#6

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, January 12, 2026 3:14:47 PM
Last Modified: Monday, January 12, 2026 3:26:40 PM
Time Spent: 00:11:52

Page 1: Facilities Request Form

Q1

Contact Person:

Name	**Tonie Campbell**
Email Address	**tonie.campbell@gcccd.edu**

Q2

Department:

AKHE

Q3

Title of Request:

Cuyamaca College Lower Field Turf

Q4

Location of Request:

Lower Athletic Field

Q5

Description of Request:When making your request, please be as specific as possible and include information such as make, model, manufacturer, color, quantity, etc.

✅ Key Benefits of Artificial Turf for a College Soccer Field

I. Much greater usability and scheduling flexibility

- A synthetic turf field can handle heavy usage: while natural grass becomes worn out or needs rest after many hours of play, a turf field can support many more hours per week.
- That means the college team could support a robust rental strategy, hold more practices, scrimmages, intramurals, or camps without worrying about damaging the surface — and you could schedule events more densely (even back-to-back games).
- It also makes the field more reliable under adverse weather (rain, overuse). Turf drains better and remains playable when grass might be muddy or damaged (inclement weather and its after effects have hurt our intercollegiate teams. Typically, the team must travel offsite to a local park to practice when fields are unusable).

This higher throughput supports a stronger athletic program, more community or club rentals, and greater return on the space.

II. Lower ongoing maintenance burden and long-term cost savings (despite higher upfront cost)

- Natural grass fields require mowing, watering (irrigation), fertilizing, pest/weed control, aeration, reseeding or re-sodding, and periodic repair — all of which add up annually.
- By contrast, a turf field eliminates mowing, watering, fertilizing, and most pest control. Maintenance becomes simpler: periodic cleaning, brushing (to keep fibers upright), infill redistribution, seam/edge inspection/repair, occasional disinfection, and drainage maintenance.
- Typical reported annual maintenance for turf is much lower than for grass.
- Over its lifespan (often 8–10 years, sometimes more depending on quality), turf can prove more cost-effective, especially when factoring in increased use and rising cost of maintenance supplies.
- Also, turf saves large amounts of water (no irrigation) — especially beneficial in a climate like San Diego's - El Cajon valley, where water conservation is often important.

Overall, once installed, turf can reduce labor, equipment, water, fertilizer, and pesticide costs, freeing resources for other campus needs (coaching, training, facilities, equipment, etc.).

III. Better performance reliability — consistent playing surface, less weather disruption

- Turf yields a more uniform, predictable playing surface: even bounce, even footing, no bare patches, no uneven wear zones. That means the college's soccer team (and opponents) can expect the same play conditions each time.
- Strategically, our intercollegiate teams are at a disadvantage when training on natural turf (grass) and having to play against an opponent that practices and plays on synthetic turf. Having multiple fields, grass and synthetic fields, allows the teams to prepare adequately for the opponent's field surface material.
- Permanent markings (lines, logos) are possible, reducing the need to repaint or remark lines as often as on grass.
- Because turf drains better and recovers faster after rain (or overuse), the risk of cancellations due to poor field conditions drops significantly. That supports reliable scheduling, especially for home games, tournaments, or region wide events.

For a college like Cuyamaca, that could mean fewer rainouts, more consistent training/game schedules, and less stress or liability around field readiness.

IV. Enhanced rental and revenue potential / flexibility for non-college use

- Because turf tolerates heavy use, the college could rent out the field more frequently — for community leagues, youth camps, clubs, tournaments, or non-soccer events — without rapidly degrading the surface.
- Opens field to additional rental opportunities and events.
- This can generate additional income or justify the investment via community engagement, outreach, or partnerships.

V. Safety and liability benefits (when done well)

- A well-installed, quality artificial turf field often includes a shock-absorbing base layer, which can cushion impacts and reduce injuries from falls.

- Because the surface is uniform and free of bumps, holes, divots, mud, or bare patches, there's less risk of trips, uneven footing, and many of the surface-related hazards that lead to ankle sprains or other injuries on degraded grass fields — especially in wet conditions or heavily used zones.
- From a liability perspective, having a dependable, safe surface reduces the risk that injuries could be traced to negligence in field maintenance or lack of proper drainage/repair — especially relevant if hosting external teams, tournaments, or rentals.

