



Rising together to make things happen....

North Hills Phoenix Association

NEWS

Vol. 9 No. 3 October 2000

NHPA P.O. Box 20784, Oakland CA 94620
(510) 273-9111 E-Mail: INFO@NHPHOENIX.ORG
WEB SITE [HTTP://WWW.NHPHOENIX.ORG](http://WWW.NHPHOENIX.ORG)

NHPA President Glenn Hammonds

Nine years after the fire that devastated the North Hills it may seem surprising that managing accelerated development is a major emerging issue, but a quick look at this issue of the newsletter tells the story. Developments in Vicente Canyon and on Grizzly Peak have raised concerns even as the City prepares to revamp its Residential Design Review policies (see articles by David Kessler, Steve Renten and Anne Seasons). The role played by Area Specific Plans such as NOHASP and possibly a new Vicente Canyon Plan has come up in the context of these and other developments, as has erosion control (see articles by Don Pierce and Fred Booker). Realizing that development will happen in our area, the goal is to make sure it is planned for sensibly, safely, and in a way that maximizes the quality of life that makes the hills a place we want to come home to. Now is the time to let our voices be heard on these issues, to familiarize ourselves with the details of the issues, and to work with the City and prospective developers while there is still an opportunity to make a difference. See for example, Steve Renten's article on Park and Trail Opportunities. Planning for development ties into the ongoing issues of fire safety, vegetation management, and blight mitigation as well as local, specific problems of construction debris and construction parking. As usual, check our web site (nhphoenix.org) for the latest on these and other issues and to find out how to participate in shaping the future of your Hills neighborhood.

The North Hills Phoenix Association will elect a new slate of officers in January at our annual membership meeting, and this the last newsletter of my term as President before the election. I would like to use this opportunity to thank you, the members of the NHPA, for your support of the organization, and urge you all to continue that support. We have in NHPA a unique and vigorous example of neighborhood involvement, action, and community spirit which I find rare and valuable. Though there were many heartaches and much loss associated with the fire in which our organization was forged, one clear benefit for me, and I think for many others, was the opportunity (well,

OK, necessity) it afforded us to come together as a community and discover and act for our common interests. With the continued building and repopulation of the hills the memory of that fire grows dimmer, and the number who share that memory fewer, but what I hope will continue despite the passage of time is the legacy of involvement and action which NHPA upholds.

It has been my distinct privilege to serve with an extraordinary group of people, the steering committee of the NHPA, and it is that group, rather than any single officer, that embodies the long term future of the North Hills Phoenix Association. I would urge all of you with an interest in community affairs in Oakland, quality of life in our neighborhood, and a free Monday night a month, to consider serving on the steering committee. Hoping to see you at our membership meeting in January,

Glenn Hammonds

Zoning Standards: One Size Fits All?

Are you aware that the City of Oakland is revising the Zoning Standards and Design Review Guidelines and Procedures for one and two unit residential buildings? The City Council had set December, 2000 as the deadline, however, as of the writing of this article there is still some debate over a few of the recommendations. In order to meet the December deadline the City Council must approve the conceptual zoning standards and procedures on October 17 and send it back to the Planning Commission to write the zoning text and guidelines. It is unclear the direction the Council will take at the October 17 meeting.

The Working Committee has been working for three years to develop the residential design review program. Key provisions include (1) combining the ten tracks of the current design review process into one citywide uniform track, (2) eliminating regular design review, including notification of neighbors, for projects that meet the new standards, and (3) relying on building envelope standards e.g., height limits, setbacks and building depth, to address issues such as view, privacy and solar access impact.

If standards and procedures interest you, you can get a copy of the current recommendations by calling Christopher Buckley at 238-6983. You can call me as your newly appointed representative to the Working Committee. I am interested in hearing your thoughts. I can be reached at 510-841-2389 or anneseasons@onebox.com.

– Anne Seasons

North Oakland Hills Area Specific Plan

As we look around the Oakland Hills and enjoy the beauty of the last remaining open spaces, one cannot help but wonder how long will it be before developers build out every last private parcel. Fortunately, for the citizens of Oakland, the City was able to acquire large tracts of this land as ‘open space’ for all to enjoy. However, much of the currently undeveloped land we enjoy is in the hands of real estate developers. Every citizen should be concerned about how we can protect these private lands from unreasonable speculative development. We should seek to ensure that these pristine areas be developed with a focus on integration with the environment and not to allow developments to detract from the intrinsic beauty of the Oakland hills.

