the time and resources that would otherwise be spent on a special in-person election.
  - b. Any vacancy created before the regularly scheduled Council election in November 2024 will be filled only until that election, no matter the length of the term won by the Councilmember who vacated the seat.
  - c. In the event of one or more vacancies created before the regularly scheduled Council election in November 2024, the number of Council seats available in each Council election will change. Three seats will be available in presidential-election years, and two will be available in gubernatorialelection years. If there are no vacancies before November 2024, the City will continue to elect two Councilmembers in presidential-election years and three in gubernatorial-election years.
- 7. Number of districts. Under no circumstances will the City or the Council take any action to reduce the number of Council districts, including by making one Council seat a mayoral seat elected at-large. In other words, there will be at least five Council districts. This Paragraph expires on November 6, 2030.
- 8. Litigation standstill. Upon full execution of this Decree and its submission to the Court as a proposed order, all litigation activities relating to the Action,

other than those necessary to effectuate this Decree or to respond to any requests made or orders entered by the Court, will be suspended.

- 9. Dismissal of lawsuit. Plaintiffs will voluntarily dismiss the Action after a district-based Council election is held in November 2030.
- 10. Enforcement. Except in the event that the parties are litigating a dispute about the final district map under Paragraph 3(i), the Council will pass an ordinance or resolution adopting a map with five Council districts no later than June 30, 2023.
  - a. If the Parties litigate a dispute about the final district map under Paragraph 3(i), the City will not adopt a final district map without this Court's approval.
  - b. If the parties are not litigating a dispute about the final district map under Paragraph 3(i) and the City nevertheless does not adopt a map by June 20, 2023, Plaintiffs may immediately file a motion for a preliminary injunction seeking compliance with this Decree. The City will not oppose any such motion, provided it is strictly limited to seeking compliance with the express terms of this Decree.
- 11. Duty to cooperate. The Parties will use their best efforts to effect the purpose of this Decree, which is to bring district-based Council elections to Santa Clarita beginning with the November 2024 election. If the parties encounter any obstacles to achieving this mutual purpose, they will work together in good faith to attempt to overcome them, presenting any disputes to the Court only as a last resort.
- 12. Non-opposition and stipulation to permanent injunction in event of attempted reversion. The City will not, before the November 2030 Council election, propose any ordinance, charter provision, referendum, or other legislative action that would provide for Council elections on any basis other than district-based elections. In the event that any such proposed legislative action is introduced in the Council, deliberated by any charter commission, included in a referendum petition or initiative petition for which signatures have been submitted, or enacted as special or general

legislation by the State of California, the City will not oppose and will stipulate to an injunction against calling, conducting or certifying any election for the Council other than a district election. This Paragraph expires on November 6, 2030. For the avoidance of doubt, this Court will retain jurisdiction over this matter to enforce this Paragraph of the Decree until the Paragraph expires.

- 13. No new lawsuits or legal actions. Plaintiffs, including any current or future subsidiaries, parent organizations, or affiliates under the direction or control of Neighborhood Elections Now, may not file or assist in any way (for example, and without limitation, by soliciting new potential plaintiffs, referring new potential plaintiffs to Plaintiffs' counsel, or providing pleadings, briefs, reports, investigations or any other document or matter prepared in connection with, or anticipation of the Action) any other person or entity to investigate, analyze, prepare for or file, another lawsuit against the Defendants, asserting a violation of the California Voting Rights Act, the federal Voting Rights Act, the Equal Protection Clause, California or federal anti-discrimination statutes, or any other statute or any state or federal constitutional provision addressing or implicating voting rights based on the facts alleged (or that could have been alleged) in the Action. For the avoidance of doubt, this Paragraph does not prohibit legal actions premised on new facts that were not (or that could not have been) alleged in the Action, and this Paragraph expires on November 6, 2030.
- 14. Release of claims. In return for the promises and other consideration provided in this Decree, Plaintiffs, for themselves and their past, present or future heirs, beneficiaries, executors, administrators, officers, employees, directors, agents, attorneys, contributors, successors, and assigns ("Plaintiff Releasors"), do, upon the entry of this Decree by the Court, fully release, acquit, waive and forever discharge the City, including its current, past, and future City Councilmembers, administration, employees, consultants, contractors, agents, attorneys, successors, and assigns ("Defendant Releasees"), from any and all claims, actions, causes of action, factual allegations, demands (including, without limitation, demands for equitable and injunctive relief and

Claims.

based upon the California Voting Rights Act, the federal Voting Rights Act, California Government Code §§ 34870-34906, California Elections Code § 10010, California Elections Code § 14030, the Equal Protection Clause of the California Constitution or United States Constitution, or California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5 ("Released Claims"), which the Plaintiff Releasors have or may have had against the Defendant Releasees based on facts and actions that occurred prior to the execution of this Decree, except for rights to enforce this Decree. For the avoidance of doubt, this Paragraph does not foreclose efforts to enforce this Decree or claims premised on new facts that were not (or that could not have been) alleged in the Action, and this Paragraph expires on November 6, 2030.