🎯 What This Means for Cuyamaca College's Soccer Program

Given that Cuyamaca already has three grass soccer fields, converting one to turf — rather than all three — could offer a balanced "hybrid" model:

- The turf field becomes the "workhorse" — used for heavy training load, rentals, intramurals, exercise science courses, camps, tournaments, community rentals — maximizing hours without wearing down grass.
- The remaining grass fields preserve a "softer", more traditional, possibly lower-injury-risk surface for occasional use (e.g. men's and women's intercollegiate games, trainings, or when athletes prefer grass).
- The college gains flexibility: turf for intensive use and scheduling reliability; grass for lower-impact play, recovery, or traditional feel.

This hybrid approach can optimize both cost-effectiveness and player welfare, while giving the athletic department and campus more flexibility in programming.

From a liability and risk management standpoint: having at least one dependable, well-maintained turf field lowers the chance of cancellations due to bad field conditions, reduces wear on grass fields (extending their usable life), and avoids overloaded usage on natural turf that could lead to damage or safety hazards.

Q6

Estimated Cost:

Scenario B — Hybrid (1 turf + 2 grass)

- Up-front cost (convert 1 field to turf; assume grass fields remain in current rotation and current state: ~$550,000–$1,200,000 for the turf field.
- Maintenance over 10 years:

  - Turf field: $5,000–$15,000/yr. → over 10 years = $50,000–$150,000
  - 2 grass fields: $20,000–$50,000/yr. each → 2 × (10-year total) = $400,000–$1,000,000
  - Combined maintenance (10-year): $450,000 – $1,150,000
- Replacement (at year ~10): turf likely needs replacement (new carpet) — assume similar cost to installation: $500,000–$1,000,000
- Total 10-year cost (including replacement):

  - Low-end: $550,000 + $450,000 + $500,000 = $1,500,000
  - High-end: $1,200,000 + $1,150,000 + $1,000,000 = $3,350,000
- Playable hours (estimate):

  - Turf field: assume ~2,800 hrs. /yr. → over 10 years = 28,000 hrs.
  - Grass fields: 2 fields × 800 hrs. /yr. × 10 = 16,000 hrs.
  - Total ~ 44,000 hours over 10 years — nearly double the all-grass scenario.

Q7

Please attach quote, if available

Lower%20field%20turf.docx (26.1KB)

Q8

Total Cost of Ownership:check all that apply

Replacement (Life Cycle),

Maintenance Cost

Q9

Please explain your plan to maintain this request:

🔄 Scenario B — Hybrid (1 turf + 2 grass)

- Up-front cost (convert 1 field to turf; assume grass fields remain in current rotation and current state: ~$550,000–$1,200,000 for the turf field.
- Maintenance over 10 years:
  - Turf field: $5,000–$15,000/yr. → over 10 years = $50,000–$150,000
  - 2 grass fields: $20,000–$50,000/yr. each → 2 × (10-year total) = $400,000–$1,000,000
  - Combined maintenance (10-year): $450,000 – $1,150,000
- Replacement (at year ~10): turf likely needs replacement (new carpet) — assume similar cost to installation: $500,000–$1,000,000
- Total 10-year cost (including replacement):
  - Low-end: $550,000 + $450,000 + $500,000 = $1,500,000
  - High-end: $1,200,000 + $1,150,000 + $1,000,000 = $3,350,000
- Playable hours (estimate):
  - Turf field: assume ~2,800 hrs. /yr. → over 10 years = 28,000 hrs.
  - Grass fields: 2 fields × 800 hrs. /yr. × 10 = 16,000 hrs.
  - Total ~ 44,000 hours over 10 years — nearly double the all-grass scenario.

Q10

Justification of Request:Please select the applicable criteria below and provide the details how the criteria relate to your request.

