



[Redacted]

Fwd: Fw: [LaBreaHancock] Fw: Important: Prevent Marginalization of GWNC, Hancock Park and Windsor Square

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

----- Original Message -----

Subject: Fw: [LaBreaHancock] Fw: Important: Prevent Marginalization of GWNC, Hancock Park and Windsor Square

Date: Sat, 23 Jul 2011 12:54:20 -0700

From: clifton <[Redacted]>

To: <[Redacted]>

----- Original Message -----

From: [Pickel, Frederick H.](#)

To: [clifton](#)

Sent: Monday, July 18, 2011 1:32 PM

Subject: RE: [LaBreaHancock] Fw: Important: Prevent Marginalization of GWNC, Hancock Park and Windsor Square

Cliff,

Please send your comments to [Redacted] – they're the ones who need to get the message from as many people as possible.

Regards,

Fred

From: [Redacted] On Behalf Of clifton

Sent: Saturday, July 16, 2011 3:28 PM

To: [Redacted]

Subject: Re: [LaBreaHancock] Fw: Important: Prevent Marginalization of GWNC, Hancock Park and Windsor Square

Dear Group,

I have yet to understand why it is that a particular group of people, who seem to me to be politically motivated to assume they know best about public situations such as this and feel it is their duty to upset several generations of inhabitants of neighborhoods within particularly happy and well established areas by intending to disrupt those associations by not only **threatening** to change the established boundaries, but actually **intending to change** those boundaries. If the inhabitants of those areas desire that the boundaries remain as presently established, they should by all means be safe to remain as currently established. Those who threaten to change the status quo should tuck their tails between their legs and leave, i.e., leave well enough alone. They should go away and make someone else unhappy if that is their mission. If their mission is to improve an unwanted condition in their view, they should take another look, and another look, and another look as necessary and do what is needed to satisfy the inhabitants. The final solution may not necessarily be the best for those pushing the changes, but it may be the best under the circumstances to satisfy the inhabitants of the affected areas - who after all is said and done are the ones that pay the taxes.

Clifton H. Clark

[REDACTED]

----- Original Message -----

From: [Pickel, Frederick H.](#)

To: [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]

Sent: Thursday, July 14, 2011 6:15 PM

Subject: [LaBreaHancock] Fw: Important: Prevent Marginalization of GWNC, Hancock Park and Windsor Square

Please let the redistricting commission hear we want to keep our neighborhood intact as a voting and political district. If you support this, hit "Reply to All" and add your comments.

From Fred Pickel

Tel [REDACTED]

From: Jack Humphreville <[REDACTED]>

To: [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]

Sent: Thu Jul 14 21:03:28 2011

Subject: Important: Prevent Marginalization of GWNC, Hancock Park and Windsor Square

Dear Greater Wilshire, Hancock Park, and Windsor Square stakeholders â€œ

If you agree with the following, click reply all, add any comments if you so desire (not necessary), and then hit send.

Your reply is important.

We need your help so that we are not completely marginalized in future California elections. Please forward this message to the California redistricting commission. Ask them to fix our boundaries. The address to send your email is [REDACTED]

1. **Who We Are.** We are voters who live in the community known as Greater Wilshire in Los Angeles. Our community includes 15 residential associations with histories dating back nearly 100 years. Our two largest and best known neighborhoods are Hancock Park and Windsor Square. Our eastern boundary is Western Avenue. Our western boundary is La Brea Avenue. You have proposed to split us in half at Plymouth Boulevard in your draft redistricting maps.

2. **The Redistricting Mission.** You are obliged to keep our century-old neighborhood intact in your redistricting effort, pursuant to the following governing rule: "*The geographic integrity of any city, county, city and county, neighborhood, or community of interest shall be respected to the extent possible without violating the requirements of any of the preceding subdivisions. Communities of interest shall not include relationships with political parties, incumbents, or political candidates.*"

3. **Required Corrections to Draft Maps:**

a. **State Board of Equalization.** Please return us to the LA district for the State Board of Equalization. We lie at the midpoint of Los Angeles, but you have inexplicably removed us and placed us in a district called East, where we claim no community of interest.

b. **Congressional Districts.** In each of the 3 options, you have divided us in half at Plymouth Boulevard. We belong with WLADT. The westernmost boundary of ELABH should not begin until Western Avenue.

c. **Assembly Districts.** In both of the 2 options, you have divided us in half at Plymouth Boulevard. We belong with LAMWS or with LADNT, but the entirety of Greater Wilshire from La Brea Avenue to Western Avenue must be included in one or the other, not both.

Signed, Your Greater Wilshire Neighbors

John Welborne, Jane Usher, Liz Fuller, Jack Humphreville, Owen Smith, Wendy Savage, Cindy Chvatal-Keane, John Gresham

[Reply to sender](#) | [Reply to group](#) | [Reply via web post](#) | [Start a New Topic](#)

[Messages in this topic](#) (1)

RECENT ACTIVITY:

- [New Members 5](#)

[Visit Your Group](#)