

Mr Patrick Sharpe

Section 7A (%) Or the to

Federal Trade Commission Washington, D.C. 20580

Re:

Premerger Notification
Compliance under Hart-Scott-Rodino Act

Dear Mr. Sharpe:

contemplated second transaction. This letter sets forth the facts as obtained from our client,

I. FACTS

The real property proposed to be acquired by

consisting of a nortion of land which has been naved and laft

space. The remaining part of the building is used as a warehouse by the contractor pending conversion of the building

Mr. Patrick Sharpe Premerger Notification Office November 30, 1990 Page 2

into office space. Parking spaces are also available in the

Summary of	Teaseahle Property	Percent of	Percent of	
warehouse	78,972	17.96%	18.96%	
Parking	213,440	48.55%	19.65%	
Rear Yard	<u>33,626</u>	07.65%	01.11%	
TOTAL	439,646	100.00%	100.00%	
When the coprojected :	onversion of warehous rentable areas will b	se to office i	s completed, the	
055		_		•

Office Space 153,370 square feet Warehouse Space 65,622 square feet Roof Deck Parking Space 263,428 square feet 482,420 square feet

used as a warehouse. Property B is owned by two parties as tenants in common, a limited partnership on the one part and two individuals on the other part. The two individuals are the

The parties are still in the process of negotiating the sale and purchase and the price may be adjusted pursuant to those continuing negotiations.

The contemplated transactions described above are real property transactions. Purchaser intends to continue the development of the property originally begun by the seller of the property. The transactions are not structured for the

Mr. Patrick Sharpe Premerger Notification Office November 30, 1990 Page 3

purpose of avoiding reporting requirements under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Act (the "Act").

II. DISCUSSION

use, the value of the non-office function of the property would be approximately 39.72%. If this percentage is then applied to the purchase price of \$28.5 million, the value of the property attributable to non-office use would be \$11,320,200. Since the areas used for functions other than office or residential use are valued at \$15 million or less, it is our understanding that the contemplated acquisition of Property A would be exempt from the requirements of the Act.

However, if were to also purchase Property B for \$5.5 million, and the percentage of Property B owned by the Owner of Property A is applied to the purchase price, the value of Property B attributable to the same owner would be \$2.86 million. This amount, even if aggregated with the value of Property A which is not exempt, still be below the threshold of \$15 million as an acquisition from the same party.

III. CONCLUSION

<u>Under the facts set forth above, the transaction</u>

would not be required to file a Notification and Report Form.

Furthermore, even if the value of the non-exempt portion of Property A were aggregated with the value of that

Accordingly, the transactions are not subject to the requirements of the Act and no premerger notification will be required by the parties.

This letter is being sent to confirm that our understanding of the reporting requirements under the Act as

Mr. Patrick Sharpe Premerger Notification Office November 30, 1990 Page 4

set forth above is correct. If our understanding is not possible.

is required, the parties would like to schedule closing before the end of December, 1990.

<u>314 kironah abya kumpa</u>nahdan da madili pendan nambdah ka

I will be out of town next week, but expect to be back at my office on Friday, December 7, 1990. Your response by then will be deeply appreciated. If it is determined that

Thank you very much for your continuing assistance in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

cc:

T concor called (12-72-90