Yes: 5 - Member Cowan, Member Schaufler, Member AlderseBaes, Member Knepper and Member Marsden

Absent: 2 - Member Watkins and Member Zollinger

20709-25 Reconsideration of Artificial Turf Study (Previously Tabled)

Presenters: Wendy Parker

Attachments: A - ESB Comments on Artificial Turf Study

Public comment was made by:

Lisa Reader
Melissa Arias
Carol Bronisz
Wendy Burke-Ryan

approval

Yes: 4 - Member Cowan, Member Schaufler, Member AlderseBaes and Member Marsden

Absent: 2 - Member Watkins and Member Zollinger

No: 1 - Member Knepper

20725-25 Presentation on North Mesa Recreation Area Master Plan

Presenters: Wendy Parker

Attachments: B - Final Design
A - North Mesa Rec. Plan
C - North Mesa PRB Presentation

Public comment was made by:

Greg Weiss
Janine Wiles
Barb Fox
David Mercer
[ ] Alvez
Robin Gurule
Felipe Alvez
Kyle Dickman
Tatiana [ ]
Lisa Reader
Craig Martin
Tara Dickman
Nancy Jo Nicholas
Kathy Miller
Melissa Arias
Wendy Burke-Ryan
Carol Bronisz
Peggy Dare (read into public comment via email).

tabled

PRESENTATIONS, PROCLAMATIONS, & RECOGNITIONS

20712-25 Presentation on Cartegraph Implementation

Presenters: Wendy Parker

Parks Superintendent Wendy Parker and Asst. Superintendent Emmanuel Abeyta provided the Board with a demonstration of the asset management system implemented in the Parks & Open Space division.

4. BOARD/STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

20724-25 Chairman's Report - Presented by Chair Watkins

Presenters: Brian Watkins

Vice-Chair Cowan gave the following updates:

The Open Space Working Group and the Bike Park Working Group provided presentations to Council, which were well received.
Parks & Recreation received a Gold Medal Finalist award.
The Brewer Arena replacement plan is expected to return to Council next month.

20710-25 Staff Report

Presenters: Katherine Hudspeth and Wendy Parker

Attachments: A - PRB Monthly Updates

Recreation Superintendent Hudspeth and Parks Superintendent Parks provided updates for their respective divisions.

20711-25 Work Group and Task Force Assignments and Updates

Presenters: Parks and Recreation Board

Vice-Chair Cowan didn't have any updates for these groups.

5. COUNCIL COMMUNICATIONS

Councilor Reager was absent. No updates were provided.

6. PREVIEW OF NEXT MEETING

Items discussed for next month's meeting include the following:

North Mesa Recreation Plan

7. ADJOURNMENT

If you are an individual with a disability who is in need of a reader, amplifier, qualified sign language interpreter, or any other form of auxiliary aid or service to attend or participate in the hearing or meeting, please contact the County Human Resources Division at 505-662-8040 at least one week prior to the meeting or as soon as possible.

Public documents, including the agenda and minutes can be provided in various accessible formats. Please contact the Community Services Department at 505-662-8241 if a summary or other type of accessible format is needed.

Comments on Proposed Relocation of North Mesa Community Garden Plots

Having been alerted to the agenda item on tonight's Parks & Rec Board meeting, I forwarded the proposed movement of the North Mesa Community Garden plots to as many of the gardeners for which I had emails. My comments echo those received and are here listed.

1. The users (renters) of the North Mesa Community Garden plots were not asked for input on the move. Given that we receive regular emails from the Parks Department with our individual water usage, it would have been very easy and appropriate to inform us of the North Mesa Recreation Area Master Plan work. This 'last minute' input could well have been avoided with proper notification.
2. Some of the renters of the North Mesa Community Garden plots have been gardening in that location for up to 30 years. That is 30 years of soil improvement, hardscape installation, and meaningful tending of the area. Moving the garden site to a new location will force a restart on the soil and understanding of the environmental factors (sun, wind, pests). I have maintained at least one plot at the garden since 1995.
3. Many of the renters have perennial vegetables/fruits in their plots. Moving of the plants will cause a set-back in production.
4. With respect to hardscape, many of the users have built deer fencing around their plots – from simple to robust. The cost of putting up the fencing was borne by the renters. Many people have also constructed raised beds, trellises and irrigation systems.
5. The County has invested significant monies into placing individual water meters so that water usage can be accurately attributed to specific users.
6. If part of the reason for the move is to expand the garden, know that use has dropped on the current footprint. The Community Gardens could also be expanded where they are by moving the compost pile, adding border fencing, and weeding the area. Also, stricter adherence to the Garden Rules could free up some of the current plots.