Support College Mission/Strategic Plan,

Health/Safety/Security Issues,

Growth of department/work area,

Demonstrate need for continuous quality improvement of department/work area

,

Provided details::

✅ Key Benefits of Artificial Turf for a College Soccer Field I. Much greater usability and scheduling flexibility • A synthetic turf field can handle heavy usage: while natural grass becomes worn out or needs rest after many hours of play, a turf field can support many more hours per week. • That means the college team could support a robust rental strategy, hold more practices, scrimmages, intramurals, or camps without worrying about damaging the surface — and you could schedule events more densely (even back-to-back games). • It also makes the field more reliable under adverse weather (rain, overuse). Turf drains better and remains playable when grass might be muddy or damaged (inclement weather and its after effects have hurt our intercollegiate teams. Typically, the team must travel offsite to a local park to practice when fields are unusable). This higher throughput supports a stronger athletic program, more community or club rentals, and greater return on the space. 🎯 What This Means for Cuyamaca College's Soccer Program Given that Cuyamaca already has three grass soccer fields, converting one to turf — rather than all three — could offer a balanced "hybrid" model: • The turf field becomes the "workhorse" — used for heavy training load, rentals, intramurals, exercise science courses, camps, tournaments, community rentals — maximizing hours without wearing down grass. • The remaining grass fields preserve a "softer", more traditional, possibly lower-injury-risk surface for occasional use (e.g. men's and women's intercollegiate games, trainings, or when athletes prefer grass). • The college gains flexibility: turf for intensive use and scheduling reliability; grass for lower-impact play, recovery, or traditional feel. This hybrid approach can optimize both cost-effectiveness and player welfare, while giving the athletic department and campus more flexibility in programming. From a liability and risk management standpoint: having at least one dependable, well-maintained turf field lowers the chance of cancellations due to bad field conditions, reduces wear on grass fields (extending their usable life), and avoids overloaded usage on natural turf that could lead to damage or safety hazards.

Cuyamaca College Lower Field Turf

Converting one of the three grass soccer fields at Cuyamaca College to artificial turf could offer a number of strategic, safety, and financial advantages — but also some trade-offs. Below I outline the main benefits and considerations for the college, especially related to safety, liability, rental and scheduling flexibility, and long-term costs.

✅ Key Benefits of Artificial Turf for a College Soccer Field

I. Much greater usability and scheduling flexibility

- A synthetic turf field can handle heavy usage: while natural grass becomes worn out or needs rest after many hours of play, a turf field can support many more hours per week.
- That means the college team could support a robust rental strategy, hold more practices, scrimmages, intramurals, or camps without worrying about damaging the surface — and you could schedule events more densely (even back-to-back games).
- It also makes the field more reliable under adverse weather (rain, overuse). Turf drains better and remains playable when grass might be muddy or damaged (inclement weather and its after effects have hurt our intercollegiate teams. Typically, the team must travel offsite to a local park to practice when fields are unusable).

This higher throughput supports a stronger athletic program, more community or club rentals, and greater return on the space.

II. Lower ongoing maintenance burden and long-term cost savings (despite higher upfront cost)

- Natural grass fields require mowing, watering (irrigation), fertilizing, pest/weed control, aeration, reseeding or re-sodding, and periodic repair — all of which add up annually.
- By contrast, a turf field eliminates mowing, watering, fertilizing, and most pest control. Maintenance becomes simpler: periodic cleaning, brushing (to

keep fibers upright), infill redistribution, seam/edge inspection/repair, occasional disinfection, and drainage maintenance.

- Typical reported annual maintenance for turf is much lower than for grass.
- Over its lifespan (often 8–10 years, sometimes more depending on quality), turf can prove more cost-effective, especially when factoring in increased use and rising cost of maintenance supplies.
- Also, turf saves large amounts of water (no irrigation) — especially beneficial in a climate like San Diego's - El Cajon valley, where water conservation is often important.

Overall, once installed, turf can reduce labor, equipment, water, fertilizer, and pesticide costs, freeing resources for other campus needs (coaching, training, facilities, equipment, etc.).

III. Better performance reliability — consistent playing surface, less weather disruption

- Turf yields a more uniform, predictable playing surface: even bounce, even footing, no bare patches, no uneven wear zones. That means the college's soccer team (and opponents) can expect the same play conditions each time.
- Strategically, our intercollegiate teams are at a disadvantage when training on natural turf (grass) and having to play against an opponent that practices and plays on synthetic turf. Having multiple fields, grass and synthetic fields, allows the teams to prepare adequately for the opponent's field surface material.
- Permanent markings (lines, logos) are possible, reducing the need to repaint or remark lines as often as on grass.
- Because turf drains better and recovers faster after rain (or overuse), the risk of cancellations due to poor field conditions drops significantly. That supports reliable scheduling, especially for home games, tournaments, or region wide events.

For a college like Cuyamaca, that could mean fewer rainouts, more consistent training/game schedules, and less stress or liability around field readiness.

