

From: Robert Guynn <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, February 9, 2022 2:05 PM
To: Christina Turner <Christina.Turner@morganhill.ca.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] PUBLIC MAP 103

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Mayor and City Council Members,

You have a choice- to interpret that redistricting statute narrowly or broadly. How you chose will have great impact on the drawing of our electoral districts.

Interpret the statute narrowly and you are sending out a message that the legislature absolutely mandated and intended that District boundaries have to be 100% contiguity. A narrow interpretation divides Districts B and D, two very important and unique communities of interest, and recouples them into extremely dissimilar communities of interest, when it is impossible to achieve because of county land dividing the areas. Also, you will also set back the historically marginalized minority community to 2017, when District B was drawn to capture the downtown corridor community of interest and to increase the chances that a member of the historically marginalized minority communities will be elected to the council.

Interpret the statute broadly and you are sending a message that the legislature did not mandate 100% contiguity when it cannot be achieved and that it intended to protect minority community. A broad interpretation is a public declaration you want to protect District B and D's very important community of interests and draw the boundary lines to encapsulate each respective district and to protect the increased probability that a member of the historically marginalized minority communities will be elected.

The city attorney interpreted the statute narrowly. But his interpretation is just an opinion that you can weight. His opinion does not carry the force of law. The city attorney's declarations that public map 103 is "illegal" and that if you adopt Map 103 the California Attorney General would come and sue Morgan Hill are nothing but extraneous statements that he should not have made- not when he is interpreting a legislative statute that has never been interpreted by a court. He has a duty to the community and the Council to render opinions that are fair and objective. His extraneous comments were unnecessary and not fair and objective to citizens and council members who support Public Map 103.

Why should we citizens not have a right to declare District D contiguous if its areas are separated by county land and not water and the areas are connected by Highway 101 and a vast network of county roads to allow the movement of people between the areas? Applying that principle would enable us to draw the district lines around very important communities of interests and protect the voting rights of minority groups. Only because the city attorney says that it does not apply because the legislature did not specifically write that it applied? Well, it also did not declare that it did not apply. So again, the City Attorney wants you to apply the principle narrowly but you can certainly apply it broadly.

It is sad to see that our city attorney is so narrowly interpreting every part of the statute that would allow you to consider and select Public Map 103, even when he knows that the results would be to completely divide two very important communities of interest and to redraw them in such a way that unites two dissimilar communities of interests. He should provide correct instructions to the Council that you are free to select whichever map you deem would be for the best of the Morgan Hill

community and he would be legally obligated to defend your decision on the map the majority of three you select, including Map 103.

I hope that three of you interpret the statute broadly in the best interest of the community and to ensure that a member of historically marginalized minority communities has a greater chance of being elected to the council. I believe that Public Map 103 is best for Morgan Hill.

Thank you,

Robert L. Guynn

Resident of Morgan Hill

Thanks Christina 😊