

April 6, 2015

**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Foothills Clusters Homeowners Association Board of Directors

**FROM:** Dale Prescott, Chairman, Landscape & Roads Committee

**SUBJECT: Roads Rehabilitation/Renovation Recommendation**

The Landscape & Roads Committee was charged by the board with evaluating, recommending and soliciting bids on a project to rehabilitate/renovate the privately owned streets of the Foothills Clusters.

During this process five options were considered to a greater or lesser degree:

- Do nothing but patch and leave the streets as they are.
- Overlay the present streets with a double chip seal.
- Overlay the present streets with two inches of new asphalt.
- Mill off the current asphalt and integrate it into the current base and repave with two to three inches of new asphalt.
- Mill off the current asphalt and repave with two to three inches of new asphalt.

During its' deliberations the committee consulted with or reviewed the following:

- ✓ Bob Reuss, a property owner and resident whose background is concrete paving and engineering.
- ✓ David Cummings, an engineer with the Pima County Department of Transportation.
- ✓ David Garrett, a resident of Casas la Ventana, a planned community that recently replaced their streets.
- ✓ A feasibility study dated July 28, 2008 performed by Design Construction Consultants (DCC) commissioned by the board.

The evaluation of the pros and cons of the various options along with the rationale for rejection or recommendation are as follows:

1. Do nothing but patch and leave the streets as they are. This is by far the cheapest alternative and the committee has requested permission to solicit bids for repairs not to exceed \$15,000. The primary purpose of this step is to protect the base from further damage. The fact remains that the streets are approximately forty years old and have far exceeded their life expectancy. The committee rejects this option.
2. Overlay the present streets with a double chip seal. The unanimous opinion of everyone consulted is that is an expensive cosmetic process. It would provide no functional improvement to the streets and would provide a modest benefit for one or two years. The committee rejects this option.

3. Overlay the present streets with two inches of new asphalt. This appears to be the least expensive of the “major” options but presents unique challenges. All of the streets would need to be saw cut and a portion removed to provide a smooth transition with Evans Mountain/Ventana Canyon roads. Also, all water valves and manholes would have to be raised level with the road surface. The fate and/or requirements of the survey monuments is unknown at this time. This process would create an additional two inch lip at driveways, especially relevant in the case of hard surface driveways. It also would increase damage at the edges where vehicles go on and off the paved surface. This option has a life expectancy of five to eight years but eventually all of the “alligating” in the current pavement would come through the new road surface. The committee rejects this option.
4. Mill off the current asphalt and integrate it into the current base and repave with two to three inches of new asphalt. This is the most expensive option we considered. Both David Cummings with PCDOT and David Garrett the homeowner from Casas la Ventana do not recommend this option. The rationale is that even though the current base may be over native soil, it has been compacted for nearly forty years and any disturbance of the base would do more harm than good. The exception to this would be in areas where pavement deterioration is so severe that the base needs to be reworked or replaced. The committee rejects this option.
5. Mill off the current asphalt and replace with two to three inches of new asphalt. This option would remove the current surface material without disturbing the base and lay down new asphalt at a depth of two to three inches. This option would provide a road surface with a life expectancy of twenty-five to thirty years for the most reasonable cost. This is the option that the committee recommends.

There are many other issues that must be addressed either in the Request for Proposal or under separate cover including but not limited to:

- Elevation of manholes and water valves.
- Preservation and/or elevation of survey monuments
- Replacement of flood control berms located at the top of some of our private driveways
- Mitigation of roadside vegetation
- Anything else we haven’t thought of yet

Based on the board’s acceptance of the committee’s recommendation or the provision of an alternative recommendation, the committee will develop a Request for Proposal for submittal to qualified vendors.