

From: [Scanlon, Amy](#)
To: [Scanlon, Amy](#)
Subject: FW: SBA proposal - comments from MNA
Date: Monday, February 03, 2014 3:34:35 PM

From: Michael Jacob
Sent: Monday, February 03, 2014 3:25 PM
To: Stu Levitan
Cc: Scanlon, Amy
Subject: Re: SBA proposal - comments from MNA

Sorry for the committee misnomer, too many things on my mind at once! Sorry also for misunderstanding that this was set for tonight. Please pass along my apologies on these the committee for those errors.

On the 12% figure, an important omission on my part was noting a 12% reduction in the block of the proposal, not the entire district. Conceptual concern remains the same: permanent loss, the potential for what remains to be considered in the future as the "base" and the cumulative effect being lost in what may seem like modest loss per any one given proposal. Hope that clarifies appropriately.

Michael

PS - Amy, if suitable, please include this as an addendum of sorts for the public record.

On Mon, Feb 3, 2014 at 3:17 PM, Stu Levitan <stuartlevitan@sbcglobal.net> wrote:
Michael
Could you explain the reference to "12% of the structures" in the 3rd graf. My understanding is that SBA OWNS 12% or so of the structures in the MHHD, not that this project involves the removal of same.
Also, we're the Landmarks Commission, not UDC.
Thanks,
Stu