

From: [William von Kaenel](#)
To: [French, Amy](#)
Cc: [Lait, Jonathan](#)
Subject: Fwd: HRB presentation in April
Date: Sunday, March 26, 2023 3:08:15 PM
Attachments: [image009.png](#)
[image012.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image008.png](#)
[image011.png](#)
[Reply Format.pdf](#)
[HRB MFP Study Session.pdf](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Ms. French,

I'm writing to follow up on a letter Post 375 sent on Monday March 20 which is attached below. The letter seeks to clarify the presentation format and standing of the Post at the HRB study session on April 13 regarding the National Register designated Memorial Flagpole at the Julia Morgan Veterans Memorial Building (VMB).

We haven't yet received acknowledgement that Planning and Development Services has received our letter, and await guidance and an understanding on how to prepare for the April 13 meeting in order to properly present our defense of the Memorial Flagpole that we hold dear.

In our letter, Post 375 took pains to fully elaborate on our rationale for equal standing with the property owner in presenting to the HRB. This request for equal standing was necessitated by the specification of other designations to: "Interested parties, stakeholders, and other members of the public". These each suggest a minor format role incongruous with Post 375's foundational VMB heritage, instrumental role in these proceedings' initiation, and provision of a compendious report [attached], whose presentation entails commensurate time.