IV. **Enhanced rental and revenue potential / flexibility for non-college use**

- Because turf tolerates heavy use, the college could rent out the field more frequently — for community leagues, youth camps, clubs, tournaments, or non-soccer events — without rapidly degrading the surface.
- Opens field to additional rental opportunities and events.
- This can generate additional income or justify the investment via community engagement, outreach, or partnerships.

V. **Safety and liability benefits (when done well)**

- A well-installed, quality artificial turf field often includes a shock-absorbing base layer, which can cushion impacts and reduce injuries from falls.
- Because the surface is uniform and free of bumps, holes, divots, mud, or bare patches, there's less risk of trips, uneven footing, and many of the surface-related hazards that lead to ankle sprains or other injuries on degraded grass fields — especially in wet conditions or heavily used zones.
- From a liability perspective, having a dependable, safe surface reduces the risk that injuries could be traced to negligence in field maintenance or lack of proper drainage/repair — especially relevant if hosting external teams, tournaments, or rentals.

⚠️ Trade-offs, Risks, and Considerations

It isn't all upside. There are real trade-offs and challenges, which the college should weigh carefully before conversion.

- Up-front cost is substantial. Installing a standard full-size turf soccer field often costs in the range of $500,000–$1,000,000, depending on turf quality, sub-base preparation, drainage, infill, labor, and other factors.
- Lifespan and replacement costs. Most turf fields require replacement every 8–10 years (or depending on wear), which again involves disposal, base work, new turf, etc. That replacement itself can be expensive.

- Maintenance isn't zero. While lower than grass, turf still requires regular maintenance: cleaning, brushing, infill management, seam inspection, drainage upkeep, and occasional repairs.
- Possible safety/performance trade-offs. Some critics argue that turf is firmer than natural grass, which can increase risk of certain injuries (especially joint stress, "turf-toe," or knee issues) — depending on the turf system, footwear, and maintenance.
- Surface heat in warm / sunny weather. Turf can get significantly hotter than grass in direct sun, making summer practices or games potentially uncomfortable or unsafe without mitigation (cooling, shade, hydration, scheduling). In all honesty, this would be my greatest concern. However, having a sprinkler system available to cool the surface before an activity works well for many colleges with similar issues that Cuyamaca might incur.

So the decision isn't trivial: you trade higher up-front cost and eventual resurfacing for long-term flexibility, lower recurring costs, and scheduling/usage advantages.

🎯 What This Means for Cuyamaca College's Soccer Program

Given that Cuyamaca already has three grass soccer fields, converting one to turf — rather than all three — could offer a balanced "hybrid" model:

- The turf field becomes the "workhorse" — used for heavy training load, rentals, intramurals, exercise science courses, camps, tournaments, community rentals — maximizing hours without wearing down grass.
- The remaining grass fields preserve a "softer", more traditional, possibly lower-injury-risk surface for occasional use (e.g. men's and women's intercollegiate games, trainings, or when athletes prefer grass).
- The college gains flexibility: turf for intensive use and scheduling reliability; grass for lower-impact play, recovery, or traditional feel.

This hybrid approach can optimize both cost-effectiveness and player welfare, while giving the athletic department and campus more flexibility in programming.

From a liability and risk management standpoint: having at least one dependable, well-maintained turf field lowers the chance of cancellations due to bad field

conditions, reduces wear on grass fields (extending their usable life), and avoids overloaded usage on natural turf that could lead to damage or safety hazards.

💡 Recommendation: What to Evaluate If Cuyamaca Moves Forward

If the college seriously considers this conversion, I'd recommend evaluating and planning for the following:

1. Up-front capital and funding — plan for $500K–$1M per field, including sub-base, drainage, infill, installation, and permits.
2. Long-term maintenance and replacement costs — set aside funds for periodic infill replacement, seam repair, eventual full replacement every 8–12 years.
3. Turf specification — choose a high-quality turf system designed for soccer (with proper shock pad, drainage, infill), and ideally a turf certified for athletics use.
4. Heat mitigation and safety protocols — especially relevant in sunny San Diego: consider watering, shade structures, scheduling practices outside hottest hours, or turf-cooling measures if needed.
5. Liability oversight and maintenance plan — assign staff, train, or contract with a turf-maintenance vendor for regular inspection, cleaning, infill redistribution, seam repair; document maintenance to reduce liability risk.
6. Usage plan / scheduling policy — map out how the three fields (1 turf + 2 grass) will be used (intercollegiate soccer team, exercise science and intramurals, rentals, camps, community use) to maximize benefits and avoid overuse of any single field surface.

