

Los Angeles County Chicano Employees Association

MARCH 2008



A Message From our President

By Lorenzo Sandoval, President

Welcome Brothers and Sisters,

First and foremost, I would like to thank you for being a member of our organization: for without you we would not exist. I am proud to say that the Los Angeles County Chicano Employees Association (LACCEA) is back on track and have made many strides in various departments. As promised we have begun an aggressive campaign to right many of the injustices done to our members. We will not stop until we have a level playing field in all departments in all areas of employment. As an organization, we are only as strong as our membership; that is why I encourage you to get involved.

For the last 39 years, LACCEA has been the leader fighting for employees rights with a strong success rate. We have a well known reputation as being aggressive as well as being effective in fighting for you, our members. We have held many meetings with department heads and have filed large federal administrative complaints to ensure that our members are treated fairly when it comes to hiring, promoting, and in receiving bilingual compensation. Many of you today working for the county have benefited from our actions. But the fight is long from over, in a county as big as Los Angeles, not one department in the County work force, mirrors the people it serves.

The struggle continues and that is why we encourage you to get involved. If you are a current or past county employee, we ask that you please get involved by contacting our office to assist in setting up a recruitment drive or help pass out our literature. Give a call to our friendly staff and they will set up everything and provide you with what ever you need. Or simply invite us to your work location and we will have a Board of Director come and talk to your staff or co-workers. Remember this is your organization and we are here to serve you and the community.

As a leader in the Chicano community we often fight for causes that affect the communities our members serve. Currently, we have cases pending before the Voting Rights Section of the U.S. Department of Justice and the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. We advocate for issues in Sacramento and Washington D.C. We are often told by elected officials that we are one of the last Chicano organizations still strongly advocating for the rights of our members in Los Angeles County. We are proud to announce that we have continued the struggle for the justice our members and the Latino community deserve.



Victor Manrique
Attorney at Law

Re-print: Fall 2003

Know Your Rights

By Victor Manrique, Attorney at Law

This is the first in a series of articles by LACCEA's new counsel on representation questions and members are encouraged to write Victor Manrique on questions of general interest. This column is a general overview not a substitute for legal advice and the result in any particular case depends upon its specific facts. You should consult counsel if you believe you have a case and the passage of time can bar a claim. The general rule to avoid discipline is to obey an order and grieve it later, unless the order places you in danger or calls for an illegal act.

What is the structure of Los Angeles County offices that cover representational issues and what do they do?

The three main county offices are: the Employee Relations Commission (ERCOM), the Civil Service Commission, and the Department of Human Resources, Appeals Unit.

ERCOM has three main functions. ERCOM processes arbitration requests by labor unions for labor contract violations and for disciplinary cases of 5 day suspensions or less. ERCOM also handles unfair labor practice charges based on anti-union, or anti-organizational activity retaliation. ERCOM further handles

Continued on page 3

Directory

- A Message From our President.....Pg 1
- Know Your RightsPg 1-2
- Promotional Rights and PitfallsPg 2-4
- We Are On Your Side!.....Pg 4
- Access to Promotional Records.....Pg 5
- Relationship Between LACCEA & Union.....Pg 5-6
- LACCEA Takes on the CountyPg 7
- Letter to EEOC Regional Director.....Pg 8-9
- Letter to Chief Probation OfficerPg 10
- Letter to U.S. Attorney General.....Pg 11

representational cases for unorganized county workers attempting to obtain union recognition by becoming part of existing labor unions or forming new labor unions. The source of ERCOM's authority starts with California Government Code Section 3500 etc. which permits counties to create ERCOM. The county ERCOM ordinance and its Rules and Regulation as well describe its role and functioning. For those of you familiar with the private sector, you will recognize that county ERCOM is similar to the federal National Labor Relations Board that covers private industry.

The Civil Service Commission handles disciplinary appeals of 5 day suspensions or greater, including discharges, disciplinary reductions and non-disciplinary medical releases. The Commission also has secondary jurisdiction to review non-promotion, examination and appraisal of promotability scoring claims after rulings by the Department of Human Resources Appeals Unit. The Civil Service Commission was established by Section 34 of the county charter and is governed by Civil Service Rules last negotiated with unions and approved by the Board of Supervisors in 1985 found as Appendix 1 to Title 5 of the County Code. The Commission also has procedural rules as well.

The Civil Service Rules refer to a "director of personnel" but this is not your departmental personnel office, rather it is the overall county Department of Human Resources. The Appeals Unit of the Department of Human Resources now carries the functions described in the Civil Service Rules of reviewing appeals on non-promotion claims, examination scoring, probationary reductions or releases, and has secondary review from departmental decisions on reclassification requests.

You file a grievance and take grievances to arbitration as well as unfair labor practices through ERCOM, and you file appeals either to the Civil Service Commission or the Appeals Unit of the Department of Human Resources.

You may not file both an ERCOM case and a Civil Service appeal at the same time on substantially the same facts, you must choose the proper forum. You may file both an arbitration and an unfair labor practice before ERCOM on the same matter, and ERCOM will defer the unfair to the arbitration and reactivate the unfair only if the arbitration is repugnant to the purposes of the ordinance.

Can LACCEA represent in all forums?

LACCEA is a voluntary county employee association open to all and it is a recognized employee organization by ERCOM. LACCEA policy is that LACCEA can represent you if you are a member for more than 90 days when the problem or claim arose either before the Civil Service Commission and before the Appeals Unit of the Department of Human Resources.

However, LACCEA's role before ERCOM is limited to unfair labor practice charges, not arbitrations. LACCEA does not bargain the labor contracts, called Memoranda of Understanding, between the county and the unions. Since the unions, such as SEIU Locals 660, 535, and 434B, AFSCME Local 685, and the County Coalition of Unions bargain the contracts as exclusive bargaining representatives for their respective units approved by ERCOM, it is the unions that control the right to arbitrate grievances under their respective MOUs. LACCEA cannot take over representation of grievances to process them to arbitration, you must go through your union to get to arbitration. LACCEA may represent on a grievance arising under a union MOU, but LACCEA is limited

to the three-step grievance process after which LACCEA representation ends. The unions may pursue binding arbitration before a third party neutral after the three-step grievance process is exhausted as provided in the MOUs. Arbitration is expensive and the unions are not required to take every grievance to arbitration, but the option is a very important consideration.

For non-represented employees, that is employees not covered by a union memorandum of understanding, you have no arbitration rights. Non-represented employees have access to the Civil Service Commission and the Appeals Unit of the Department of Human Resources, limited access to ERCOM under an unfair labor practice, and no access to ERCOM under union arbitration provisions.

LACCEA policy as established by the Board of Directors is that members must choose their representative at the beginning of the grievance or appeal process and may not switch back and forth between organizations at different steps of the process.

What other County offices help employees?

The Office of Affirmative Action Compliance maintains statistics on the composition of the county workforce and both receives complaints from employees on discrimination by departments and assists departments to defend against discrimination complaints by employees. The OAAC has no authority to order departments to remedy discrimination, it may only set up non-binding mediation. A discrimination appeal may be made before the Civil Service Commission or under the non-discrimination provision of most union contracts, and where the discrimination is based on union activity, before ERCOM as an unfair labor practice.

The Long Term Disability office of the Department of Human Resources provides information on this important protection. The LTD plan is described in County Code Section 5.28.440 etc. and is administered for the county by the Voluntary Plan Administrators.

The Americans with Disability Act office of the Department of Human Resources assists employees with information ADA protections and can recommend accommodations to departments.

Disability retirement is not administered by the county but by the separate Los Angeles County Employee Retirement Association (LACERA). For employees in contributory plans, except Plan E, you may have early retirement rights based upon service or non-service connected disability.

The next article will cover examination and promotion rules.

Re-print: February 2004

Los Angeles County Promotional Rights and Pitfalls

By Victor Manrique, Attorney at Law

This article addresses competitive promotional rules for permanent employees inside the county system found mainly in Civil Service Rules 7, 10, 11, which are online at the county website. You have only 10 business days to

file an appeal challenging an examination score, the Appraisal of Promotability score or a promotion you believe you should have obtained, and such challenges must be filed with the Appeals Unit of the Department of Human Resources. The strength of a case will always depend on the particular facts and if you believe you have a case, call LACCEA immediately.

Promotion Rules, Rights and Pitfalls:

There is no county right to promotion, only a right to fairly compete in a process that is supposed to be “fair and impartial” and where “it is county policy that vacancies will generally be filled from within,” Rules 1.02 and 7.06. An employee may only be permanently appointed from an eligibility list, Rule 11, and that list is created by the Department of Human Resources, Rule 10. There are three types of exams: open and competitive exams are open to county employees and those outside the county; county-wide exams are open to all county employees; and departmental promotional exams are limited to employees of the department. The examination job bulletin identifies the type of exam, sets out minimum qualifications, and describes how employees will be scored, but beware of Rule 7.03(A) which states:

“A written notice of each examination shall be posted prior to the opening of the filing period of the examination on the official county recruitment bulletin board in the department of personnel. For promotional examinations, a written notice of each examination shall be posted for at least 10 days prior to the examinations.”

This sounds like a 10-day posting rule, but watch these manipulations. First, the “department of personnel” is the county-wide Department of Human Resources, not your departmental personnel office. The rule requires posting only in DHR, but if you are looking at your office’s bulletin board or the management secretary’s clipboard, you may never see the official notice and cannot timely apply. Solution: find out where the official posting location is and monitor that location, better yet, negotiate a union contract that adds “official” posting locations to assure fair distribution. Secondly, DHR routinely issues job bulletins which are posted one day and the filing window opens the very next day and may close that day or a few days later. DHR reads Rule 7.03 to require the 10 days notice only for the examination interview or rating, and does not give 10 days from the date of posting to the opening of the filing window or period to receive applications. Instead of reading “examination” as an examination process of which the filing window is the beginning of the examination, DHR subverts the spirit of the rule to invite manipulations where favorites may be given secret notice of the opening and closing of a short filing window under 10 days. This does not always happen, but it happens with enough frequency to see that those with inside information have an unfair advantage. This can occur not only on an individual basis but where temporary or contract employees are converted into permanent county employees and given special orientation on the process while long-term permanents are left in the dark.

Rule 7.13 describes how an exam score is usually based 50% on an Appraisal of Promotability and 50% either from a rating of records, or on a written or verbal test. Rule 20.02(A) states:

“Ratings of efficiency of performance shall be made for permanent employees at least once each year, and for probationers by the end of the probationary period.”

Management often fails to issue yearly PE’s. The principal way to challenge a low AP score is to show that it is inconsistent with the last three years of Performance Evaluations. Without PE’s, it is hard to challenge a low AP. Any employee covered by a union memorandum of understanding or union contract should file a grievance on management’s failure to issue timely PE’s, including group grievances if groups are affected by this negligent practice. Non-represented classifications can use departmental grievance procedures which mirror the union procedures.

Challenging an AP requires an appeal to DHR Appeals Unit within 10 business days, but consider these hurdles. Rule 7.02 requires that any exam score or AP protest “shall give specific facts and reasons to support the protest” However, in recent years, department’s and DHR claim AP’s are confidential documents and employees can look at, but may not obtain a copy of their AP, which means an employee must “give specific facts and reasons” in an appeal from memory of viewing the AP. In 2001, the Civil Service Commission was repeatedly asked to rule that employees have a right upon request to receive their AP’s, but the Commission refused, instead coaxing DHR to invent an awkward policy where DHR will provide a copy of the AP only after the employee files an appeal, and will not by its policy release rating standards to decipher the AP scores. This 2001 DHR policy contradicts written guidelines issued in 1991 by the Technical Services Branch of the same DHR which stated that an employee was entitled to a copy of the AP and the rating standards to understand it upon request, which makes sense given the specificity requirement for filing an appeal under Rule 7.02. The Civil Service Rules regarding AP’s have not changed, only a growing attitude of secrecy to shroud promotions in mystery and minimize challenge to managerial decisions. You have 10 business days to inspect your examination materials and that extends to the notes of an applicant’s oral interviews, Rule 7.19, and the same time to file an appeal, so you must act fast. Use the PE categories to match-up with AP categories to point out inconsistencies for an AP appeal.

Rule 10 describes how applicants to a promotional exam are grouped into five groups or bands based upon the exam score, and anyone in the top group is equally reachable. Rule 11 requires that the person selected for promotion must be from the top group where there are over five available in the top group. There are two exceptions: Rule 11(E) permits a promotion from a lower band if there are 5 or less in the top band (Rule of 5); and Rule 11.03 permits a select-certification for an ability not tested on to promote someone from a lower band even if there are more than five in higher bands for exams.

Again, watch these manipulations. If employees in the top group decline a particular location for the promotion or are otherwise discouraged from accepting, they are deemed “unavailable” and excluded from the Rule of 5 count, so management can reach into the next lower band passing over others in the top group. Also, select certifications can be abused to justify reaching into any low band to pluck a favorite for promotion. However, the rule is clear that the special skill must be “some particular job-related criterion not tested in the examination” yet not only is this restriction improperly ignored, but the prohibition of using select certification in a departmental promotional examination per Rule 11.03(B) may also violate your rights.

As if this management flexibility in the Rules were not difficult enough to overcome, the creeping secrecy extends to fundamental information necessary for you to evaluate whether proper grouping and appointments occurred. Many employees are told that examination lists are confidential and cannot be viewed where the DHR representative confuses a certification list containing confidential data with an eligibility list. Rule 10.04 states:

“All eligible lists shall be open to public inspection except when the director of personnel judges that disclosure of names of candidates for high-level management positions would jeopardize their current employment.”

Eligible lists are not confidential. You have the same right as a member of the public to access eligible lists and you must do so to analyze potential violations of your rights. DHR improperly imposes another level of secrecy when it allows an employee to inspect the list, but refuses to give the employee a copy. DHR acts as if the public records act of the county does not exist and imposes a secrecy rule completely at odds with the law. Every member of the public has a right to obtain public documents from the county after paying the required fee per County Code Section 2.170.010, and the eligible lists are specifically made public by Rule 10.04, the only exception being to protect current employment of those seeking high-level management positions. DHR permits an employee to “inspect” eligible lists and absurdly requires you to memorize or write down countless names in groups to simply understand what happened. Use Rule 10.04 and County Code Section 2.170.010 requests to get copies of eligibility lists.

Eligible lists are supposed to expire after one year or where another exam for the same item is run, Rules 10.06 and 10.07. Problems occur where the department extends the life of lists denying newer potential applicants a chance to compete. Another problem occurs where an expired list is re-activated only to appoint someone and then allowed to expire, and then re-activated, etc. If you discover any practice you find unfair, discuss it with your representative.

Obtain These Documents To Investigate Your Case:

1. The examination bulletin.
2. Your application including your last three years of Performance Evaluations.
3. Your Appraisal of Promotability document and rating standards.
4. Your overall examination score.
5. The eligibility list.
6. If another has been promoted, check eligibility group placement, analyze the Rule of 5 grouping, inquire if a select certification occurred and upon what job related criteria not tested during the exam was it made.
7. If a discrimination claim under Rule 25 exists, document facts as detailed as possible with witnesses and documents. (This subject will be discussed in future articles.)

Appeals Procedure:

LACCEA can assist you in filing the initial appeal with the DHR Appeals Unit. The Appeals Unit does not have a hearing procedure and will issue a decision based on the written appeal. If there is no DHR response within 60 days of filing or if the appeal is denied, the matter may be moved to the Civil Service Commission. However, the Civil Service Commission generally only has

limited jurisdiction under Rules 7.20, 4 and 25 where DHR has denied the appeal and there are facts showing that discrimination based upon race, age, sex, medical condition, disability, religion, nationality, organization affiliation, marital status or other non-merit factor exists. There is generally no review by the Commission if an appeal and DHR denial is based upon an unfairness claim. This process is particularly frustrating where unfair scoring is the only claim, and the DHR Appeals Unit simply repeats what departmental management has told them instead of conducting a truly independent investigation of the claims. For your information, most union contracts do not reach promotional rights and unions cannot usually arbitrate a non-promotion claim, although there are often contractual limits on the extent of out-of-class or temporary assignments. Finally, be advised the Commission ruled in a 2002 case that it had no jurisdiction over acting appointments even if permanent promotion rights of permanent employees were harmed, such a claim must be taken to court. Where the Commission grants hearing, its process takes about 9 months and the appeal does not stop appointments of others. The remedy sought in promotion cases is the immediate appointment with retroactive differential back pay and the Commission has broad discretion to fashion a remedy.

Do not be discouraged by promotion hurdles, you must continue to compete in the promotion examinations, stay flexible, appeal when you have to and look for mentors to help your career moves.



We Are On Your Side!

*By Mary Anne Saucedo,
General Manager*

Every year, hundreds of cases go before the County's Civil Service Commission. Some involve discrimination. Many involve an employee appealing a suspension, demotion, or discharge.

What if your job becomes at risk? Every department in the county has a personnel office with advocates and lawyers on the department's side. What's at stake? Your job.

Who's on your side? We are! We provide effective representation in areas involving County policy, promotions, discipline and administrative proceedings.

In order to keep up our efforts, we need your support. With your continued recruiting efforts, we will be able to continue to offer you the finest and best representation and advocacy for the equality of all its members. As an added benefit to signing up a new member and keeping LACCEA strong, LACCEA will **pay you \$10.00** for each new member that you recruit. If you set up a recruitment drive you will receive \$10.00 for each new member that signs up on that day. (Example \$10.00 x 10 new members = **\$100.00 for you**.) To have a representative from LACCEA visit you and set up a recruitment drive, please call me at (626) 458-2314.

LACCEA is here for you!

Mary Anne Saucedo, General Manager

Re-print: June 2006

LACCEA Triggers Access To Promotional Records

By Victor Manrique, Attorney at Law

Around February 2005, members of the Board of Directors of LACCEA met with Michael Henry, the Director of the countywide Department of Human Resources, (“DHR”), and presented a brief arguing a series of demands to respect employee rights and reduce the secrecy around county promotions that causes so much demoralization in the workforce. LACCEA specifically requested the following:

- (1) An employee should be given copies of her/his Appraisal of Promotability documents immediately upon request by the employee without the 10-day waiting period imposed in recent years so that the employee can evaluate whether to challenge a score and file a timely appeal which must be done within 10 days of receipt of score;
- (2) Employees should be given copies of the rating scale and rating standards upon request so that the employee can understand how the AP is scored;
- (3) Employees should be given copies of eligible lists upon request so that employees can check whether promotions are following the banding rules. Civil Service Rules require the promotion to be made from the highest band unless there are less than 5 available candidates in the bands above, or unless there is a select certification for certain type of exams; and
- (4) DHR should respect the 10-day posting period prior to the opening of an examination to eliminate secret exams where only a select few are given notice before the application window is shut.

On June 10, 2005, the DHR notified LACCEA that it approved the first three points but did not respond on the fourth point. However, the DHR advised that it had to consult with other county labor unions before concluding a new policy. Curiously, DHR never consulted with the unions when these same rights were quietly removed from employees around 2000.

Consultations with other labor organizations such as Local 660, SEIU, and the County Coalition of Unions, occurred from the fall of 2005 through July 17, 2006. On July 17, 2006, DHR issued a new set of policies on APs and eligible lists that provide for the following:

- (1) Copies of the Appraisal of Promotability will be provided to an employee immediately upon the request of the employee without any waiting period;
- (2) Copies of the rating scale and rating standards will also be provided to an employee upon the request of the employee;
- (3) Copies of eligible lists will be provided to an employees at anytime under the Public Records Act County Code Section 5.170.010, but if the request is made under the new DHR policy, then copies of eligible lists will be made available to employees six (6) months after the employee is placed on the eligible list.

DHR’s implementation of the new policy is likely to be very weak without our active assistance and you can help. In a friendly, professional manner, ask your departmental human resource and exam unit representatives if they are familiar with the new DHR policy on APs and Eligible Lists that issued July 17, 2006, and ask when training for their staff on this subject will be complete. Do not argue with such staff, simply obtain information. If you sense ignorance or lack of enthusiasm to comply, please report the details to the LACCEA office for appropriate follow-up by the LACCEA attorney.

Regarding LACCEA’s fourth demand on the 10-day posting rule, LACCEA cites the second sentence of Civil Service Rule 7.03(A) that states, “*For promotional examinations, a written notice of each examination shall be posted for at least 10 days prior to the examinations.*” DHR claims this language means it must give 10-days notice prior to an actual test exam, not 10 days posted notice prior to opening the filing window. DHR’s abusive interpretation ignores the first sentence of the same Rule that states “*A written notice of each examination shall be posted prior to the opening of the filing period of the examination on the official county recruitment bulletin board in the department of personnel.*” The Rule clearly refers to posted notice before applications are accepted. As of now, DHR clings to the abusive view that it has the right to post a job one day and shut the filing window the next day. If you become aware of such an abusive approach in any exam, please report it LACCEA for evaluation and appropriate action.

Re-print: September 2006

The Relationship Between LACCEA and Union Representation

By Victor Manrique, Attorney at Law

LACCEA is a “recognized employee organization” under the county code and the county recognizes that LACCEA may represent members in their employment relationship with the county, with certain limitations described below. LACCEA cannot bargain a labor contract because it is not a certified bargaining representative like a labor union. The state and county law empower the Employee Relation Commission (ERCOM) of the county to certify exclusive bargaining representatives for defined bargaining units and once certified through an ERCOM election, the petitioning labor union is the only entity that can obligate the county to bargain over wages and terms and conditions of employment for all classifications covered. A certified labor union bargains labor contracts known as Memoranda of Understanding (“MOU”). At the same time, the state law permits employees to choose their representative in an individual representation case and may choose LACCEA representation in Civil Service and grievances, though LACCEA may not use the union arbitration procedure and cannot replace the union in bargaining over wages, and other terms and conditions found in MOUs.

Civil Service: LACCEA, just like a labor union, may and does represent employees at all stages of the appeal proce-

ture before the county Civil Service Commission. The Civil Service Commission has jurisdiction to hear serious discipline ranging from 6 to 30 day suspensions, demotions and discharges, and following review by the Department of Human Resources, the Commission also hears promotion, examination, and probation cases. Just like a labor union, LACCEA may and does represent employees in departmental investigative interviews and at Skelly meetings prior to the imposition of formal discipline. If discipline occurs, LACCEA files the appeal to the Civil Service Commission continues representation through the final administrative action by the Commission. A Civil Service case has four phases, the request for hearing obtained before the Commission, the evidentiary hearing usually lasting one to three days before a hearing officer, and then one or two more objection hearing arguments before the Commission to finalize a case. LACCEA does not, nor do the unions generally, bring lawsuits on individual cases in court following a final Commission action, at that point an employee must retain their own counsel if they wish to pursue a writ of mandate in superior court.

DHR Appeals: As mentioned, some cases involving promotions, examination and appraisal of promotability scores, and certain probationary and resignation retraction claims are first required to be filed with the Appeals Unit of the Department of Human Resources. LACCEA, just like a labor union, may and does represent employees in such claims.

Grievances Under Union Contract: LACCEA, just like a labor union, may also represent individual employees using the grievance procedure negotiated by a union in its labor contract or MOU, however, LACCEA may only represent the employee at the first, second and third step of a grievance process, LACCEA may not use the arbitration provision of an MOU. The reason for this limitation is that a union is legally responsible to all its members to defend and interpret its negotiated contract in arbitration and the law does not allow another entity that represents only a portion of the unit to present a contract interpretation that may benefit certain members but may be harmful to the unit's overall interests. The fact that LACCEA cannot use arbitration is extremely important to employees because the first three steps of the grievance process are decided by the same chain of command that imposed the grieved action. For some types of claims such as contesting negative text in a "competent" performance evaluation, LACCEA can represent since under ERCOM rules a "competent" evaluation may not be arbitrated so there is no difference between LACCEA and union representational rights. However, since only a labor union may take an unresolved grievance to arbitration following the third level decision, it is unwise to use LACCEA for claims that may be arbitrable. Arbitration is a process where the union and management choose a third party neutral, equally divide the pay for the arbitrator, the arbitrator holds a hearing and renders a binding decision on the parties. For example, an "improvement needed" performance evaluation can only be grieved and arbitrated, there is no Civil Service jurisdiction, so the employee should not waive arbitration rights using LACCEA representation, instead should pursue such a grievance through the union, because in six months, an "improvement needed" can become "unsatisfactory." Further, if a layoff occurs, a person on "improvement needed" is laid off first, regardless of seniority, so challenging an "improvement needed" through arbitration is much wiser. An "unsatisfactory" performance evalua-

tion requires either demotion or discharge which comes within the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission, and here the employee can choose either LACCEA or their union representative. Other types of claims such as pay claims for benefit time or AWOP time, or out-of-class/additional responsibilities pay claims, or suspensions of 5 days or less are best handled by the union because again, only the union can arbitrate such claims. Moreover, if the grievance affects an entire classification or unit, such as a department-wide health insurance, retirement or benefit issue, or a safety policy, or use-of-force policy issue, etc., then these types of broad claims should be handled by the union which has the legal right to force management into consultations and negotiations affecting large groups. LACCEA pushes broad policy issues relating to equal employment opportunities and affirmative action through its EEO section, and not generally through individual representation cases though certainly discrimination claims arise in the individual case setting as well.

Departmental Grievance Procedure: LACCEA may also represent managerial employees in a grievance using a departmental grievance procedure for "non-rep." employees, that is, those in classifications not covered by a union contract. LACCEA is a voluntary association of county employees and employees of any classification may join whether they are management or non-management. The rights of managerial employees may vary significantly from unionized employees and the provisions of the county code or internal department policies usually control such claims. Unions have defined bargaining units composed of specific classifications either defined by ERCOM or negotiated by the parties, and even where some unions have "non-rep." membership for non-covered employees, such membership usually has restricted rights inside the union to assure that only the covered classifications impact their respective bargaining relationship with the county.

LACCEA co-exists in a county environment with many other unions and employee organizations and must respect the overlapping rights of members who hold dual memberships. To avoid misunderstandings and limit potential liability in representation functions, many unions, and LACCEA has a policy adopted by our Board of Directors that reflects this mutual respect for other groups:

"The member must choose their representative at the beginning of the case and LACCEA will not accept cases where the member has chosen alternate representation and later attempts to switch representation back to LACCEA."

Therefore, you must choose your representative early and cannot go back and forth between organizations. Assisting you in evaluating this decision is an important part of the initial consultation with the LACCEA attorney so that you understand how your rights may be impacted by your decision.

**Victor Manrique has represented LACCEA members since 2002. He has represented over 40 local and 9 international labor organizations in 21 years as a labor lawyer, he was Chief Counsel to Local 660 SEIU from 1993 to 2002, and he has handled over a thousand cases before the Los Angeles County Civil Service and ERCOM Commissions.*



LACCEA Takes on the County of Los Angeles

*By Alan Clayton,
Director of EEO*

On behalf of LACCEA, I have been very active in taking on Los Angeles County management and the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors. In September 2007, I filed a binder with the Voting Rights Section of the United States Department of Justice in regards to our Federal Voting Rights case against the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors. We are requesting that they commence litigation against Los Angeles County in Federal court. If successful, we are confident that we will double Latino representation on the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors. We would have two Supervisors out of five.

I have been able to secure numerous letters from National, state, and local Latino organizations in regards to our Section 2 federal administrative redistricting complaint against the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors 2001 adopted districts. ([See letter of support from MABA on page 11](#))

We received an extension of our settlement with the Department of Health Services of one year and a Hispanic female has been appointed to the position of plan administrator. We are still very dissatisfied with the Department of Health Services commitment to the settlement. We have had many meetings with the department to push them to comply with the settlement agreement. The settlement deals with the lack of Latinos in management and supervisory positions through out the Department of Health Services.

On behalf of LACCEA, I filed a Title VII employment discrimination complaint with the Los Angeles Office of the United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) against the recruitment and hiring practices of the Los Angeles County Fire Department ([See the letter to the EEOC on pages 8-9](#)). I met with the Fire Chief and the County Affirmative Action Officer on this issue. I expect a response from the Fire Department in March 2008.

On behalf of LACCEA, I filed a Title VII employment discrimination complaint with the Los Angeles Office of the United States EEOC in regards to Probation Department Supervising Deputy Probation Officer exam. We are alleging that the exam had an unfair result in regards to the promotions of Hispanics to the position of Supervising Deputy Probation Officer. Our President Lorenzo Sandoval, our 1st Vice President Carlos Coronado, and I met with Dennis Tafoya the County Affirmative Action Officer and Probation Chief Robert Taylor on this issue. They have given us a response to

our Federal complaint which we are reviewing.

Andy Martinez, LACCEA Board Member and President of the Hispanic Managers Association and I met with County Affirmative Action Officer Dennis Tafoya concerning a detailed ethnic breakdown report that I prepared on over 25 County departments. We have requested that he thoroughly review the numerous reports in the binder that I provided.

I have also met over the last year with a number County Department Heads including the Department of Public Works, Department of Children and Family Services, and Department of Public Social Services. In addition, I along with LACCEA's board members, representatives of the Los Angeles County Hispanic Managers Association, and the Mexican American Correctional Association have met with the Chief Probation Officer Robert Taylor many times over the last year.

I met with Assemblyman Mendoza regarding the re-introduction of LACCEA's Constitutional Amendment that is designed to have judicial district elections. If that happens, we should significantly increase the number of Latino judges on the Superior court. I was also able to secure from Assemblyman Mendoza a very strong letter concerning the lack of representation of Latinos in the Probation Department; he sent that letter to the Chief Probation Officer ([See support letter on page 10](#)). I also have met with the staff of a number of other elected officials in Sacramento concerning the lack of representation of Latinos in Management and Supervisory level positions in the Probation Department. I asked them to consider writing a letter to Chief Taylor on these important issues. In addition, I have communicated to Chief Taylor on numerous occasions that I would be glad to work with the department to prevent any lay offs of Probation staff due to the budget crisis in Sacramento.

I also was able to complete a major task that will preserve what LACCEA has accomplished in the years from 1995 to 2007 on behalf of Latinos in Los Angeles County government. I was able to catalog 91 volumes that I had compiled over the last 12 years of my primary activities as your Director of EEO at LACCEA and those of other staff that have worked here during that period of time. The UCLA library accepted the binders and they will be part of their permanent collection. There are very few collections of historical documents concerning the activities of major Latino organizations at university libraries. We can be proud that future generations of Latinos and others will know about our accomplishments.

Over the last 13 years that I have been your Director of EEO, LACCEA has been a leader in the fight for equal employment practices for Latinos, we have been a leader in the fight to have adequate numbers of Spanish-speaking staff in public contact positions, we have been a leader in support for state funds for juvenile programs, we have been a leader in attempting to increase the number of Latinos on the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, and we have also been a leader in fighting to save county staff from layoffs when there are budget problems in Sacramento.

Please remember these successes would not have been possible without your support .

A Letter to United States EEOC Olophius Perry

The following is a portion of LACCEA's discrimination complaint against the Los Angeles County Fire Department.

September 27, 2007

Mr. Olophius Perry
Regional Director, United States EEOC
Los Angeles District Office
Roybal Federal Building
255 East Temple Street, 4th Fl.
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Mr. Perry,

The Los Angeles County Chicano Employees Association (LACCEA), whose membership consists of employees of Los Angeles County government, are filing this organizational complaint against the Los Angeles County Fire Department alleging that this department has not recruited and hired Hispanics or a class on an equal basis to Whites for the positions of Firefighter/56 hours.

We base the complaint on our analysis of Los Angeles County CWTAPPS encumbered Firefighter/56 hours positions from 12/31/95 to 6/30/07. For the position of Firefighter/56 hours, the CWTAPPS data shows that on 12/31/95 27.8% of the Firefighter/56 hours positions were held by Hispanics. As of 6/30/07, the percentage of Hispanic Firefighter/56 hours positions only increased to 28.8%. The Hispanic Firefighter/56 hour classification percentage increased only 1% in 11 1/2 years. Compare this to the Hispanic 12th grade graduates in Los Angeles County. In the period from 1999-2000, 46.5% or 25,977 of the high school graduates in Los Angeles County were Hispanic. In the period between 2005 and 2006, 49.07% of the high school graduate in Los Angeles County or 41,703 persons were Hispanic (*See Table A on page 7*).

In comparison, Whites on 12/31/95 comprised 55.5% of the Firefighter/56 hour positions according to the CWTAPPS data. As of 6/30/07 Whites comprised 57.8% of the Firefighter/56 hour positions. In 1999-2000, Whites comprised 25.8% or 20,003 of the high school graduates in Los Angeles County. In 2005-2006, Whites comprised 23.32% or 19,814 of the high school graduates in Los Angeles County.

The minimum qualification for the Firefighter/56 hour position is a high school diploma. Whites in 2005-2006 had a potential qualified applicant pool of approximately 23.0% to 23.5% for the Firefighter/56 hour positions. Whites were hired at the rate of approximately 57% to 58% for the Firefighter/56 hour position in 2006. The Hispanic qualified applicant pool for the Firefighter/56 hour position was approximately 49.0%. Hispanics were hired at the rate of approximately 28% to 29% for the Firefighter/56 hour position in 2006. I base these estimates on a review of the CWTAPPS

data for the encumbered Firefighter/56 hour position in the period from 6/30/06 to 6/30/07.

It is clear from the data provided in the preceding paragraph that in regards to the Firefighter/56 hour job classification in the period from 6/30/06 to 6/30/07, Hispanics were not recruited or hired in percentages commensurate with qualified applicant pool in comparison to Whites.

We believe that the comparisons Hispanics and Whites that we have just described is statistically significant; that is, the under representation of Hispanics in the Firefighter/56 hour classification does not appear to occur by chance. Absent any other explanations, the Fire Department would be expected to recruit and hire Hispanics and Whites in numbers that more or less approximates their availability in the qualified applicant pool. General comparative statistical data showing qualified applicant (recruitment) pool disparities in relation to hiring raise an inference of discrimination. In addition, where substantial statistical disparities exist, they alone may constitute *prima facie* proof of disparate impact discrimination because the selection process results have an impermissible disparate impact on Hispanics who would seek to be recruited and hired by the Fire Department. Finally, enclosed is a chart that shows the representational levels in the period from 12/31/95 to 6/30/07 for Whites and Hispanics in the Firefighter/56 hour position (*See Table B on page 7*).

The adverse impact analysis in this complaint is based on current Supreme Court and lower court decisions. In *Hazelwood School District v. United States*, 433 U.S. at 308, the Supreme Court established the proposition that for statistics to have any value in discrimination case the statistics must compare the composition of the qualified and available applicant pool to the compositions of the applicants selected.

In *Teamsters*, 431 U.S. at 340, the key finding in this Supreme Court Title VII case was that one of the critical questions for any pattern and practice case is determining at what point the disparity becomes sufficiently large and the probability of chance sufficiently low to allow an inference of discrimination to be drawn from the disparity.

It is clear that the Fire Department representation level of Hispanics at the Firefighter/56 hour position also is in violation of the Uniform Guidelines 4/5 rule as implemented by your agency. The Uniform Guidelines, 29 CFR § 1607(4) D provides in part as follows "A selection rate for any race, or ethnic group which is less than four-fifths (4/5) or eighty percent (80%) of the rate for the group with the higher rate will generally be regarded by the Federal enforcement agencies as evidence of adverse impact, while a greater than four-fifths rate will generally not be regarded by Federal enforcement agencies as evidence of adverse impact. In the Firefighter/56 hour classification the evidence appears to demonstrate that Whites were recruited and hired at a level in comparison to the level that Hispanics were recruited and hired at a level that violates the 80% rule.

We are requesting that your office fully investigates this complaint. It is very important that the Fire Department reflect the qualified applicant pool of Hispanics. Recruitment efforts that re-

sult in keeping the status quo of Whites dominating the Fire-fighter/56 hour position strongly appears to violate Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and also are not good public policy.

There are three Federal Court Title VII recruitment cases that you might want to review. These cases are:

1. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, New Haven Branch of the NAACP vs. Town of East Haven, East Haven Board of Education, United States District Court for the District of Connecticut 998 F. Supp. 176; 1998 U.S. Dist Lexis 3972; 76 Fair Empl. Prac. Case (BNA) 903 Filed March 25, 1998, Decided March 25, 1998
2. Association Against Discrimination in Employment, Inc et al v. City of Bridgeport, et. al. Civ. No B-75-268, United States District Court for the District of Connecticut, 479 F. Supp. 101; 1979 US Dist Lexis 10188; 20 Fair Empl. Prac. cas.

(BHA) 985: 21 Empl. Prac. Dec. (CCH) P30, 321

3. United States of America, Plaintiff-Appellant/Cross-Appellee V The City of Warren Michigan, Defendant-Appellee/Cross Appellant, The City of Warren Police and FireFighter Civil Service Commission, Rule 19(a) Party, Defendant-Appellee C97-1024) No 97-1024/97-107.5 United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit 138 F.3d 1083; 1998 U.S. App. Lexis 4652: 1998 Fed App. 005P (6th Cir); 79 Fair Empl. Prac. Case (BNA) 1603; 73 Empl. Prac. Dec. (CCH) P 45.389 October 28, 1997 Argued, March 16, 1998 Decided.

Sincerely,

Alan Clayton

Alan Clayton, Director of EEO
LACCEA

Table A

Number of 12th Grade Graduates in Los Angeles County									
	American Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	Filipino	Hispanic	Black	White	Multiple or No response	Total
2005-2006	204	10,655	462	2,772	41,703	8,623	19,814	750	84,983
%	0.24%	12.54%	0.54%	3.26%	49.07%	10.15%	23.32%	0.88%	
2004-2005	233	10,257	433	2,723	43,662	9,376	20,171	675	87,530
%	0.27%	11.72%	0.49%	3.11%	49.88%	10.71%	23.04%	0.77%	
2003-2004	238	9,786	440	2,631	41,492	9,152	20,451	487	84,677
%	0.28%	11.56%	0.52%	3.11%	49.00%	10.81%	24.15%	0.58%	
2002-2003	266	10,055	451	2,568	38,975	8,777	20,934	203	82,229
%	0.32%	12.23%	0.55%	3.12%	47.40%	10.67%	25.46%	0.25%	
2001-2002	369	10,056	529	2,438	37,418	8,589	19,933	177	79,509
%	0.46%	12.65%	0.67%	3.07%	47.06%	10.80%	25.07%	0.22%	
2000 -2001	227	10,136	390	2,369	36,629	8,098	20,392	89	78,330
%	0.29%	12.94%	0.50%	3.02%	46.76%	10.34%	26.03%	0.11%	
1999-2000	238	10,071	393	2,168	35,977	8,354	20,003	97	77,301
%	0.31%	13.03%	0.51%	2.80%	46.54%	10.81%	25.88%	0.13%	

Table B

Fire Fighter/56 hours	White		Black		Hispanic		Total Positions						
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female							
12/31/1995	553	54.8%	7	0.7%	125	12.4%	2	0.2%	281	27.8%	0	0.0%	1009
Overall %		55.5%				12.6%				27.8%			
3/31/1999	588	56.1%	7	0.7%	117	11.2%	1	0.1%	294	28.0%	0	0.0%	1049
Overall %		56.8%				11.3%				28.0%			
9/30/2003	617	53.2%	12	1.0%	125	10.8%	1	0.1%	338	29.2%	2	0.2%	1159
Overall %		54.2%				10.9%				29.4%			
6/30/2004	641	53.6%	13	1.1%	124	10.4%	1	0.1%	352	29.5%	2	0.2%	1195
Overall %		54.7%				10.5%				29.6%			
6/30/2005	685	55.8%	12	1.0%	120	9.8%	0	0.0%	346	28.2%	3	0.2%	1227
Overall %		56.8%				9.8%				28.4%			
12/31/2205	705	56.2%	13	1.0%	123	9.8%	0	0.0%	349	27.8%	4	0.3%	1255
Overall %		57.2%				9.8%				28.1%			
3/31/2006	691	56.2%	13	1.1%	118	9.6%	0	0.0%	344	28.0%	4	0.3%	1229
Overall %		57.3%				9.6%				28.3%			
6/30/2006	698	56.5%	14	1.1%	116	9.4%	0	0.0%	345	27.9%	9	0.7%	1235
Overall %		57.7%				9.4%				28.7%			
3/31/2007	720	56.7%	16	1.3%	113	8.9%	0	0.0%	359	28.3%	4	0.3%	1270
Overall %		58.0%				8.9%				28.6%			
6/30/2007	703	56.5%	16	1.3%	110	8.8%	0	0.0%	354	28.5%	4	0.3%	1244
Overall %		57.8%				8.8%				28.8%			

A Letter to Chief Probation Officer Robert Taylor from Assemblymember Tony Mendoza

January 10, 2008

Mr. Robert Taylor, Chief
Los Angeles County Probation Department
9150 East Imperial Highway, 2nd Floor
Downey, CA

Dear Chief Taylor,

The lack of fair promotional and hiring practices for Latinos in the Los Angeles County Probation Department has been brought to my attention.

There is a severe under representation of Latinos in the top management positions in your department. The severity of under representation of Latinos in top management positions has continued during your tenure as the Chief Probation Officer. For example, the Executive Bulletin issued on 11/20/07 identifies nine promotions to the position of Bureau Chief and only one of those promotions went to a Latino. The same Executive Bulletin identifies three promotions to the position of Deputy Director and there were no Latinos promoted to this top management position. The record shows that out of 12 top level Probation Department management promotions on 11/20/07 only one went to a Latino. In Los Angeles County where over 47% of the population is currently Latino this lack of appointment of Latinos to the top policy making positions in your department is offensive.

As of 9/30/07, you had no Latino Senior Probation Directors out of seven positions and only one Latino Bureau Chief out of seven positions. This is according to the CWTAPS report dated 9/30/07.

In the Senior Probation Director classification on 6/30/01, there were four Latinos out of 11 positions for a percentage of 36.4%. As previously stated as of 9/30/07 the Probation Department has no Latino Senior Probation Directors.

On 6/30/04, Latinos comprised 11 out of 56 Probation Director positions for a percentage of 19.6%. As of 9/30/05, Latinos comprised 12 out of 58 Probation Director positions for a percentage of 20.7%. As of 9/30/07, Latinos comprised only 12 out of 53 Probation Director positions for a percentage of 22.6%. In 13 years the percentage of Latinos at the Probation Director position has only increased by approximately 3%. Also, on 12/31/01, Latinos comprised 5 out of the 14 Probation Director I positions or 35.7%. As of 9/30/07, Latinos comprised 11 out of 39 of the Probation Director I positions for a percentage of 28.2%.

As of 6/30/05, Latinos comprised 3 out of the 7 Special Assistant positions for a percentage of 42.9%. As of 9/30/07, Latinos comprise only 2 out of the 9 Special Assistant positions for a percentage of 22.2%.

As of 6/30/01, Latinos comprised 12 of the 58 Supervision Detention Service Officer positions for a percentage of 20.7%. As of 9/30/07, Latinos comprised 15 out of the 82 Supervision Detention Service Officer positions for a percentage of 18.3%. In over six years there has been no increase in the percentage of Latino Super-

vising Detention Services Officers.

As of 3/31/06, Latinos comprised 55 out of the 232 Supervising Deputy Probation Officer positions for a percentage of 23.7%. As of 9/30/07, Latinos comprised 68 of 271 Supervising Deputy Probation Officer for a percentage of 25.1%.

In the area of hiring practices the strongest example of Latino under representation in the Probation Department is at the Group Supervisor level. Latinos comprised on 6/30/01 128 out of the 413 Group Supervisor Nights position for a percentage of 31%. In 2005, 49% of the high school graduates in Los Angeles County were Latino. Clearly, there were a significant potential pool of Latino candidates for these positions. However, on 9/30/07 Latinos comprised only 129 of the 404 Group Supervisor Night positions for a percentage of 31.9%. There has been almost no increase in the percentage of Latinos in this significant job classification over the last six years.

The information contained in this letter presents an unacceptable record in regards to your department's commitment to the equal promotion of Latinos to high and mid level management positions. Also, your record of promoting Latinos to Supervisory law enforcement positions is very disappointing especially to the position of Supervising Detention Services Officers.

I am informed that these issues have been brought repeatedly to your attention by the Los Angeles County Chicano Employees Association (LACCEA) in meetings with you. I am also informed that they are dissatisfied with the Departments commitment to work effectively to correct this historic under representation of Latinos.

Clearly, Latinos are almost non existent in the top policy making positions in your department. You have only one Latino in the top 16 positions in your department, representing less than 7% of your top policy making positions.

As an Assembly member representing a portion of Los Angeles County, I want the resources that the legislature sends to Los Angeles County used equitably and fairly. This includes fair representation of Latinos in policy making positions in county departments that service the residents of Los Angeles County so that there is equal delivery of county services to all communities. How effective has your outreach been to the Latino community in seeking Latino candidates? Latinos need to be involved in your recruitment efforts in a significant way.

I hope that you will review your current lack of representation of Latinos especially in top policy positions and take the appropriate steps to ensure in the future that there will be diversity in these top management positions. Clearly, there are qualified Latinos that should have been considered for promotion and promoted to some of these top level positions. Currently, there are eight whites and only one Latino in these positions.

I look forward to working with you in the future on Probation programs that will benefit the residents of my district and the rest of Los Angeles County.

Sincerely,

Tony Mendoza

Assemblyman Tony Mendoza
56th District

A Letter to Attorney General Michael B. Mukasey from MABA

February 14, 2008

Honorable Michael B. Mukasey, Attorney General
United States Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, D.C. 20530-0001

Dear Attorney General Mukasey,

On behalf of the Mexican-American Bar Association (MABA) of Los Angeles County, with over 500 members, I am requesting that the Voting Rights Section of your Civil Rights Division file a Section 2 federal voting rights lawsuit against the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors current legislative districts. With the Latino community currently having the ability to elect candidates of its own choice in two Supervisorial districts instead of the current one district it should be the top priority of your Voting Rights Section to file this Section 2 Federal voting rights lawsuit as soon as possible.

It is important to note that your Voting Rights Section in the years from 2001 to the present has filed only three Section 2 redistricting challenges in Federal Court. Alamosa County with 16,000 residents in 2000 filed in 2001 and lost, Osceola County with 179,000 residents in 2000 filed in 2005 and won in 2006, Village of Port Chester with 27,000 residents in 2000 filed in 2006 and won in 2008. The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors Section 2 violation if filed in federal court would have been much more significant than all the other three Section 2 redistricting cases. It is important to point out that in 2000 Los Angeles County had over 9,500,000 residents of which 44.6% were Latino and that by 2007 Los Angeles County has over 10,000,000 residents of which over 47% are Latino.

There is no evidence that the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors will not continue to draw in 2011 one packed Latino district because of their past practice. The Supervisors know that the cost for a plaintiff organization to litigate a Section 2 Federal Voting Rights case against the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors would be in the millions of dollars because of the reality that if the Board of Supervisors lost at the Federal District Court level it would appeal the decision to the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals and then if it lost again to the United States Supreme Court. The United States Department of Justice has the resources to successfully prosecute this case now.

On September 27, 2007, Alan Clayton, on behalf of LACCEA, filed LACCEA's sixth binder that contained many documents that had been previously filed with the Voting Rights Section of the United States Department of Justice concerning this administrative complaint for the period from June 2006 through August 2007. The binder also contained additional new information that had not yet been filed with the Voting Rights Section. Included in the binder was a third alternative Los Angeles County Board of

Supervisors map drawn by Alan Clayton. In addition, on September 28, 2007, Alan Clayton, on behalf of LACCEA, filed with the Voting Rights Section an updated analysis of the impact of the 2006 Latino CVAP numbers in Los Angeles County on the issue of proportionality in regards to LACCEA's Section 2 administrative complaint filed with your Voting Rights Section in regards to the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors adopted 2001 districts.

Alan Clayton, on behalf of LACCEA, has filed since February 2003, six binders containing over 3500 pages in regards to this Section 2 administrative complaint.

With the next Los Angeles County Board of Supervisor elections scheduled to take place in June of 2008, we strongly recommended that your Voting Rights Section make a recommendation to the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Civil Rights Division to file this case within the next 30 days because any further delay after that would make it almost impossible to secure a federal district court ruling halting the June 2008 primary election.

In summation, the Voting Rights Section of the Justice Department over the last year has consistently avoided a decision on whether to file this case in Federal District Court. The failure in the Voting Rights Section to file this case demonstrates a lack of commitment by the Bush Administration to vigorously enforce on behalf of Latinos Section 2 of the Federal Voting Right Act in regards to prosecuting Section 2 Latino Redistricting cases in Federal Court. Since over 10% of the Latino population in the United States resides in Los Angeles County the failure of the Voting Rights Section to file this strong case is appalling. It should be noted that the Voting Rights Section in 1985 filed a Section 2 redistricting case against the City of Los Angeles that resulted in the creation of a second Latino district. Gloria Molina was elected to that district. Also, the Voting Rights Section in 1988 filed a Section 2 against the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors districts that were adopted in 1981. They along with MALDEF and others were successful in that Section 2 Federal Voting Rights Case. As a result of the Federal Court decision a Latino majority district was created and Supervisor Molina was elected to that district.

I look forward to your response.

Pete Navarro

Pete Navarro, President
Mexican -American Bar Association of Los Angeles County

cc. Congressman Baca, Chairman Hispanic Congressional Caucus
Congresswoman Grace Napolitano
Congresswoman Lucile Roybal-Allard
Congresswoman Hilda Solis
Congressman Xavier Becerra
Congresswoman Linda Sanchez
Arturo Vargas, Executive Director NALEO
Brent Wilkes, Executive Director National LULAC
Tony Morales, National Commander American G.I. Forum of the United States

Board of Directors & Officers

Lorenzo Sandoval, President
Carlos Coronado, 1st Vice President
George Castro, 2nd Vice President
Monica Gastelum, Secretary
Sandra Solis, Treasurer
Armando D'Avila
Robert Glorae
Joaquin Herran
Ray Leyva
Andy Martinez
Ralph Ochoa
Rudy Rico
Marcelino Sandoval
Gilbert Valeriano
Luis Vasquez

Staff

Mary Anne Saucedo, General Manager
Zuly Barrios, Assistant General Manager

Retained Counsel

Law Offices of Victor Manrique

Director of EEO

Alan Clayton

REMINDER:

- We need to keep our association's records accurate in order to best represent you.
- Please update your contact information by sending us a notice to 2200 S. Fremont Ave, Suite 201, Alhambra, CA 91803 and make it attention to Zuly Barrios, or give us a call at (626) 458-2314, or you may e-mail us at laccea@sbcglobal.net.
- Please include your full name, employee number, department number, home address, work address, e-mail address, home phone number, and work phone number. Thank you.

MEMBERS RECOGNITION

LACCEA is looking for members that we can Highlight in our newsletter. Do you know a LACCEA member that should be recognized for their accomplishments, activities, retiring, exemplifies the LACCEA goals, or just a great person?

Please submit their name, article, and their phone number to the LACCEA office.

Articles will be reviewed and if necessary edited due to space in our newsletter.

LACCEA

**2200 South Fremont Avenue, Suite 201
Alhambra, CA 91803-4316
Tel (626) 458-2314 • Fax (626) 458-2317**

www.lacountychicano.org

E-Mail: laccea@sbcglobal.net



Happy Easter!



ADDRESS CORRECTION REQUESTED.
PLEASE DO NOT FORWARD.