
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 11/7/2015 9:50:26 AM -0800
To: "Illgen, Richard" <CITY OF OAKLAND/CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE/RECIPIENTS/ILLGEN.R>
CC: [REDACTED]
Subject: 24th Street Violations

Hi Richard,

I recognize that we have not spoken previously, so hopefully you'll have the time to respond to this email, or call me at your convenience on Monday. I will be busy 1:30-3:30pm. I am free to meet in person any day this week aside from Tuesday.

I am [REDACTED] t 669/671 24th Street, one of two buildings damaged by fire on March 21st of this year. Two of our neighbors died, and the story has rightfully been making the rounds in City circles, the art and music communities, and in the media as well.

We have an exceedingly difficult landlord, Kim Marienthal, of Coldwell-Banker in Berkeley. It sounds like you and Geno have been in touch about him and my building's status. We the tenants have tried our best with Mr. Marienthal over the past seven months to convince him to comply with Geno's very simple initial requests that he follow standard City procedure to bring the building up to standards of habitability. It is a long road, to be sure, but Marienthal refuses to take even the first steps in the order that Geno wants them. He doesn't place priority on return of utilities, structural reinforcement of the burned unit, or routine inspections. Rather, his focus has been solely on clearing the building of debris and our personal possessions, and he clearly feels he does not need permits to do either of these things. As you may have seen in Marienthal's emails, he would love to evict us to have us out of his hair. As is the story with too many buildings in Oakland these days, the owner is going to use this opportunity to do capital improvements and hike up rents.

We have told Marienthal that we are happy to remove our possessions from the building pending an about-face in tactics, meaning: his immediate and continued compliance with Geno's requests, a guarantee of our right to return to the building at our current rents once completed and permitted for occupancy, a complete stop to his seven-month-long unlawful eviction crusade, and potentially funding to enable the movement of six live/work apartments' worth of personal and business assets - none of us have major personal savings here. The immediate concern, of course, is simply that Marienthal play ball with Geno, which is where I hope you can be of assistance.

Our attorney Steven Rood (who is working with Steven Schectman on this) has spoken with Marienthal's attorney Bill Segesta several times regarding the matter, and it appears that despite Steven and Bill's good terms and long professional history together, Bill is unable to reign in his client and get him to agree to some basics regarding City rebuilding guidelines.

It is my understanding from speaking with Geno that Marienthal's ongoing passive noncompliance and recent unpermitted demolition attempt have led the Planning and Building Department to seek steps towards putting the building into Receivership, or H7 status.

We the tenants would love to see some documentation or a simple summary of what Receivership means for our landlord and for us, as we have every intention of complying with your needs, but in truth we do not know how it works.

We are very interested in the timeline of this matter as well, as it has become clear in Steven and Bill's most recent conversation that Marienthal will not hesitate to send a demolition crew in to sweep the building - despite its red-tagged status. We fear this will happen in the coming days, in blatant violation of both Planning Department guidelines and our ongoing active leases.

I am CCing Steven Rood, Steven Schectman, Geno, and the thirteen surviving tenants, as I strive for transparency with all parties. However, it is just fine if you'd like to have a dialogue directly with Mr. Rood or Mr. Schectman. We'd just like to get some movement on this ASAP so we can get a game plan together.

Thanks for your time.

[REDACTED]