✅ In Summary

Converting one of Cuyamaca College's soccer fields to artificial turf could yield significant benefits: increased usage hours, reduced long-term maintenance and water costs, more reliable scheduling (especially in inclement weather), and expanded rental/revenue potential — while maintaining some grass fields preserves flexibility and player preference. It also helps mitigate wear and tear across all fields and reduces the risk of cancellations or poor field conditions.

To follow, here is an estimated 10-year cost-benefit projection for Cuyamaca College, comparing “all-grass,” “one-turf plus two-grass,” and “all-turf” scenarios (with estimated costs, savings, and usage capacities).

📊 Assumptions & Cost / Usage Benchmarks (per field Based on industry data for soccer / football-size fields):

Usage capacity (playable hours): Some sources estimate that a turf field can support many more hours of use than grass. For example: ~2,800 hrs. /year for turf vs ~800 hrs. /year for grass (in a hypothetical comparison). That's a 3–4× increase in usable hours per year.

🔄 Three Scenarios for Cuyamaca College (over 10 years)

Because Cuyamaca currently has three grass fields, there are three potential model scenarios for consideration:

- Scenario A – All 3 remain natural grass ("All-grass")
- Scenario B – Convert 1 field to turf, keep 2 grass ("Hybrid: 1 turf + 2 grass")
- Scenario C – All 3 converted to turf ("All-turf")

For simplicity, we shall assume each field is of similar size/quality, usage is spread equally across fields, and usage increases if turf is available. For this purpose, I shall neglect: revenue from rentals, inflation, and interest rate on capital, possible grants/subsidies, or opportunity cost. This is a "straight cost and usage" baseline.

📈 Scenario A — All-Grass (3 fields)

- Up-front cost: Assume existing fields already paid for — we consider just maintenance over 10 years.
- Maintenance cost range (3 fields):
    - Low end: 3 × $20,000 = $60,000/year → 10-year total = $600,000
    - High end: 3 × $50,000 = $150,000/year → 10-year total = $1,500,000

- Playable hours (approximate): If each grass field ~800 hrs./year → 3 fields → ~2,400 hours / year; over 10 years → ~24,000 hours

Thus over 10 years, estimated cost: $600K–$1.5M, ~24,000 playable hours.

🔄 Scenario B — Hybrid (1 turf + 2 grass)

- Up-front cost (convert 1 field to turf; assume grass fields remain in current rotation and current state: ~$550,000–$1,200,000 for the turf field.
- Maintenance over 10 years:
    - Turf field: $5,000–$15,000/yr. → over 10 years = $50,000–$150,000
    - 2 grass fields: $20,000–$50,000/yr. each → 2 × (10-year total) = $400,000–$1,000,000
    - Combined maintenance (10-year): $450,000 – $1,150,000
- Replacement (at year ~10): turf likely needs replacement (new carpet) — assume similar cost to installation: $500,000–$1,000,000
- Total 10-year cost (including replacement):
    - Low-end: $550,000 + $450,000 + $500,000 = $1,500,000
    - High-end: $1,200,000 + $1,150,000 + $1,000,000 = $3,350,000
- Playable hours (estimate):
    - Turf field: assume ~2,800 hrs. /yr. → over 10 years = 28,000 hrs.
    - Grass fields: 2 fields × 800 hrs. /yr. × 10 = 16,000 hrs.
    - Total ~ 44,000 hours over 10 years — nearly double the all-grass scenario.

🎯 Scenario C — All-Turf (3 fields)

- Up-front cost: 3 × ($550,000–$1,200,000) = $1,650,000 – $3,600,000
- Maintenance over 10 years: 3 × ($5,000–$15,000/yr.) = $150,000 – $450,000
- Replacement at year ~10: 3 × ($500,000–$1,000,000) = $1,500,000 – $3,000,000
- Total 10-year cost (including replacement):
    - Low-end: $1,650,000 + $150,000 + $1,500,000 = $3,300,000
    - High-end: $3,600,000 + $450,000 + $3,000,000 = $7, + ~$7,050,000
- Playable hours (estimate): 3 turf fields × 2,800 hrs./yr. × 10 = ~84,000 hours

🔎 Interpretation — Cost per Hour & Value

How the three scenarios compare on "cost per hour of use over 10 years":

- All-grass: $600,000–$1.5M / ~24,000 hours → $25–$62 per hour
- Hybrid (1 turf + 2 grass): $1.50M–$3.35M / ~44,000 hours → $34–$76 per hour
- All-turf: $3.30M–$7.05M / ~84,000 hours → $39–$84 per hour

These ranges are broad because of variability in maintenance practices, turf quality, usage levels, and actual replacement costs.