15. Express waiver of all claims under California Civil Code section 1542. This Agreement extends to all of the above-described Released Claims and

demands under the California Public Records Act), debts, damages, costs, expenses,

including expert fees, losses, or attorneys' fees of whatever nature, involving or relating

to the City's electoral system, or elections held thereunder, whether or not known,

suspected or claimed, arising out of, based on, or in any way related to (i) the facts alleged

(or facts that could have been alleged) in the complaint filed in the Action, or (ii) claims

Section 1542 provides:

"A GENERAL RELEASE DOES NOT EXTEND TO CLAIMS THAT THE CREDITOR OR RELEASING PARTY DOES NOT KNOW OR SUSPECT TO EXIST IN HIS OR HER FAVOR AT THE TIME OF EXECUTING THE RELEASE AND THAT, IF KNOWN BY HIM OR HER, WOULD HAVE MATERIALLY AFFECTED HIS OR HER SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEBTOR OR RELEASED PARTY."

potential Released Claims, and the Parties expressly waive, for themselves and all other

Releasors, all rights under California Civil Code section 1542 with respect to all such

Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP

Notwithstanding section 1542, the Parties expressly acknowledge that this Agreement is intended to include in its effect, without limitation, all Released Claims described in Paragraph 13, whether known or unknown, whether suspected to exist or not at the time of the execution of this Agreement, which contemplates the extinguishment of all such Claims, except for rights to enforce this Agreement.

- 16. Non-admission of liability. This Decree pertains to a disputed claim under a statute, and is not intended to be, and may not be construed as, an admission by any of the Parties or Releasors of any violation of any statute, law, or constitutional provision, or of any other improper or wrongful conduct, for any reason.
- 17. Admissibility of this Decree. This Decree shall not be admissible in any legal or administrative proceeding, including proceedings between the City and Plaintiffs, except in a judicial or administrative proceeding for breach of this Decree's provisions.
- 18. Integration. This Decree constitutes the final and complete agreement of the Parties and supersedes all prior or contemporaneous negotiations, promises, covenants, agreements, or representations concerning any matters directly, indirectly or collaterally related to the subject matter of the Decree. In entering into this Decree, no Party has relied on any statement, promise, representation or warranty whatsoever that is not expressly set forth in the Decree. In the event of any subsequent litigation, controversy, or dispute concerning any of the Decree's terms, no Party shall be permitted to offer or introduce any oral or extrinsic evidence concerning any other alleged collateral or oral agreement between the Parties.
- 19. Amendment. This Decree cannot be amended, modified, or waived except in a writing signed by all Parties that expressly states an intention to modify this Agreement.
- 20. Governing Law. This Decree and any claim, dispute, or controversy between the Parties arising out of or relating to this Agreement will be governed by the law of the State of California.

- 21. Parties equally responsible for drafting. The Decree may not be construed in favor of or against any particular Party, and it shall be interpreted as if drafted equally by each Party.
- 22. Representation by counsel. The Parties have been represented by counsel in negotiations culminating in this Decree. The Parties all read this Decree, reviewed it with counsel, and fully understand the meaning and effect of each and every provision of this Decree, including the meaning and effect of the releases and the waiver of rights under California Civil Code section 1542.
- 23. Authority. The undersigned represent that have authority to execute this Decree.
- 24. Execution in parts. This Decree may be executed in parts, which will be binding upon the Parties as if all Parties executed the same copy. The Decree may be executed by electronic signatures. Delivery of the Decree bearing an electronic signature or signatures shall have the same force and effect as if the Decree bore an inked original signature or signatures.
- 25. Fees. In the event any action in law or equity is initiated by Plaintiffs to enforce the provisions of this Decree, including Paragraph 1(b), and/or in the event Plaintiffs bring a motion under Paragraph 3(i) above, Plaintiffs will be eligible for attorneys' fees if they prevail.
- 26. Severance. Once the proposed order is entered by the Court, if any part of this Decree is later declared invalid, void, or unenforceable, that portion shall be deemed severed from the Decree, and the remaining parts shall remain in effect. Upon any binding determination that any part of this Decree is invalid, void, or unenforceable, the Parties shall negotiate in good faith to modify the Decree so as to effect their original intent as closely as possible in a legally enforceable manner.

The Parties have executed this Decree on the following dates:

DATED:  $\frac{4}{//}$ , 2022

Michael Cruz

- 1	
1	DATED: April 11, 2022
2	Sebastian Cazares
3	1 de Pallet
4	DATED: April 11, 2022
5	executive director Neighborhood Elections Now
6	Heighborhood Dictions 11011
7	DATED: APRIL 172022 August Vette
8	City of Santa Clarita
9	
10	APPROVED AS TO FORM
11	DATED: April 11, 2022 LAW OFFICES OF SCOTT RAFFERTY
12	DATED: April 11, 2022  By: Scott Rafferty
13	Attorney for Michael Cruz, Sebastian Cazares,
14	Neighborhood Elections Now
15	DATED: April 12, 2022 GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
16	By:
17	Kahn Scolniek  Attorney for the City of Santa Clarita
1	Attorney for the City of Banta Clarita
18 19	iproposed order
20	This Court has reviewed and carefully considered the terms of this proposed
21	consent decree and is persuaded that there is good cause to enter it. Accordingly, it is
22	consent decree and is persuaded that there is good eache to each of the consent decree and is persuaded that there is good eache to each of the consent decree and is persuaded that there is good each of the consent decree and is persuaded that there is good each of the consent decree and is persuaded that there is good each of the consent decree and is persuaded that there is good each of the consent decree and is persuaded that there is good each of the consent decree and is persuaded that there is good each of the consent decree and is persuaded that there is good each of the consent decree and is persuaded that there is good each of the consent decree and is persuaded to the consent decree and the co
	05/18/2022 SO ORDERED as of, 2022.
23	SO ORDERED as of, 2022.
24	THE STATE OF THE S
25	Los Angeles Superior Court
26	
27	Jon R. Takasugi/Judge
28	

13
[PROPOSED] CONSENT DECREE, SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT, AND ORDER

Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP