

THE COMMUNIQUE

from

LOS ANGELES COUNTY CHICANO EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION

FEBRUARY 2004



A Message From Our President

By
Lorenzo Sandoval
President, LACCEA
Board of Directors

I hope you enjoyed your holidays. On behalf of myself, and the LACCEA staff, we would like to wish you and your family a prosperous New Year. I can't believe that the year has come and gone so quickly. Last year I promised that my goals would be to keep the members informed, make us financially stronger, and to continue LACCEA's outstanding record of advocacy for its members and the Latino community.

I have kept that promise by sending our newsletter out on a regular basis, and keeping members up to date on all of our activities. We have had meetings at various work locations. We have also set up employee days where we have sponsored retirement workshops and workshops informing our members of their county benefits. If you would like us to visit your work site give us a call in order to set a LACCEA/Employee benefits day at your work location.

When I took office, LACCEA, without more revenue, would have had to spend more than it was collecting in membership dues, depleting our reserve that had been built up. The reason for this was two main factors. 1) Membership has decreased over the last 10 years because many of our long time members have retired and because of agency shop. 2) As cost increased {utilities, rent, postage, salaries, ect.}, dues remained the same for at least the last eight years. Because of these reasons, the 2002 LACCEA Board of Directors

Update On LACCEA Activities

By
Rudy Rico
Senior Advisor, LACCEA

Our Board of Directors has voted to increase our dues three dollars a month for a litigation fund. As a long-time LACCEA member who served as your President for six consecutive terms of office, I strongly support this action. LACCEA in the past has successfully sued the county over the lack of hiring Spanish-speaking staff and twice over affirmative action regulations. In order to continue to be able to effectively fight the county on key issues that impact on our members, we need to have the ability to take the county to court. Our County Board of Supervisors does not respect organizations that will not fight back. As your past President, for many years, I know that when we have sued the county in

the past they have treated us with more respect. We have been very careful in the past to sue only when we have had a solid complaint. Our legal actions have always been designed to benefit the Latino employees in the County of Los Angeles and to benefit the Latino community.

LACCEA's Director of EEO has been working hard on trying to maintain the Schiff/Cardenas funding for the Probation Department and community programs that will benefit at-risk youth, youth currently under the jurisdiction of the Probation Department, and youth leaving the Probation Department and returning to the community. Los Angeles County currently receives 28 million dollars for these programs. It was LACCEA who effectively

sponsored this bill, which has brought over \$330,000,000 in California for programs that are designed to help juveniles. Los Angeles County has received almost \$100,000,000 in new money because of LACCEA's outstanding leadership on this issue. The Mexican-American Correctional Association (MACA) and the Los Angeles Chapter of the Hispanic American Police Command Officers Association (HAPCOA) assisted us in this historic effort. LACCEA, the Los Angeles Chapter of MACA, and the Los Angeles County Hispanic Managers Association (LACHMA) have been strongly advocating with our elected officials in Sacramento to keep this

Attention All LACCEA Members!

.....
Please update your mailing address by sending us a notice to 2200 S. Fremont Ave., Suite 201, Alhambra, CA 91803 or you may e-mail us at laccea@sbcglobal.net Please include your full name, employee number, home phone number, and work phone number.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

(Continue on page 2)

(Continue on page 3)

agreed to raise dues. This money went to our general fund. However, we still have a very strong membership base with over 1,060 current members.

Your LACCEA Board of Directors now has voted to increase dues by three dollars in March 2004 for our first ever fund strictly devoted to litigation. This decision is strongly supported by Rudy Rico, our six term President, our Executive Director for the last year, and currently our senior advisor. This decision would put LACCEA in an even stronger position to fight the county on issues of importance to our members. Since we are in good fiscal condition, LACCEA should not have to raise dues again for many years. The increase in dues should have been done years ago, as all of our cost went up. When I became President in late 2002, I knew that we had to exercise fiscal discipline. By maintaining fiscal discipline without reducing our services and utilizing volunteers as well as board members doing some of the work, we've been able to maintain a prudent reserve for emergencies. This could not have been done without the tireless effort of our board members and staff, who have given their time and commitment to make this organization the finest Latino employee advocate organization in Los Angeles County and probably in the State of California.

I also want to personally thank Rudy Rico and Raul Solis who both served as our Executive Director. They are both outstanding retired county managers and served in our top staff positions at no cost to the membership. They both believed that this association was worthy of their strong commitment of time. Their strong commitment has made the association even stronger.

My final promise was to make LACCEA an even stronger, more active organization. I can proudly say that LACCEA is stronger than ever! We have not only been successful in grievances and in civil service complaints in numerous departments, we are also poised to file a huge EEOC complaint (promotional discrimination) against the Department of Health Services for failing to meet the needs of the community by failing to promote well qualified Latinos to management positions. This will be the largest Latino public sector employees' promotional discrimination complaint in the United States. We are still trying to resolve this issue with the department head.

We also have a Federal Voting Rights complaint with the Department of Justice over redistricting in the County of Los Angeles. This is the largest Latino voting rights complaint filed in the United States with the United States Department of Justice. If the United States Department of Justice successfully sues the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, it will dramatically change the lines of the current county districts. It will create a second district in which Latinos will comprise over 60.0% of the population. If this happens, the Latino community would have the ability to elect a prominent, strongly pro labor Latino to this district. Among the candidates for this heavily Latino district could be 1) Los Angeles City Council Person Antonio Villaraigosa, 2) Congresswoman Hilda Solis, 3) Congresswoman Grace Napolitano, 4) State Senator Gloria Romero, 5) State Senate Martha Escutia, 6) Former State Assemblyman Tom Calderon, 7) Assembly member Rudy Bermudez, 9) Congresswoman Linda Sanchez, and 10) Assemblyman Ed Chavez. This could make the Board of Supervisors much more supportive of the Latino employee issues and of issues that impact on the Latino community, such

as provide sufficient numbers of certified Spanish-speaking staff in all county departments so that the Spanish-speaking community can receive equal delivery of county services. Winning this case could also have a tremendous positive impact on county employees and organized labor. It would allow a strong pro-labor candidate to run and win a seat on the Board of Supervisors. This new pro-labor Supervisor could appoint a pro-worker civil service commissioner which would protect your rights from abuse by management.

After years of decline in membership, we finally have recorded increases in membership in 2003 and hope to continue the upward trend in 2004. I personally have recruited over 75 new members in the last three years.

As this newsletter is being sent out, we face severe cuts in the County budget that will directly affect our members. For example, the Probation Department could face almost 1,700 layoffs and also huge demotions. Rest assured that LACCEA is already fighting hard to protect our members from layoffs or demotions. In 1995 and 1996, we led the fight and successfully saved over 1,000 jobs in the Probation Department and 1,800 jobs in the Department of Social Services. We will also continue to aggressively fight to have our certified Spanish-speaking staff protected from layoffs or demotions. We recently were successful in having some health services departmental employees protected from layoffs last year because they were certified Spanish-speaking staff on the bilingual bonus (please read our newsletter article on this critical issue).

Alan Clayton, our EEOC director, has already been to Sacramento and will continue to go there to advocate retaining our county funds, which should lessen county employee layoffs. This board has, and will continue to meet with members of the legislature. As previously stated, we will also use the March dues increase for a litigation fund so that we will be able to conduct lawsuits if the board decides that they are warranted. The areas in which we may need to consider a lawsuit in the future include 1) bilingual exemptions from layoffs and demotions, 2) significant cases of systemic promotional discrimination against Latinos, and 3) a second district where the Latino community can elect a candidate of its own choice on the Board of Supervisors.

LACCEA will aggressively fight for the recruitment, hiring, and promotions of Latinos, and for the hiring of certified Spanish-speaking staff. It is also very significant that LACCEA, after five years of struggle, convinced Governor Davis to sign our outreach bill (Senate bill 2047). This bill authorizes the recruitment of underrepresented minority groups, in our case Latinos, as part of a recruitment overall plan. Our Director of EEO, Alan Clayton, and former State Supreme Court Justice, Cruz Reynoso, worked for five years to pass this bill. This bill was vetoed three times by Governor Pete Wilson and Governor Gray Davis before Governor Gray Davis signed it into law in 2002. Alan Clayton, our Director of EEO, met with Governor Gray Davis on this bill and was successful in convincing his legal counsel that he should support this critical civil rights bill. This bill will enable thousands of Latinos in the future to be recruited for county jobs. Our message to the Board of Supervisors and Department Heads is the following: Do not under estimate our resolve, for your mistake will be costly!!

Si se puede!!

(Continued from page 1)

money intact. Over 50% of the at-risk youth and youth under the jurisdiction of the Probation Department are Latino. Without resources, many youth could get involved or stay involved in the criminal justice system. Currently, because of our efforts and the efforts of several legislators, the 28 million dollars is in the governor's budget.

LACCEA is currently preparing detailed analysis of data for a number of county departments in preparation for meetings with their department heads. Some of these departments include 1) Probation, 2) Children's Services, 3) Public Works, and 4) Department of Social Services. LACCEA will be joined by the Hispanic Managers Association in meetings with department heads.

LACCEA's current analysis shows that the Departments of 1) Children Services, 2) Public Works, 3) Health Services, 4) Sheriffs, 5) Probation, and many other departments have not fairly promoted Latinos to Supervisory, Administrative, and Management positions. With LACHMA support we will be strongly advocating to increase promotional appointments for Latinos in all these departments.

Our Director of EEO, on behalf of LACCEA, has prepared a massive complaint that we are prepared to file with the United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission against the Department of Health Services. We will have one last meeting with the Director of the department to see if we can resolve our issues over the lack of Latino promotions.

When I was President of LACCEA in 1995 and 1996, we were successful in saving 1,000 jobs in the Probation Department. Our Director of EEO, Alan Clayton, led that fight for us in Sacramento, in speaking before the Board of Supervisors, and in conducting press conferences to focus public attention on this issue. Without our leadership role all of the Probation Camps would have closed and most likely all Probation employees under 5 years county service in 1996 would have lost their jobs. Many of those employees are current members of our association. We also led the fight in saving 1,835 jobs in the Department of Social Services in 1996.

We are already strongly advocating in Sacramento to keep county jobs. We have already called the Chair of the Board and Supervisor Don Knabe office to let him know that we will do anything that we can to help fight to protect county jobs.

We will also continue over aggressive fight to maintain certified Spanish-speaking staff with the bilingual bonus in their positions if layoffs came. We have led the fight on this issue for the last eight years.

I am also very proud that LACCEA, in the period from 1996 to 1998, was a leader in the effort to convince over 100,000 Latinos in applying for citizenship in Los Angeles County. Many of those individuals will be sworn in as citizens this year. It was a great victory for LACCEA and the Latino community.

LACCEA also successfully fought to maintain bilingual pay for thousands of Spanish-speaking certified staff. Many of these employees are members of LACCEA. We were the organization that successfully prevented potential up to 40% of the employees losing their bilingual bonus.

LACCEA also has been the leader in the fight for having a second Latino elected to the Board of Supervisors. Without our leadership this issue would have no chance of success. Over 16 Latino organizations are supporting us in

this historic Latino civil rights struggle. LACCEA is the only organization with the "guts" to tell the Board of Supervisors that the status quo is not acceptable and that Latinos deserve their fair share of Los Angeles County jobs, promotions, and services.

This case, if decided favorable to us, could result in the election of a very strong supporter of labor to our Board of Supervisors. This could result in more favorable union contracts and more emphasis on employee rights instead of management rights. Also, this new supervisor could appoint a pro-employee civil service commissioner that will be supportive of workers rights.

LACCEA has continued its quality representation of our individual members. Our attorney, Victor Manrique, is winning many grievances for our members and is involved currently in a major civil service case involving the non promotion of one of our members.

In conclusion, you, the member, can be justifiably proud of your organization and its tremendous accomplishments with the current leadership of our President Lorenzo Sandoval and our Board of Directors. I expected LACCEA to continue to be the leader in the fight for justice for Latino employees in Los Angeles County.

I encourage all of our members to recruit a new member. We must expand our membership base. LACCEA will pay you \$10.00 for each new member that you recruit after we have received three months of dues deductions. We fight the fights that no one else will. For example, in 1986 Latinos comprised only 17.0% Supervising Eligibility Workers in the Department of Public Social Services. Today as a result of our efforts over many years Latinos comprise over 40.0% of the Supervising Eligibility workers. Today Latinos comprise over 50.0% of the entry level Children Services Workers. In 1986, Latinos represented under 25.0% of those positions. Again, this would not have happened without our continued efforts. I am especially proud of our advocacy in my old department, Public Works. I and our Director of EEO have met with all of the Directors of Public Works since 1995. Sustained our efforts have led to the promotions and hiring of hundreds of Latinos over the last nine years.



Meet Our Board Member



Michael Santos was elected to the LACCEA Board of Directors in May 2003. Michael Santos comes to us from the Probation Department. He is a 14-year county employee who started his career in the Los Angeles County Coroners Investigation Unit. He later transferred to the Los Angeles County Probation Department. Mr. Santos has had various assignments in the Probation Department changing from the position of Group Supervisor Nights, to the position of Detention Service Officer, and to his present assignment as a Transportation Deputy assigned to San Fernando Valley Juvenile Hall.

Michael Santos was awarded the “Badge of Courage”, the department’s highest award given for bravery, in 1999 presented by his peers at the Probation Department. He has also participated as a runner in the Baker to Vegas Challenge the Cup Relay in the past. He currently serves as a 1st time Vice President of the LACCEA Board of Directors. He is also the legislative chair for the National Latino Peace Officers Association (San Gabriel Valley Chapter). Michael Santos also served as an intern for the late John Ferrero, who for many years served as the President of the Los Angeles City Council.

We expect great things from Mr. Santos in the future. He was nominated by his fellow executive board members to become the 1st Vice President. He serves on the recruitment committee and involved in working with staff on maintaining our current board initiatives. Mr. Santos recently participated in a meeting whose goal was to come up with strategies to help save county jobs that are endangered by the Governor’s budget. Mr. Santos plans to active advocate to save county jobs over the next five months. Mr. Santos lives by the motto, “If a leader doesn’t stand up for his people that he represents, then he stands for nothing”. Mr. Santos is effectively working for the success of LACCEA and for the Latino community.

Los Angeles County Promotional Rights and Pitfalls

by
Victor Manrique, Attorney for LACCEA
February 10, 2004.

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.

THE LAW OFFICES OF VICTOR MANRIQUE
3278 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1002
Los Angeles, California 9001
(213) 487-4733

A Letter to County Chief Administrative Officer David E. Janssen

The LACCEA will be sending a letter to the Chief Administrative Officer David E. Janssen supporting the exemptions of certified bilingual staff. If layoffs came we must be prepared to fight to retain our Spanish-speaking certified staff that are currently receiving the bilingual bonus. Enclosed is a portion of that letter.

February 26, 2004

David E. Janssen, Chief Administrative Officer
Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 713
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Mr. Janssen:

It is the position of the Los Angeles County Chicano Employees Association (LACCEA), and the Los Angeles County Hispanic Managers Association (LACHMA), that certified bilingual employees be exempted from demotions and layoffs. Without exemptions, potentially hundreds of certified Spanish-speaking employees could be demoted or laid off. Based on our discussions with several department heads and stories in the media, we have two concerns concerning potential future layoffs of Spanish speaking certified county employees. The first is that in the event of layoffs, certified bilingual workers' current heavy caseloads would increase for the reason that fewer certified bilingual workers would be employed to respond to an increasingly large non-English speaking population in Los Angeles County. The second concern is a corollary to the first: the county's level of services to the non-English speaking population would be adversely impacted.