Although the City has numerous zoning ordinances, they oversee only basic architectural design criteria for general construction, they are not intended to affect an overall sensitivity to the hill environment. Recognizing the need for increased oversight, in 1986 Oakland passed a development plan empowering the City with additional controls to address some of these issues. This detailed set of ordinances is called the North Oakland Hills Area Specific Plan or more commonly referred to as NOHASP.

NOHASP was created with the intent of managing future housing development in the higher elevations of the North Oakland Hills, primarily along the Grizzly Peak and the Skyline corridors. The major intent of NOHASP was to permit private development in a manner that reflected a deliberate sensitivity to the unique hill environment, ecology, and utility infrastructure. In order to achieve a balance between private development and the existing hill environment, NOHASP ordinances focus primarily on allowable building density, vegetation and ecology preservation, and view protection.

In managing future housing density in these hill areas, NOHASP outlined, parcel by parcel, the approximate number and location of all future dwellings. The allowable dwelling density was based primarily on the natural topography of the parcels and access from existing roadways. Additionally, in an effort to retain the feel of openness and to preserve many of the spectacular views, individual building locations were specified within each parcel to create ‘protected view corridors’.

Unfortunately, today NOHASP is being challenged by an ever-increasing number of developers who are dissatisfied with the predefined building density limitations. Every day we hear about developers, who are determined to amend NOHASP in their favor and seek to increase the mandated housing density limits. Amending NOHASP is no easy task. It requires both Planning Commission and City Council approval. But even with those challenges, the financial incentives are quite strong for speculative development.

If you are concerned about retaining the intent of NOHASP, please write your city council representative, the Planning Commission, or the NHPA. Let’s continue to demand reasonable and sound development within the hills of Oakland and to request that the City maintain the integrity of the North Oakland Hills Area Specific Plan.

– Donald Pierce

Skyline Developments

There are 3 developers working on the west side of Skyline Blvd. between Broadway Terrace and the junction of Tunnel Road and Skyline Blvd. Their property totals over 35 acres. Presently the area is zoned for about 16-20 houses, but the magnitude of the investments and the current pace of the real estate markets will probably increase the pressure to build up the density. As many long-time residents know, the zoning and density levels in this area were chosen after careful consideration of the infrastructure and the safety needs of the area. The concessions and regulations were spelled out in a document called NOHASP. The 1991 fire increased our awareness of how dangerous the area is, given the narrow roads, limited evacuation routes and lack of fire fighting water reserves.

Normally this situation would be a precursor to a royal kerfuffle over the interests of the neighborhoods versus the interests of the developers. However, these developers seem to be respecting the existing zoning limits and have not been requesting a steady stream of variances. Some of the neighbors have questions about the size of the planned houses, but they are being accepted by the City and aren’t blocking views, so it isn’t clear how long the objections will be sustainable.

There is one other developer group in the area; its efforts have been stymied by a group of concerned citizens, who are sticking with the existing zoning and City Officials who are keeping the laws and needs of the neighborhoods upper most in their considerations. This developer group is still struggling with the concept that laws mean what they say. They are also still trying to persuade the City and the neighbors that 3 = 7 or maybe 3 = 5, reflecting the fact that the zoning specifically allows 3 houses in the area and they want to put in 7 or maybe 5. They also want to access their project from Skyline and not Grizzly Peak Blvd. The authors of NOHASP felt the burden of fire fighting and evacuation would best be split between

these routes and allocated lots for this parcel from Grizzly. The developers think they can make more money by imposing some of the costs of their development on the local residents and leaving us with additional risks and that seems to sum up their values. So far it hasn't worked.

Open Space and Trails Opportunities

The reason all the development on Skyline hasn't yet shaped up to be a battle royale is because the builders on the west side of the road are supportive of some of the Park and Trail concepts that the adjoining neighborhoods believe in and because they are willing to site development where it might make the most sense, economically, environmentally and socially instead of every where they can cram in a giant house. A group of neighborhood associations including the North Hills Phoenix Association, Skyline Blvd. Neighborhood Association, Grizzly Peak Neighborhood Association, Grizzly Peak Estates Neighborhood Association, Citizens for Oakland's Open Space and Claremont Ridge Association (formerly the Alliance of Gwin Highlands and Claremont Knolls) are engaged in a unique effort to jointly plan the future use of this area.