For these reasons, I strongly recommend leaving the North Mesa Community Garden plots where they are. There has been much investment, sometimes decades, in plot improvements and environmental assessment in order to grow productive gardens. It seems that the Maintenance Yard could be placed in an area that does not require the upheaval of the North Mesa Community Garden Plots.

Respectfully,

Janine Fales
115 Alhambra Drive
White Rock, NM

-----Original Message-----
From: Margaret Dare <dare.margaret@icloud.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 1:32 PM
To: PRB@lacnm.us.; Williams-Hill, Julie <julie.williams@losalamosnm.gov>; Parker, Wendy <wendy.parker@losalamosnm.gov>
Cc: Dare, Peggy <pdare@comcast.net>; Wendy Ryan <wburke_ryan@hotmail.com>; Lawrence And Carol Bronisz <bronisz@cnsp.net>
Subject: North Mesa Park Plan meeting tonight Oct 9

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Wendy, the email link for the PNB won't go through. Could somehow you transfer my comments below?

Dear Parks and Recreation Board,

At the last council meeting, the bicycle group indicated that they wanted changes to this plan before you tonight. Particularly in regard to the size of the bicycle area.

My comments below are as a member of the Stables community and also as a designer. It's a beautiful design as shown yet I think still could serve everyone better with some changes:

1. Leave the garden patches in the location as they are now with no maintenance yard there. The existing gardens are good neighbors for the stables, and the home that is adjacent.

2. Recognize and keep the well-established pathway through the fence at the SW corner of the Stables, the outside of Lot 132 that is used by the south community to get to and around the Stables.

3. The planned sand volleyball courts are in areas that are needed for parking for the rodeo. In general, the rodeo parking looks to be less than needed unless multi use areas (grassland) is used as we do now. At last summer's rodeo, even with less attendance than usual because of lack of a stadium, I counted over 100 cars in the late afternoon.

4. Parking for the bike park, and the facility building #16 could be more secure and accessible if it was closer to San Ildefonso Road. It could be at Area #29.

Thank you for this interactive process and your consideration.

Sincerely,

Peggy Dare
65 Obsidian Loop

Responses to Comments from ESB and PRB
PRB Meeting on September 11, 2025
ESB Meeting on September 18, 2025

Updated: October 8, 2025

PRB Comment	Response	Proposed Revision	Page/Paragraph
Did not see cost estimates in the agenda packet.	Cost estimates were included in the report.	N/A	Page 68 of Attachment B
Why aren't more multi-use fields being added, despite apparent public demand?	Feedback from the community indicated opposition to multi-use fields. Many teams feel they are already competing for limited field space, and adding multi-use fields could worsen the issue. The design concept was dropped after reviewing survey results. Several fields were expanded to accomodate multiple sports as a compromise.	N/A	Appendix D - Survey Results
Why are mostly baseball and softball fields being considered for artificial turf, when they're only used 4–5 months a year?	Softball players gave extensive feedback requesting more late-night games and extended use during shoulder seasons. Artificial turf would allow for back-to-back games and longer seasons. Additionally, several users have stated that they have seasons that begin in February/March. Dara Jones (soccer field) was evaluated and recommended for potential artificial turf installation.	N/A	Summary of Recommendations Table (Pg 5), Framework Plans (Pg 51, Pg 53)
Fields 1–3 don't need new lighting or extended play hours, especially since fewer teams are currently active in Los Alamos.	Community feedback indicated a desire for more time and access to fields. The proposed layouts allow for more user group access which would influence the amount of teams active in Los Alamos. Additionally, none of the lighting on LAC fields is newer than 30 years old and upgrades are desired to update and upgrade facilities to current standards. The newer lighting would also eliminate the lighting spillover to neighboring properties.	N/A	Lighting Plans (Pg 55, Pg 57)
Does the cost estimate include irrigation costs for natural fields?	Yes, irrigation costs are included.	N/A	Cost Estimates, Pages 69-76
Why is Spirio Field included in the cost estimates, even though it's currently under renovation?	It was included in case artificial turf is considered for Spirio Field 5–10 years from now.	N/A	Attachment G (Framework Plans) Pg 53
Field maintenance needing to be redistributed every 2–3 hours of play. Where exactly does this apply?	Applies to high-wear areas like first base, batter's box (baseball/softball), and goal mouths (soccer).	N/A	