Clearly, given the potential imbalance of the workloads there is an operational necessity for exempting certified bilingual workers from layoffs. Further, the absence of workers with bilingual skills could jeopardize the adequacy of services provided to a large segment of the county's population. Moreover, beneficiaries of the services could contend that their state statutory rights under the Dymally-Alatorre Bilingual Services Act, California Government code section 7290, et. seq. are being violated. Because of such adverse consequences, we ask you to support the exemption of certified bilingual employees on the bilingual bonus.

The County has acknowledged the need for bilingual personnel by creating and filling certified bilingual positions throughout its departments. The existence of positions requiring bilingual certification speaks to the need for them: if there were no need for bilingual employees, the County would not create positions requiring bilingual skills.

The issue of exempting bilingual county staff from layoffs was addressed in AFSCME v. County of Los Angeles, (1983) 146

Cal. App. 3d. 879. In 1981, the Probation Department enacted exemptions from lay-offs and demotions for certified bilingual staff for Deputy Probation Officer (DPO) positions in order to meet the limited-English-proficiency needs of the community. Since 1981, the need for bilingual services has dramatically increased. The rationale for exemptions in 1981 holds true today, except with greater force.

According to the 1980 Census, Latinos in Los Angeles were 27.6% of the total County population. In the year 2000, Latinos have grown to 44.6% of the population of Los Angeles County. The percentage of limited or non-English-speaking clientele has substantially grown because of this tremendous increase in the Latino population. There is a substantial increase from the Latino population figures in effect at the time of the 1981 bilingual staff exemptions, and this increase in population has had repercussions for numerous county departments where a significant percent of clientele is now non-English or limited English proficient. For example, in the Probation Department in 1992 in the field offices, 56% of the juveniles in supervision and 40% of the adult offenders in supervision were Latinos. Due to the high percentage of Latinos who are non-English and limited-English-proficient, these demographic changes have created a need for bilingual services that we believe currently have not been met by many county departments, including the Health Department and the Probation Department.

There is additional data that shows that since 1981, the need for bilingual services has dramatically increased. In the Los Angeles Unified School District, the current Latino student population is over 70%. Obviously, the need for bilingual services has increased tremendously with this growth in the Latino population. For example, in the 1981-1982 school year, there were 117,388 students enrolled in the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) who were limited-English proficient. By 1992-1993, the number of limited-English proficient students in LAUSD was 279,899. In 1992-1993, forty-four percent of the students attending LAUSD were limited-English proficient students. Spanish was the language spoken by 90% of the limited-English proficient students or 252,931 students. In 1995-1996 46% of the students attending LAUSD were limited-English proficient. Of that percentage, 277,505, or 92.2% of the students spoke Spanish. Approximately, 5% of the limited-English proficient students spoke various Asian languages. This data demonstrates that the rationale for exemptions is much stronger today than it was in 1981.

As noted in AFSCME, in seeking approval of the county director of personnel for the exemptions pursuant to civil service rule 19.05, the then Acting Chief Probation Officer Kenneth Fare wrote, "The Department has historically established a need to provide bilingual services to its Spanish-surnamed clients...Further, there is uncontradicted evidence that each certified bilingual specialist occupies a position with a demonstrated continuing need for his or her services, and that the need would not be met but for the exemptions." (Id. at 545)

In County Counsels' Points and Authorities in Support of Return by way of answer to petition for writ of mandate and request for injunctive relief dated September 10, 1981 in the case

of AFSCME v. Los Angeles County No C379 717 the County Counsel submits the following: "On page 14 County Counsel states in section III"

"Respondent May Be Required by Law to Maintain Bilingual Services"

"While Respondent does not concede that it is compelled by law to maintain any particular level of bilingual services, it does recognize the existence of federal and state law, which at least arguably, requires the provision of some level of bilingual services. To ignore those requirements in favor of strict seniority would be foolhardy and expose Respondent unnecessarily to liability."

In the conclusion section of this legal brief County Counsel state:

"Respondent submits that the foregoing argument and the evidence in the record clearly establish the propriety of the exemptions from the order of layoff reductions based upon certified bilingual ability. The legitimacy of bilingual ability as a special skill under Respondent's Civil Service Rules sufficiently insulates it from challenge. Indeed, Petitioner's challenge to the legitimacy of bilingual ability as a special skill would seem to be made in bad faith in light of the contrary position it has taken on numerous occasions in the past, and in the current M.O.U., even if Petitioner were not stopped from asserting the challenge."

"Finally, Respondent submits that rather than violating the equal protection rights of anyone, the exemptions based on bilingual ability ensure their preservation. In the first place, they are not based on race. In the second place, the exemptions preserve the rights of Respondent's client population to equal access to services."

LACCEA's and LACHMA's position is that the county should exempt all employees who receive bilingual pay. If an individual receives bilingual pay, it is due to the requirements that he or she uses their skills on the job. Certified bilingual supervisors, in addition to line staff, should also be exempt because they play a critical role in providing services to the language minority population. Bilingual supervisors are responsible for responding to complaints from the public, often fill-in for absent entry level subordinate employees and also have direct contact with the public. Not exempting certified bilingual supervisors would discourage non-English speaking residents from complaining about staff members and could result in Spanish-speaking clientele not having their work processed in a timely basis. The result would be unequal delivery of services to Spanish-speaking clientele.

AFSCME v. County of Los Angeles (1983) 146 CAL. App.3rd 879 is illustrative of how the operational necessity for bilingual personnel can be met by the application of Civil Service Rule 19.05, which provides for the exception to the order of layoff or reduction. Rule 19.05 state that a department may retain an employee despite the order of the layoff where it would be in the "best interest of the service", which is defined based on such consideration as:

1. Special qualifications possessed by only the employee(s) retained, important to performance of the department's work;
2. Loss of the employee's skills on a particular assignment would adversely affect public welfare;
3. An employee's distinctly superior documented work performance. (Civ. Service Rule 19.05)

Exempting certified bilingual employees ensures that the County's capacity to serve non-English-speaking residents will not be impaired. Moreover, the County has taken the action of exempting certified bilingual personnel when faced with reducing its workforce in the past.

Given the need for bilingual services and the budget shortfall, the County must take action to maintain the level of bilingual services it currently offers. The County must consider how the proposed reductions in staff will affect equal delivery of services to its language minority residents. It is imperative that each department head assess the impact of any potential reductions in the services provided to the non- or limited-English-speaking clientele will be affected.

In complying with the law, the County must consider exempting bilingual employees in all departments and immunizing bilingual certified employees from demotion. If the County goes forward with a layoff plan that has the effect of reducing services available to non-English and limited-English-proficient clientele, the County would potentially be in violation of both state and federal law.

Additionally, Los Angeles County government cannot enact a policy that would violate Title VI of the Civil Rights Act on 1964 by having a discriminatory impact on the equal delivery of services to the Spanish and Asian language speaking communities.

We do not want Los Angeles County to support any requirements or policies that would serve to undermine the Los Angeles County Government's compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. Section 2000 d, and 45 C.F.R. Part 80.

TITLE VI OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states, "No person in the United States shall, on ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance". Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 applies to all recipients of federal funds, without regard to the amount of federal funds that they have received.

It is LACCEA's and LACHMA's opinion that the failure of Los Angeles County to have sufficient certified bi-lingual staff to overcome language barriers to healthcare or other programs that provide social services to the community currently has a serious discriminatory effect on foreign born non-English and limited English speaking patients, depriving them of services that are as effective as those received by the rest of the community. We believe that this discriminatory effect violates

Title VI. Layoffs of certified bi-lingual staff could substantially increase the discriminatory effect on service delivery to limited and non-English speaking clients.

In addition, we are concerned that without adequate protection from department heads who may not support equal delivery of service to limited and non-English speaking clients, that Los Angeles County could violate Title 45 Code of Federal Regulations Part 80.

Guidance Memorandum

Title VI Prohibition Against National Origin

Discrimination - - Persons with Limited-English Proficiency

1. Background

"This memorandum is intended to offer guidance to staff of the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) with respect to its enforcement of the responsibilities of recipients of Federal financial assistance from HHS to persons with Limited-English Proficiency (LEP), pursuant to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 2000d et seq. ("Title VI"). Such recipients include hospitals, managed care providers, clinics and other health care providers as well as social service agencies and other institutions or entities that receive assistance from HHS. This document will provide guidance to OCR investigators in assessing compliance, negotiating voluntary compliance, and providing technical assistance. It also stresses flexibility, particularly for small providers, in choosing methods to meet their responsibilities to LEP persons. Through OCR's investigative activities in this area, both recipients and LEP beneficiaries will be made more aware of their respective obligations with respect to the provision and receipt of services."

"The guidance is intended to clarify standards consistent with case law and well-established legal principles that have been developed under Title VI."

"Section 601 of Title VI states that "no person in the United States shall on the ground of race color or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." Regulations implementing Title VI which are published at 45 C.F.R. Part 80, specifically provide that a recipient may not discriminate and may not, directly or through contractual or other arrangements, use criteria or methods of administration which have the effect of subjecting individuals to discrimination because of their race, color or national origin, or have the effect of defeating or substantially impairing accomplishment of the objectives of the program with respect to individuals of a particular, race, color or national origin."

"The statute and regulations prohibit recipients from adopting and implementing policies and procedures that exclude or have the effect of excluding or limiting the participation of beneficiaries in their programs, benefits, or activities on the basis of race, color, or national origin. Accordingly, a recipient must ensure that its policies do not have the effect of ex-

cluding from, or limiting the participation of, such persons in its programs and activities, based on national origin. Such a recipient should take reasonable steps to provide services and information in appropriate languages other than English in order to ensure that LEP persons are effectively informed and can effectively participate in and benefit from its programs.”

“English is the predominant language of the United States and according to the 1990 Census is spoken by 95% of its residents. Of those residents who speak languages other than English at home, the 1990 Census reports that 57% of U.S. residents above the age of four speak English “well too very well”. The United States is also, however, home to millions of national origin minority individuals who are limited in their ability to speak, read, write, and understand the English language. The language barriers experienced by these LEP persons can result in limiting their access to critical public health, hospital and other medical and social services to which they are legally entitled and can limit their ability to receive notice of or understand what services are available to them. Because of these language barriers, LEP persons are often excluded from programs or experience delays or denials of services from recipients of Federal assistance. Such exclusions, delays, or denials may constitute discrimination based on national origin, in violation of Title VI.”

“LEP persons can and often do encounter barriers to health and social services at nearly every level within such programs. The primary reason for this difficulty is the language barrier that often confronts LEP persons who attempt to obtain health care and social services. Many health and social service programs provide information about their services in English only. Many LEP persons presenting at hospitals or medical clinics are faced with receptionists, nurses and doctors who speak English only, and often interviews to determine eligibility for medical care or social services are conducted by intake workers who speak English only.”

“The language barrier faced by LEP persons in need of medical care and/or social services severely limits their ability to gain access to these services and to participate in these programs. In addition, the language barrier often results in the denial of medical care or social services, delays in the receipt of such care and services, or the provision of care and services based on inaccurate or incomplete information. Services denied, delayed, or provided under such circumstances could have serious consequences for an LEP patient as well as for a provider of medical care. Some states recognize the seriousness of the problem and require providers to offer language assistance to patients in certain medical care settings.”

“The U.S. Supreme Court, in *Lau V. Nichols*, 414 U.S. 563 (1974), recognized that recipients of Federal financial assistance have an affirmative responsibility, pursuant to Title VI, to provide LEP persons with meaningful opportunity to participate in public programs. In *Lau v. Nichols*, the Supreme Court ruled that a school system’s failure to provide English language instruction to students of Chinese ancestry who do not speak English denied the students a meaningful opportunity to participate in a public educational program in violation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.”

“In addition, the same criteria should be used as is provided in the Dymally-Alatorre Bilingual Services Act: The Dymally-Alatorre Bilingual Services Act, Cal Gov’t Code § 7290 Et seq., requires state and local agencies to provide bilingual services to limited English proficient residents and to those who speak no English. The Act recognizes that “the effective maintenance and development of a free and democratic society depends on the rights and ability of its citizens and residents to communicate with their government and the right and ability of the government to communicate with them. Cal Gov’t Code § 7291 The Act also acknowledges that the provision of bilingual services “provide[s] for effective communication between all levels of government in this state and the people of this state who are precluded from utilizing public services because of language barriers. Id. Under the Act, the State must hire sufficient bilingual personnel to ensure the same level of services to non-English speaking persons as is available to English-speaking person’s seeking such services. Cal Gov’t Code § 7296.4 The contractors for the Healthy Families Program will be held to the same standards that the State requires for its department to fully comply with the Dymally-Alatorre Service Act Cal Gov’t Code § 7290, § 7291, § and Cal Gov’t Code § 7296.4.”

“The 1973 Dymally-Alatorre Bilingual Services Act required that every State department directly involved in providing public services employ bilingual staff or interpreters when a substantial portion of their clientele is limited or non-English-speaking. In 1977, the legislature added to the Act a section which mandates that materials explaining services in English be translated into non-English languages spoken by a substantial number of the service population. Another important addition was the definition of “substantial” as 5% of the service population of any local office or facility of a State agency. This set the standard for determining the minimum number of bilingual contacts required to mandate the establishment of bilingual positions.”

“The Act defines “public contact position” and establishes State departments’ authority to determine which positions have interaction with the public in the performance of the agency’s functions. A general description of public contact services provided by State departments includes: casework services; administrative, informal and formal hearings; criminal and civil investigations; Institutional services to students, patients, residents and inmates; and the licensing and certification of Individuals or facilities as required by statute.”

In addition to the laws or statutes already cited, there are other California laws that mandate the need for equal delivery of services to limited and non-English speaking patients.

SENATE BILL 1840, CHAPTER 672, HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE, SECTION 1259

§ 1259. General acute care hospitals; Interpreters and bilingual professional staff.

- “The Legislature finds and declares that California is becoming a land of people whose languages and cultures gives the state a global quality. The Legislature further

finds and declares the access to basic health care services is the right of every resident of the state, and that access to information regarding basic health care services is an essential element of that right.”

Therefore, it is the intent of the Legislature that where language of communication barriers exist between patients and the staff of any general acute care hospital, arrangements shall be made for interpreters or bilingual professional staff to ensure adequate and speedy communication between patients and staff.

- As used in this section:

1. *“Interpreters’ means a person fluent in English and in the necessary second language, who can accurately speak, read, and readily interpret the necessary second language, or a person who can accurately sign and read language. Interpreters shall have the ability to translate the names of body parts and to describe competently symptoms and injuries in both languages. Interpreters may include members of the medical or professional staff.”*

- “Language or communication barriers” means:

1. *“With respect to spoken language, barriers which are experienced by individuals who are limited-English-speaking or non-English-speaking individuals who speak the same primary language and who comprise at least 5 percent of the population of the geographical area served by the hospital or of the actual patient population of the hospital. In cases of dispute, the state department shall determine, based on objective data, whether the 5 percent population standard applies to a given hospital.”*

In addition, Los Angeles County policy cannot violate the Hill-Burton Act. The following is a description of that act: HILL – BURTON ACT

Under the Hill – Burton Act, facilities that have received federal funds undertake a “community service” assurance that last forever. 42 U.S.C 291 et Seq. § 124.603 Provision of services.

“(a) General. (1) In order to comply with its community service assurance, a facility shall make the services provided in the facility or portion thereof constructed, modernized, or converted with Federal assistance under title VI or XVI of the Act available to all persons residing (and, in the case of facilities assisted under title XVI of the Act, employed) in the facility’s service area without discrimination on the ground of race, color, national origin, creed, or any other ground unrelated to an individual’s need for the service or the availability of the needed service in the facility. Subject to paragraph (b) (concerning emergency services), a facility may deny services to persons who are unable to pay for them unless those persons are required to be provided uncompensated services under the provision of Subpart F.”

It is our understanding the OCR has held that the requirement of nondiscrimination contained in Hill-Burton requires hospitals to address the needs of non-English speaking patients.

Finally, with regards to tort liability if services are not provided or the staff is not competent to perform the services, it is LACCEA’s and LACHMA’s recommendation that the following criteria should be considered:

TORT LIABILITY

It is our belief that when providers perform medical procedures on individuals with whom they have never effectively communicated, who have no understanding of the consequences of the procedure, the potentials for tort liability are endless. It is our understanding the National standards set by the Joint Committee on Accreditation of Hospitals, the Joint Committee on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations and the National Committee on Quality Assurance all call for the use of linguistically appropriate services. It is our view that violation of these standards, as well as simple common sense, indicate that failing to overcome language barriers to health care could constitute professional negligence.

LACCEA and LACHMA have long been concerned about the County of Los Angeles’s commitment to policies and staffing that provide equal delivery of services to the Spanish language-speaking community. We have for the least the last 20 years advocated for the recruitment, hiring, and promotions of certified bilingual Spanish-speaking staff so that there will be equal delivery of services to limited and non-English speaking members of the public that utilize Los Angeles County services. We have met with Los Angeles County government Department Heads over the years stressing the importance of this issue. We have a strong concern as to whether Los Angeles County has been in the past and is presently sensitive to this issue. Approximately 80% to 90% of the language needs in this County are for services in Spanish. Certified Spanish-speaking staff should perform that service. In the Los Angeles Unified School District, over 90% of the children who are limited English proficient are Spanish-speaking children.

In order for the county to provide equal delivery of services to Spanish-speaking clientele and other language minority clientele in compliance with Federal and State laws, LACCEA and LACHMA are asking you to direct your department heads to exempt bilingual certified employees in their departments from layoffs and demotions. Such a policy would demonstrate that the county wants to provide equal delivery of services to the Spanish-speaking community and other language minority populations.

We respectfully request that you direct each department head to provide us with a report detailing each department’s bilingual staffing by work location and how each department’s bilingual staffing could be impacted by the impending demotions or layoffs and their plan of action for ensuring equal delivery of services to non and limited English-speaking patients and clients. We would like a copy of these Departmental plans for ensuring equal delivery of services to their limited and non-English speaking patient and client population sent to us within 20 business days.

Sincerely,
Alan Clayton
Director of EEO
LACCEA

Andy Martinez
President
LACHMA

LACCEA Files Historic Section 2 Federal Voting Rights Complaint with the Voting Rights Section of the United States Department of Justice Against the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors

By Alan Clayton
Director of EEO

Los Angeles County Chicano Employees Association

On November 5, 2003 the Los Angeles County Chicano Employees Association, with approximately 1060 Los Angeles County employee members, filed a Section 2 Federal Voting Rights Administrative complaint with the Voting Rights Section of the United States Department of Justice charging that the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors districts adopted in 2001 violated the Federal Voting Rights Act.

This complaint is supported by the following Latino organizations (1) the National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials, (2) the Mexican-American Bar Association of Los Angeles County, (3) the California Latino Redistricting Coalition, (4) the Los Angeles County Hispanic Managers Association, (5) the Los Angeles Chapter of the Mexican-American Correctional Association, (6) the American-G.I. Forum, the United States and California Department, (7) the Los Angeles County Latino Prosecutors Association, (8) the Los Angeles County Latino Public Defenders Association, (9) the Los Angeles City Employees Chicano Association, (10) the California Hispanic Chambers of Commerce, (11) the Latino Coalition for Fair Reapportionment, (12) Hispanics for Fairness in the Media, (13) the Los Angeles Chapter of the Personnel Management Association of Aztlan, (14) Nosotros, (15) the Hispanic-American Police Command Officers Association (Los Angeles Chapter), (16) the Council of the Mexican-American Administrators (LAUSD), (17) the Latin Business Association, (18) Café De California, (19) Los Angeles Chapter, National Association of Hispanic Nurses, (20) State Mexican American Correctional Association, and (21) California Latino Medical Association.

Los Angeles County is the largest county in the United States with over 9,500,000 people. Los Angeles County Latino population in 2000 was over 4,000,000 and in the year 2000 44.6% of the population was Latino. Los Angeles County's budget is over 17 billion dollars and the county employs over 85,000 employees of Los Angeles County. It is important to note that the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors has not appointed a Latino to the department head position in any of the largest county departments in the last 10 years. The major county departments that currently do not have a Latino Department Head include the Department of Health Services, the Department of Children and Family Services, the Fire Department, the Road Department, the Department of Public Social Services, the Department of Mental Health, and the Probation Department. Other departments without a Latino Department Head include the Chief Administrative Office, County Counsel, the Office of the Public Defender, the Department of Human Resources, Public Library, Register-Recorder, Superior Court, the Treasurer and Tax Collector, and the Office of the Affirmative Action Compliance. In addition, Latinos are severely under represented in management and policy positions throughout the various county departments.

Professor Leo Estrada, a redistricting expert, made the following statement about LACCEA's Board of Supervisors Redistricting plan in a letter to the Voting Rights Section of the United States Department of Justice:

"The LACCEA proposed map for the Los Angeles Board of Supervisors represents a dramatic departure from the County adopted Plan. The LACCEA Plan requires that one re-think how communities are structured in Los Angeles County. The LACCEA Plan re-defines communities of interest and acts to preserve those communities."

"The population variance is within the 10% deviation that the Courts have allowed for local governments. Much of the deviation is caused by keeping cities intact. For example, the LACCEA Plan split only 6 cities out of 88. It is inevitable that the City of Los

Angeles be split given its geographic breadth. The cities of Long Beach, Torrance, and Lomita are split to remove the more Democratic voter portion from District 4. This city-split helps to maintain the current Republican and Democratic voter percentage in District 4. In addition, a significant African American population in North Long Beach is moved into District 2. Finally, the City of Glendale and Duarte are split on a partisan basis."

"The LACCEA map proposes two districts with Spanish-surname voter registration figures of 44.6% for District 1 and 46.9% for District 3. This being Southern California, the remainder of both districts has large numbers of multiple ethnic groups. The largest group, Whites, have a voting strength under 35% in the LACCEA District 1 and under 37% in LACCEA District 3. By comparison, the Board of Supervisor approved Plan has one district with 59% Spanish-surname voter registration (District 1). The next highest Spanish-surname voter strength is 21.2% (District 4). Importantly, the LACCEA proposed Plan avoids the over-concentration of Latinos in one district. The 1990s demonstrated that "packing" is an issue that is exacerbated in highly populated Latino districts over the decade due to population growth."

"Redistricting is a political process and the proposed LACCEA Plan challenges the existing political situation. Current incumbents may strongly disagree with the LACCEA's innovative approach. However, the LACCEA proposed Plan is a well-crafted map that used the most recent Court guidelines for redistricting. The LACCEA Plan gives a very high priority to preserving cities, avoids packing minorities into a single district, and keeps major geographic regions together. This Plan also endeavors to maintain the current partisan voter registration balance."

Additionally, LACCEA's complaint is not the first time that Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors districts have been challenged as being in violation of Section 2 of the Federal Voting Rights Act. In 1990, Los Angeles County was found to have violated the law by its fragmenting of Latino voters in its 1981 Board of Supervisors map. In 1990, the Voting Rights Section of the United States Department of Justice stated in a brief, filed with the United States Supreme Court, that the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors in 1981 could have drawn one district with a Spanish-surname voter registration from 44.0% to 46.0%, however it chose to draw in 1981 two districts each with a Spanish-surname registration of approximately 23.0%.

LACCEA is requesting that the Voting Rights Section of the United States Department of Justice fully investigate LACCEA's Latino Section 2, Federal Voting Rights complaint. LACCEA is confident that after investigation that they will find that the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors violated Section 2 of the Federal Voting Rights Act in their 2001 adopted Board of Supervisors districts. LACCEA hopes then that the United States Department of Justice will file in federal court a Section 2 Federal Voting Rights lawsuit designed to overturn the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors 2001 adopted districts.

This lawsuit, if successful, will empower Latinos living in Los Angeles County and will give the Latino community an opportunity to receive equal employment opportunities and equal delivery of services from Los Angeles County government. It will also give the Latino community an opportunity to elect candidates of its own choice to two Board of Supervisor districts instead of one Board of Supervisor district. Currently, Latinos have not achieved these goals. We believe that this is the largest voting rights challenge being filed with the Voting Rights Section of United States Department of Justice on behalf of the Latino community.

This lawsuit if successful could result in a huge benefit to all county employees by electing a strong pro-labor Supervisor from LACCEA's proposed District 3 which is located in the San Gabriel Valley. This district's data show that the voters would be both heavily Latino and pro-labor. The Latino population in District 3 would be almost 61.0% and the Spanish-surname voter registration would be 46.9% in 2001 and would probably be approximately 50.0% by the 2006 primary election. The election of a pro-labor board member could lead to better union contracts and the appointment of a civil service commissioner who is a proponent of employee rights instead of being pro-management.

Press Conference and Other Budget Activity

By
Alan Clayton
Director of EEO

On Tuesday, February 10, 2004 the Los Angeles County Chicano Employees Association, in conjunction with the Los Angeles Chapter of the Mexican American Correctional Association, held a very successful press conference on the steps of the Board of Supervisor Chambers. We had four television stations (Channel 5, 7, 34, & 52), two newspapers and one radio station cover our event.

Approximately 25 to 30 Latino Probation Department employees, who are members of MACA and LACCEA, attended our press conference. We explained to the media that 1,700 Probation Department employees could be laid off if the Governor's budget cuts stands. We also discussed the programs that would be curtailed if the Governor's TANF-Fund reduction stayed in the final budget.

The LACCEA has also been meeting with elected officials over the budget cuts and its affect on critical county programs and staff. We plan to continue our meetings with elected officials.

**Get Your LACCEA
T-Shirt Today!**



Only \$10.00 Each

COLOR: BLACK OR WHITE

SIZES: L, XL, 2XL, 3XL, 4XL

Shirts are available for pick-up only. Call us at (626) 458-2314 to reserve your t-shirt.

Note: All new members receive a free LACCEA T-Shirt. To become a member give us a call at (626) 458-2314.



LACCEA

2200 S. Fremont Ave., Suite 201
Alhambra, CA 91803
(626) 458-2314 • Fax (626) 458-2317
www.lacountychicano.org

ADDRESS CORRECTION REQUESTED.
PLEASE DO NOT FORWARD.