Under many plausible mid-range assumptions, the hybrid scenario roughly doubles usable hours compared to all-grass, with a modest increase (or even similar) in cost per hour — making it more efficient if the additional hours are valuable (practices, rentals, community use, etc.).

If Cuyamaca can fill the additional capacity (i.e. schedule more practices, host rentals, camps, tournaments, community leagues), the hybrid approach gives the "best of both worlds": a reliable, high-capacity turf field AND the flexibility/softer surface of grass.

✅ Qualitative Considerations (Beyond Just Costs)

- Flexibility & Throughput: The hours-used assumptions assume turf allows many more hours/year. In reality, that increased capacity enables more practices, intramurals, rentals (youth leagues, community groups), camps, etc. That may generate revenue or at least greater utilization.
- Water, labor, and resource savings: Turf removes need for mowing, watering, fertilizing, pest control — which for a college in a region like San Diego can be significant (especially water cost). This is built into maintenance savings in the table.
- Reliable scheduling / inclement weather resilience: More consistent field availability under turf — fewer cancellations due to muddy or worn grass. This reliability has intangible value: less disruption, more dependable scheduling for practices/games/rentals.
- Replacement cost planning: Because turf needs replacement ~ every 10 years, the college must plan for the capital expense — but this also offers a known timeline for budgeting and renewal.
- Hybrid advantage: Having both turf and grass preserves options: turf for heavy-use, rain/practice/rental; grass for lighter use, traditional feel, possibly reduced joint impact.

💡 What This Suggests for Cuyamaca College

- If Cuyamaca envisions significantly increasing usage (more practices, intramurals, community rentals/leagues, camps), then converting 1 field to turf (Scenario B) likely gives the best "bang for buck." You nearly double usable hours vs all-grass, while keeping at least two grass fields for variety and lower-impact use.
- If the college moves away from our facility rental policy and only needs moderate use (e.g., a few team practices and occasional games), staying all-grass might remain the most cost-effective over 10 years — especially at the low end of maintenance. However, this does not address our key issue of playing fields for inclement weather scenarios.
- Going "all-turf" (Scenario C) offers maximum capacity and scheduling flexibility, but the 10-year capital outlay is large; this only makes sense if there is sustained high demand (rentals, camps, constant use) — or a plan to amortize via revenue-generating rental events. There are other concerns that

would need to be evaluated for this scenario. Risk of injury, temperature, blood borne pathogens, etc. would strongly need to be considered.

- The hybrid model provides a balanced approach — flexibility, capacity, resilience — with more predictable long-term budgeting (especially if turf replacement is anticipated and reserved for).

📝 Limitations / What This Projection Doesn't Capture

- This proposal assumed generic "typical U.S." costs and usage; real local costs (labor, water, utilities, usage demand) will alter results.
- Potential revenue — e.g., rental income, camp fees, community leagues. In reality, these could offset a large part of the cost, especially under the hybrid or all-turf scenario.
- Inflation, interest rates, replacement-cost escalation, regulatory or environmental costs (e.g., disposal of old turf), and maintenance staff turnover are not included.
- This proposal does not attempt to model injury risk, athlete wear & tear, liability, or medical costs — though those could be very relevant.
- Assumption of equal "wear" across fields and equal usage distribution; real use patterns will vary (e.g., some fields may be preferred, some may be used more heavily, etc.).

✅ My Recommendation (Based on This Model)

It is my recommendation for Cuyamaca College — and given likely value in increased usage, flexibility, rentals, and scheduling reliability — to adopt the hybrid model: convert one of the three fields to turf, keep two as grass. This gets the majority of the benefits of turf (capacity, reliability, maintenance savings) while preserving grass for lower-impact use, athlete preference, and surface variety. The Hybrid Model provides the most balanced, cost-effective approach over a 10-year horizon under realistic assumptions.