The Park and Trail values are expressed in the Oakland General Plan and the Open Space and Recreation Element in considerable detail. The development groups and the associations noted above are jointly bringing those values to the planning effort. We have created a committee that we are calling the North Oakland Open Space and Trails Coalition to pursue these objectives. I am part of that committee and we are actively conducting discussions with the developers. If you would like more information, you can contact me, or your representatives in the associations noted above and they can put you in contact with the committee.

– Steve Renten
510-654-7497

Erosion Control

In the last issue of the NHPA newsletter I talked generally about landslides and the relationship between slope, vegetation, and water. Knowing a little bit about the kinds of landslides that can occur here in the Oakland–Berkeley Hills is all very well, but how do we know if our properties have the potential for problems and what can we do when faced with one close at hand? Obviously, the most important thing is to be aware of your environment. If you live at the base of a hill be aware of what is above you. Is there a topographic depression above, below, or on your property? These areas typically have deeper soils and are the most prone to failure on steep slopes under certain rainfall conditions. Know where you drain your urban runoff and that of your neighbors so that if need be, you can move drainage pipes so water doesn't concentrate in these swales or hollows. Be aware of wet areas

on your land, especially if it is occurring in the summer months or of seeps that occur during winter rainfall. Are there vegetation types such as sedge grasses that suggest continually moist soils on your property? It is surprising how much more water is available since we lost most of our mature vegetation during the 1991 fire. If the wetness is pervasive and persistent then contact a geologist for advice as to your available options. For small areas of wet soils one can plant trees or shrubs to make use of the excess soil water.

If a small landslide does occur on your property what can you do about it? The most popular approach has been to put plastic sheeting over the slide area so as to keep the soils as dry as possible. If you choose to do this there are certain things one should be aware of (despite the logic in this it is surprising how many people get it wrong). When putting the plastic over the slide area do not use stakes to hold down interior portions of the plastic sheeting (stakes make holes). Rather, use stakes around the perimeter and from these stakes suspend partially filled sandbags with ropes to keep the plastic in place. Two years ago a large slide developed on the hill slope behind Schooner Hill in Hiller Highlands. A contractor placed several plastic sheets over the slide area holding it in place with wooded stakes and sandbags. The stakes were placed every 10-15 feet apart and a sandbag was placed at each stake to act as a weight. Unfortunately, the stake provided a hole and the sandbag provided enough weight to create a depression towards which water flowed. So rather than keeping the slide area dry, the mitigation acted to increase the amount of water to critical parts of the slide resulting in increased erosion (although the mitigation continued to look good from a distance).

Another factor to consider is maintenance. Winds blow and the plastic sheeting tends to come apart despite the best of intentions. If a continuous barrier is not maintained then the effect of the plastic is to collect water from a large area, concentrate it, and then drain it to a small area resulting in saturated soils that could become unstable. Additionally, when collecting rainfall on large plastic sheets one needs to consider where is this water going to go and what are the consequences of concentrating water to a downhill location? Also, when entering the soil it also acts to reduce water leaving the soil by evaporation. When the weather is nice the plastic acts as a barrier to soil water evaporation resulting in wetter soils over time. As such, in most cases it might be best to leave the plastic on the shelf unless its use is warranted.

Be a good property owner, think before you act and cooperate with your neighbors.

– Fred Booker

Vicente Canyon

On Thursday, September 7, some 60-80 neighbors and City Staff attended a meeting, hosted by City Council member Jane Brunner about development in Vicente Canyon. Critical factors in development issues are zoning laws and design review guidelines. Oakland is currently considering major revisions of these. Since Jane Brunner's community meeting on Saturday Oct. 14th between 10 AM and Noon at Peralta School will focus on these revisions, we deferred in-depth discussion on this important component. Tom Haw (tomhaw@vanguardgroup.com) is Jane's representative on the group which has been considering revisions.