PRB Comment	Response	Proposed Revision	Page/Paragraph
Why are there no lights at the far end of Spirio Field?	The West end of Spirio is a multi-use field serving multiple purposes such as community events and doesn't require additional lighting like sports fields do. This can be reevaluated in furture Master Plan efforts.	N/A	
Are there comparative cost estimates between turf and natural fields?	Costs estimates for natural and artificial turf are included in the cost estimate section of the report, and the maintenance requirements were evaluated for both. This information can be used to compare the costs for each field type (natural and synthetic). The upfront costs of natural turf tend to be approximately half of the synthetic, however the life time maintence demands are significanly higher for the natural turf as compared to synthetic.	N/A	Cost Estimates, Pages 69-76, Table 3.2 Page 36
The plan was not presented to the Environmental Sustainability Board (ESB).	The Artificial Turf Feasibility Study report was presented to ESB on 9/18/25.	N/A	Appendix G, Artificial Turf Testing and Data Resources
Feels "low-input" user groups have disproportionate influence.	Over 350 responses were gathered across two digital surveys, in addition to five public meetings, interviews with field user groups, and ongoing collaboration with County staff.	N/A	Appendix A, C, D, E
Alarmed by the high costs and environmental impacts of artificial turf.	Cost estimates have a start date at the year 2028 and every 5 years for 10 years. Review of environmental impacts of artificial turf is outside of the scope of this feasibility study, however, the report includes data resources and links to relevant independent research on current environmental impacts of artifical turf.	N/A	Appendix G: Artificial Turf Testing and Data Resources
Supports developing a comparison of turf vs. natural field costs.	Costs estimates for natural and artificial turf are included in the cost estimate section of the report, and the maintenance requirements were evaluated for both. This information can be used to compare the costs for each field type. The upfront costs of natural turf tend to be approximately half of the synthetic, however the life time maintence demands are significanly higher for the natural turf as compared to	N/A	Cost Estimates, Pages 69-76, Table 3.2 Page 36

PRB Comment	Response	Proposed Revision	Page/Paragraph
The title of the study is misleading; believes it is actually a redevelopment and master plan.	This is not a master plan, the report is meant as a tool for guiding future decisions about North Mesa Recreation Area and Overlook Park.	(1) Proposing to replace the word "Conceptual" and replace with "Feasibility" (2) Add purpose statement: "Consideration of opportunities for artificial turf use, field realignment, and facility improvements at North Mesa Sports Complex and Overlook Park."	(1) In the Title of and throughout the report. (2) Add sub title/purpose statement below title.
Requests: A horse trail along North Mesa Road. Bike racks at the fields.	A horse trail and bike racks are proposed amenities that are outside of the scope of the study. This is not a master plan, the report is meant as a tool for guiding future decisions about North Mesa Recreation Area and Overlook Park. These amenities could be considered at the time of future Master Plan efforts.	N/A	
Unclear what recommendations are being made to the Council.	Recommendations are included in the report. They are being provided to guide future decision-making regarding potential improvements to the North Mesa Recreation Area and Overlook Park.	N/A	Summary of Recommendations Table (Pg 5), Framework Plans (Pg 51, Pg 53)
The ESB should be given the opportunity to receive and review the presentation.	The Artificial Turf Feasibility Study report was presented to ESB on 9/18/25.	N/A	
ESB Comment	**Response**	**Proposed Revision**	**Page/Paragraph**
Study Scope and Use			
Seen as a conceptual planning tool covering more than just turf; some support advancing it while deferring turf-specific decisions.	Correct, this feasibility study is meant as a planning tool. This report does not specify turf-specific decisions. It provides an overview and factors to consider as well as recommended placement for the synthetic turf within the geography of the complexes and as desired by the community. The report offers recommendations for the use of synthetic turf and primary locations for its deployment.	Proposing to replace the word "Conceptual" and replace with "Feasibility"	In the Title of and throughout the report.

ESB Comment	Response	Proposed Revision	Page/Paragraph
Environmental Impacts			
Concerns over heat island effect	Review of heat island effect of artificial turf is outside of the scope of this feasibility study, however, the report includes data resources and links to relevant independent research on environmental impacts of artifical turf. Furthermore, heat island effect is a function of the turf and infill chosen. Specific materials are not part of this scope and should be studied at the time of implementation. Green spaces, trees and landscaping may be used to offset the heat island effect of artificial turf.	N/A	Appendix G: Artificial Turf Testing and Data Resources
Stormwater runoff and infiltration	See pg. 41 'Because Los Alamos County is governed by Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permits,synthetic turf fields must be designed with proper drainage systems to prevent runoff carrying infill or contaminants into stormwater infrastructure.' Specific subsurface material for drainage is not part of this scope. Additionally, we illustrated how grading and stormwater runoff could work on a very conceptual level so that we could consider the grading issues. Further attention should be given to this issue as the design commences.	N/A	Page 41 of the report.
Microplastics	The study of microplastics in artificial turf is outside of the scope of this feasibility study, however, the report includes data resources and links to relevant independent research on environmental impacts of artifical turf.	N/A	Appendix G: Artificial Turf Testing and Data Resources
Gray water management	Only some of the fields are being recommended for artificial turf. The remaining natural turf can continue to be watered using reclaimed (gray) water.	N/A	Summary of Recommendations Table (Pg 5), Framework Plans (Pg 51, Pg 53)
Durability and UV resistance of turf materials.	The study of durability and UV resistance of artificial turf is outside of the scope of this feasibility study, however, the report includes data resources and links to relevant independent research on environmental impacts of artifical turf.	N/A	Appendix G: Artificial Turf Testing and Data Resources

ESB Comment	Response	Proposed Revision	Page/Paragraph
Health and Safety			
Mixed views—study claims reduced injuries, but comments raised risks of ACL/joint injuries	The study of injury risk on artificial turf is outside of the scope of this feasibility study, however, the report includes data resources and links to relevant independent research on the impacts of artifical turf.	N/A	Appendix G: Artificial Turf Testing and Data Resources
Heat-related safety issues if fields reach unsafe temperatures.	This is a function of turf and infill selection which are not part of this scope. However, the concern for heat retention was considered throughout the report, specifically on pg. 32 and pg 36. This issue needs further consideration as the design commences.	N/A	Pages 32, 36 (Table 3.2 Turf System Comparison – Maintenance and Management Considerations)
Lifecycle and Cost			
Need for greater detail on warranties, usable lifespan, replacement and disposal costs, and maintenance burdens.	Report includes factors to consider when specifying artificial turf products and the recommendations include specifying artificial turf materials that meet recognized environmental standards and the Cradle-to-Cradle certification. Warranties and recyclability along with life cycle costs should be updated with current data as design commences and products are being specified.	N/A	Table 5.4: Summary of Study Recommendations (Page 66), Table 4.1: Environmental Standards Commonly Applied in Synthetic Turf Projects (Pg 42), Section 4.4 Context-Based Comparison: Synthetic Turf vs.Natural Grass (Pages 45-47), Table 3.2 (Page 36)
Alternatives			
Requests to evaluate non-turf solutions such as improved natural grass management, gopher control, or transport to other playable fields.	The report summarizes the best practices in natural turf maintenance. In addition to maintence, natural turf requires rest between use to up-take nutrients and recover. Our team has tried natural turfs for sports projects and found that Buffalograss and blue grama grass as alternatives simply don't stand up to the use demands that turf grass receives in these activities. Report includes a maintence and management comparison for both natural and synthetic	N/A	Section 4.4 Context-Based Comparison: Synthetic Turf vs.Natural Grass (Pages 45-47), Table 3.2 (Page 36)
Community Impacts			
Importance of transparency and ongoing engagement, keeping ESB and the community informed	Future engagement is outside of the study scope. Staff to ensure community engagement as master planning and design commences.	N/A	
Local concerns included traffic safety near Overlook.	Traffic study is outside of the scope of this feasibility study.	N/A	
Local concerns included potential for pollinator gardens.	Pollinator gardens is outside of the scope of this feasibility study. This is not a master plan, the report is meant as a tool for guiding future decisions about North Mesa Recreation Area and Overlook Park. This and other amenities could be considered at the time of future Master Plan efforts.	N/A	