City Staff made an initial presentation, including an overview of the proposed new design review guidelines; an explanation of the City's Creek protection ordinance; a run-down on the current status of projects on creekside properties in our area (there are currently no permits filed for properties considered at risk); suggestions for interim controls on development in the area; and an enumeration of the advantages and disadvantages of an Area-Specific Plan.

Dozens of neighbors spoke, expressing their frustration and outrage with the many invasive disturbances and disruptions caused by ongoing development. We addressed numerous highly specific issues. Among the key points were widespread unhappiness with the City's baffling notification practices; toleration of widespread illegal parking and littering around construction sites which creates both danger and ugliness; monster homes, homes built without adequate street parking; concerns about landslides and inadequate attention to slide problems before plans are approved; the continuing failure to achieve adequate vegetation management on City tracts and in Claremont Canyon; attempts by developers to elude controls in general and grading restrictions in particular; the destruction of newly paid roads by construction vehicles; and most importantly, the City's lack of credibility because of its failure to enforce its own regulations. Among the positive suggestions was Steve Renten's announcement of an ongoing effort to preserve undeveloped areas and create a greenbelt of parkland and trails.

Obviously, what happens from this point on is what is most critical. Is it best to proceed with the expensive and time-consuming development of an Area Specific Plan, or are we likely to get equal or better protections more quickly and cheaply by relying on expanded controls, such as the interim ones proposed by City Staff?

One major concern is the ability and willingness of City Staff to properly enforce existing regulations. Clearly there are good regulations on the books. Do they comprise an adequate starting point for protecting Vicente Creek and rebuffing inappropriate types of development? Could we collaborate with the City to strengthen regulations, and add the critical

coherence needed in the review of permit applications to slow or halt the invasive madness plaguing the neighborhood and which catalyzed the calling of the meeting?

We could and should not have made so important and complex a decision on the evening of Sept. 7. Jane Brunner's office will convoke a meeting of a smaller group to consider the best way to proceed, now that we have had a chance to air many of the problems, and see some of the ideas the City has offered to help address neighborhood concerns. That meeting has been scheduled for 9 A.M. on Thursday, September 28th.

– David Kessler

Report of September 28 Meeting

A meeting was held at City Hall on 9/28/00 with Megan Van Sant (Jane Brunner's Assistant), Calvin Wong & Willie Yee of CEDA and residents of the North Hills regarding development of Vicente Canyon.

Concerns and opinions expressed at the 9-28-00 meeting:

- 1) Protection of the creek and mature vegetation is needed. A 30' buffer zone on either side of the creek was proposed but not discussed. Need to consider mature eucalyptus as other than a weed. (The person to talk to about this issues is Dan Galleger of Park & Rec 510-615-5850 or 5856; they are currently looking at changes to Park & Rec's policy regarding tree removal).
- 2) Inability of homeowners to review development plans. Willie Yee said he could provide a copy of design review plans to be kept at the Rockridge library (This is a step in the right direction, we need to follow up on this to make sure it happens).
- 3) Mixed feelings regarding development. Some people are not as concerned about the size of homes as others. I have looked over a City review of Floor Area Ratios (FAR) of recent building plans for fire area homes which reveals that of 65 homes only 14 exceed 4000 sq. ft. of which 3 exceed 5000 sq. ft. However, of the 53 homes which have a calculated floor area ratio, 25 exceed the City's suggested FAR of 0.5. This means that almost 50% of the recent homes are oversized for their lots, yet only 6 of these 53 homes exceeds 4000 sq. ft. in size. So, are we being inundated by monster homes, or can a 3000 sq. ft. home be too big if it is built on a 5000 sq. ft. lot, or is a 5000 sq. ft. home a monster home if it is built on a 20,000 sq ft lot? Where does your home fit in the mix? For homeowners willing to send me their data fred@geomorph.com (Address, residence, garage and lot size) I am willing to update the City's spreadsheet so we have a better understanding of our neighborhood. Having hard numbers as to the character of our neighborhood will help our

cause with the City in upholding stricter floor area ratios.

4) The need for erosion control standards. It is not enough to talk about aggressive erosion control; the City needs to hold contractors to a standard that we can check against. It was suggested that ABAG's Manual of Standards for Erosion & Sediment Control Measures be used.

5) Purchasing the development rights for the remaining large parcels within Vicente Canyon. Is it possible for a large landowner to donate development rights to a non-profit for a tax write-off?

6) Some neighbors voiced their desire for an Area Specific Plan (ASP) similar to that of the North Oakland Hills Area Specific Plan (NOHASP). Can neighborhood objectives be met using Floor Area Ratios, Interim Controls and Revisions to the Design Review Process? City staff has expressed that they would not support an ASP for Vicente Canyon for the reasons of time, cost, and the political implications of the plan.

Overall, I think very little was accomplished at the 9/28/00 meeting as we were not able to focus on what we want to do and until we do so it will be hard to discuss the ways in which to accomplish our goals. So, with this in mind several objectives have been suggested by concerned citizens:

1) We each write up a concise list of exactly what we want done, what peeves us about the process and also the specific lots you are concerned about and what those concerns are.

2) We need people to focus on aspects of development:

a. There have been suggestions that NOHASP is outdated and open for review and termination in the future. What is our position to be? Why?

b. Floor Area Ratios: we need more neighborhood-specific data so we can characterize where we are and what is appropriate for future development. Include garage space?

c. The proposed Interim Controls and Design Review Revisions (see NHPA web page), will it change the character of the neighborhood or the impact of future development?

d. Park and Rec regarding their tree policy. Should developers be able to come onto a site and clear cut large areas without any controls? Should mature eucalyptus be protected?

e. Monitoring erosion control practices at major construction sites this winter to ensure that debris and sediment does not end up in the creek.

f. We need people to research and understand the environmental issues. What are the laws, best practices, and recommendations regarding creek, wetland and wildlife habitats in this area? Should we, in the interests of the long-term neighbor-

hood, try to establish open space? Are people willing to donate money to a conservation fund to buy sensitive areas within the canyon?

g. A major failing in mitigating building bulk has been the lack of appropriate landscaping. Can we define a landscape character for our neighborhood that is both fire safe and meaningful for the Hills area?

– Fred Booker

Local Elections

The North Hills Phoenix Association sent letters to Henry Chang Jr. and Rebecca Kaplan, candidates for Councilmember-at-Large for Oakland, and to Joyce Roy, candidate for AC Transit Director and Roy Nakadegawa, candidate for BART director. Following are letters that were sent and the replies. Mr. Nakadegawa also included various documents which may be read on our web page. Alan Johnson (BART) and Greg Harper (AC Transit) were contacted but did not reply.

Dear Ms. Kaplan and Mr. Chang:

Because we think the City Council election is of vital importance to our community, The North Hills Phoenix Association is interested in publishing a brief statement from you in our fall newsletter. We live in the northeast section of Oakland, roughly the area bounded by Highways 24 and 13. The early October issue will reach about 1000 homes. I enclose a copy of our latest issue, which is also available at our website www.nhphoenix.org.

Because our area was largely destroyed in the 1991 Oakland Hills Fire and is still in the process of being rebuilt, vegetation management and zoning/planning issues are of great interest to us. Because we are in direct proximity to the Caldecott Tunnel, the proposed Fourth Bore is also an important issue for area residents

Although we are glad that we now have a fire station in our area, unsafe accumulations of vegetation in Claremont Canyon to the north, as well as poorly maintained City owned-properties within our area are significant fire threats. Do you envision the City Council devoting more resources to vegetation management throughout the Oakland Hills?

Oakland is currently revising its Zoning and Design Review procedures. But only with the diligent application of good regulations can monster homes, drainage and erosion problems, and excessive development be prevented. Do you have any thoughts on how City Departments can be adequately staffed and encouraged to defend our neighborhoods and keep our hills and waterways healthy and attractive?

We have had numerous discussions about the proposed fourth bore of the Caldecott Tunnel. Construction would severely

impact our area; the long-term affects on traffic congestion and urban sprawl are a cause for concern to many of us. Do you think an additional Tunnel bore would benefit Oakland?

Sincerely,
David Kessler
Vice-President, North Hills Phoenix Association

Reply from Henry Chang Jr.

In 1964, my family lost our Oakland hills home and family dog to an electrical fire that burned my two-year old house to the ground. My wife and I had four young children at the time, and I will never forget it. I understand firsthand the tragedy of losing a house to fire. There are ways in which the city and the community can work together to decrease the potential for another firestorm and preserve neighborhood character, and I will continue my work to devote the necessary resources to these efforts.

I supported the Creek preservation ordinance, and I support an increase in vegetation management and blight enforcement as ways that we can reduce the risk of fire. I am working with councilmember Jane Brunner to identify resources for this effort.

I established the Zoning and Design Review board two and a half years ago because current zoning and design review procedures for new homes need revision. We need to establish and enforce objective guidelines, such as floor area ratio and mass limitations, as well as view protection for established homes to protect neighborhood character.

I do not see the proposed fourth bore for the Caldecott Tunnel as a solution to traffic congestion. Alternative modes of transportation must be considered, and there must be an extensive environmental impact report before any further exploration. In the short term, I support an increase in local bus service to the hills.

– Henry Chang, Jr.

Reply from Rebecca Kaplan

Thank you very much for sending me your newsletter, and inviting me to share my thoughts with your neighborhood association. I am running for the at-large seat on the Oakland City Council in order to bring attentive, responsive government to the city of Oakland, and will continue to make myself available to community groups, both throughout the campaign and when I am in office. I am the only candidate committed to serving full-time, without conflicts of interest, time or loyalty (since councilmembers receive a full-time salary, it is reasonable to expect this). I will bring to the city council my dedication, along with my education and training, including a Master's in Urban and Environmental Policy, a law degree from Stanford, and work experience in the Oakland office of the California State Assembly, the City of Cambridge Commission on the Status of Women, and legal work on issues of civil rights, labor, housing, and environmental law.

I am eager to work together with NHPA to ensure the safety and quality of the neighborhood. In terms of the specific questions in your letter, the following are my positions:

I oppose a fourth bore in the Caldecott Tunnel (it would negatively impact our environment and surrounding communities).

I support substantial improvements in Oakland vegetation management to reduce fire threats, including replacing fire-prone non-native species, and increasing brush-abatement efforts

I oppose runaway overdevelopment, and believe that we should use strong design review and zoning regulations (including enforcement) to protect the neighborhood from fire damage, continued soil erosion, excess traffic, etc. I will work to make it clear to city staff that our priority is to protect the safety and integrity of existing neighborhoods, not to approve new developments at any cost

By practicing fiscal responsibility, and avoiding costly business mistakes, we can provide sufficient funding to strengthen the above-mentioned programs without increasing our overall budget.

Rebecca Kaplan for Oakland City Council, at-large
(November 7th election) www.rebeccakaplan.org
E-mail: rebeccak@igc.org tel: 510-653-5884

Letter to Roy Nakadegawa, candidate for BART Director

Dear Mr. Nakadegawa:

Because you are running for BART Director in our neighborhood, the North Hills Phoenix Association would like you to contribute to our fall newsletter. We live in the northeast section of Oakland (bounded by Highways 24 and 13). This early October Newsletter issue will reach about 1000 homes. I am enclosing the last issue. In addition, a copy is published on our website. You can learn more about us at this website: www.nhphoenix.org.

We only have one bus line, the number 6, in our area. It only serves us on weekdays in the mornings and afternoons and only reaches some of the residents. The line runs irregularly and for most people is not a practical way to get to BART. Since we live so far away, we must drive to the Rockridge BART station. As you know it is almost impossible to find a parking space after 8:30 AM. I am enclosing a letter that we sent to our City Council last winter.

We are inviting you and your opponent to answer a question of concern to us. The question is:

Parking at our nearby BART Station, Rockridge, fills up around 7:30 AM and on-street parking places are almost non-existent after 8:30 AM. How do you propose to solve our parking problem?

– Howard Matis
North Hills Phoenix Association

Reply from Mr. Nakadegawa

To answer your question on Parking access to BART for me is a complex question in that as a professional engineer I take a comprehensive view and it would be difficult to answer in just two paragraphs. I enclose an OpEd article that I wrote on parking which I sent to the Contra Costa Times about two weeks ago which somewhat relates my position on parking that I am also sending as an attachment. In addition, I sent a letter to the City of El Cerrito regarding a feeder transit service in lieu of parking and a memo to BART Board and staff on my recent trip to Portland whose feeder transit service provided excellent access to their rail system. (These articles can be found on our web site www.nhphoenix.org.)

In general, I strongly feel BART should charge at least \$2 per day to offset the inequity of many lower income people in central cities who, in order to use BART, have to pay additional bus fare of about \$2. With some of the parking revenue collected we could fund more feeder transit.

– Roy Nakadegawa PE

Letter to AC Transit Candidate Ms. Joyce Roy

Because you are running for AC Transit Director in our neighborhood, The North Hills Phoenix Association would like you to contribute to our fall newsletter. We live in the northeast section of Oakland (bounded by Highways 24 and 13). This early October issue will reach about 1000 homes. I am enclosing the last issue. In addition, a copy is published on our website. You can learn more about us at this website, www.nhphoenix.org.

We only have one bus line, the number 6, in our area. It only

serves us on weekdays in the mornings and afternoons and only reaches some of the residents. Prior to 1995 the bus ran regularly every 15 minutes from morning to evening. Because our neighborhood is so steep, a half-mile walk is too far for many people. In fact, most people in our neighborhood live too far from the bus line.

We are inviting you and your opponent to answer a question of concern to us. The question is:

Our transportation needs are difficult to meet as we have a limited population that lives over an extended geography. How can AC Transit help the North Hills community and keep within the tight budget of the district?

– Howard Matis
North Hills Phoenix Association

Reply from Ms. Roy

Regarding Inadequate Bus Service

Hearing that your community wants more service on the #6 Bus Line is like music to my ears. Increasing bus service would be one of my main goals as a director of AC Transit and first priority should be to increase service where people want and need it. I consider a frequency of less than 30 minutes no service at all. And it should be at least 15 minutes during commute hours. I would like to hear more from you on this or other transit issues. I can be reached at 655-7508 or through my website at www.joyceroy.org.

– Joyce Roy
Candidate for Board of Directors, AC Transit, Ward II

Check this website for more election news:
nhphoenix.org/Election2000/2000.html

Yes! I want to join/renew with the North Hills Phoenix Association. I have enclosed my annual membership fee of \$35 payable to the North Hills Phoenix Association. New _____ Renew _____

Name: _____

Address: _____

Telephone – Home _____ Office _____

Fax: _____ E-Mail _____

North Hills Phoenix Association, P.O. Box 20784, Oakland CA 94620

Phone: 510-273-9111

Although the NHPA is a non-profit organization, membership is not tax-deductible. E-Mail: nhpa@nhphoenix.org

Candidate Search

In January 2001, the NHPA elects new officers. If anyone is interested in leading the NHPA in the new millennium or if you wish to nominate anyone, please contact us by telephone, regular mail or E-mail and our nominating committee will get in contact with you.

Dues: Dues for the NHPA are \$35.00 per calendar year. Since we are a lobbying organization the dues are not tax deductible. We thank you for your support.

Alert!! As December approaches Leigh Renteria, Neighborhood Services Coordinator, reminds us that theft from mail boxes is still a problem in the Hills.

To prevent identity and mail theft:

- Promptly remove mail from your mailbox after delivery whenever possible.
- Deposit outgoing mail in post office collection mailboxes or at your local post office. Do not leave letters which contain checks in unsecured mail receptacles.
- Shred preapproved credit applications, credit card receipts, bills and other financial information you don't want before discarding them in the trash or recycling bin.
- Never leave receipts at bank machines, bank counters, trash receptacles, or unattended gasoline pumps.
- Report Identity theft to local police department and US Postal Inspection Service.

The North Hills Phoenix Association News is published by the North Hills Phoenix Association 510-273-9111. Copyright 1997 by North Hills Phoenix Association. Copying of newsletter or portions of it are permitted with attribution. The North Hills Phoenix Association is a community organization of home owners in the vicinity of State Highway 24, upper Broadway Terrace, upper Skyline Blvd. and east of Tunnel Road affected by the October, 1991 Firestorm.

NHPA Newsletter editors – Marc and Vallery Feldman

Presorted Standard
U.S. Postage
PAID
Oakland, CA
Permit No. 510

Postmaster:
Please deliver to current resident if address
is unavailable

Web site - <http://www.nhphoenix.org>

Phone - 510-273-9111

Oakland, CA 94620

P.O. Box 20784

North Hills Phoenix Association