

# Livermore Area Recreation and Park District

## Staff Report

---

---

TO: Chair Pierpont and LARPD Board of Directors

FROM: Mathew Fuzie, General Manager

PREPARED BY: David Weisgerber, Community Outreach Supervisor

DATE: May 13, 2026

SUBJECT: Parks, Recreation, and Trails Master Plan Update Phase 4:  
Policy Discussion Continued

---

---

### RECOMMENDATION:

Review and discuss key policy considerations related to system condition standards and lifecycle-based funding, building on the direction provided at the May 4, 2026, Policy Workshop. Provide input to guide development of goals, policies, and implementation strategies for the updated Master Plan.

### BACKGROUND:

The Livermore Area Recreation and Park District is currently updating its Parks, Recreation, and Trails Master Plan to guide the future development, maintenance, and programming of parks and recreation services over the next ten years.

On May 4, 2026, the Board of Directors participated in a Policy Workshop to provide direction on key policy areas, including project prioritization, partnerships, cost recovery, arts programming, and the District's role in open space and trails.

This item continues that discussion, focusing on system condition standards and lifecycle-based funding strategies for parks and facilities. These topics are more implementation-focused and build on the broader policy direction provided during the workshop.

Board input on these items will help define the tools the District will use to understand the level of reinvestment needed to maintain District assets over time and inform development of financial and capital improvement strategies as part of the Master Plan.

## DISCUSSION:

The following policy questions (7 and 8, continued from the May 4 Policy Workshop) are intended to guide Board discussion on system condition standards and long-term funding strategies for parks and facilities.

### ***Policy Question 7: What level of system condition should the District maintain across its parks and facilities?***

As part of the Master Plan Update process, staff conducted a comprehensive review of the condition of District parks and facilities. The results of this assessment were summarized using a facility condition matrix that visually conveys asset condition in a simplified, three-color format. A preliminary version of this matrix was presented to the Board earlier in the process, and the Board supported its use as a tool to inform the updated Master Plan.

For the purposes of the facility condition matrix:

- **Green** indicates asset is in good working condition; only routine, scheduled maintenance is required.
- **Yellow** indicates asset is functional but shows wear; repairs, refurbishment, or upgrades will be needed to restore optimal condition.
- **Red** indicates asset requires significant repair or replacement within the next few years based on manufacturer's recommendation and field evaluation.

Assets in "red" condition may remain functional but require repair or replacement to maintain reliable service. "Red" does not indicate unsafe conditions; any safety-related issues are addressed immediately.

The District currently has approximately 12% of assets in "red" condition. While some level of deferred maintenance is expected as part of the asset lifecycle, Board direction is needed to establish a target standard for overall system condition and guide long-term reinvestment.

Not all "red" conditions carry the same level of risk. Some may be cosmetic or operational, while others, such as irrigation systems or roofs, are foundational and may impact service delivery if not addressed.

Each park and facility has been assigned an overall condition rating, with greater weight given to foundational asset categories to reflect overall condition. Establishing a system condition standard will help define the level of reinvestment needed to maintain facilities over time.

This standard is intended to provide policy direction for the desired condition of District assets over the long term. It should not be driven solely by current resource constraints but rather reflect the level of service the Board seeks to provide to the community.

*Policy Direction: System Condition Standard*

Staff is seeking Board direction on the desired level of system condition to guide long-term planning and reinvestment. This direction will inform the development of capital improvement strategies and maintenance priorities.

*Potential Approaches for Consideration*

- *High Standard (0% Red – Target Condition):* Maintain a high system standard by eliminating “red” conditions over time, recognizing this requires sustained and proactive reinvestment
- *Managed Standard (Maintain 10-15% Red):* Maintain a defined level of “red” conditions over time, generally aligned with current system conditions, while prioritizing higher-risk or foundational assets and allowing lower-risk items to remain deferred
- *Reactive / Resource-Constrained Approach:* Address “red” conditions primarily as they arise, without a defined long-term target for overall system condition. Delaying maintenance until failure can shorten the useful life of assets and/or increase the cost of repair or replacement

***Policy Question 8: How should the District fund ongoing maintenance and replacement of its parks and facilities over time?***

Following the discussion of system condition standards, the next consideration is how the District funds the maintenance and replacement needed to achieve that standard over time.

Parks and facilities require continuous reinvestment as assets progress through their useful life. This includes both major capital replacements and ongoing maintenance necessary to sustain reliable service.

Determining full lifecycle costs, often referred to as Life Cycle Cost Analysis (LCCA), is a fundamental best practice in asset management. Lifecycle cost analysis includes:

1. Acquisition Costs
2. Operating Costs
3. Management/Repair Costs
4. Downtime Costs
5. Disposal/End-Of-Life Costs

These costs can be estimated through detailed analysis or standardized metrics (e.g., cost per square foot or per acre) and used to guide long-term funding strategies.

This discussion also relates to how facility costs are incorporated into program pricing and cost recovery, and how the District balances funding sources across services. Potential tools may include facility fees, program contributions, reserve policies, or structured capital replacement programs.

*Policy Direction: Lifecycle-Based Funding*

Staff is seeking Board direction on the overall approach to funding ongoing maintenance and replacement of parks and facilities. This direction will inform the development of funding strategies and financial policies as part of the Master Plan implementation.

*Potential Approaches for Consideration*

- *Lifecycle-Based Funding Approach:* Identify and plan for the full lifecycle cost of facilities, with a goal of funding these costs over time through structured and predictable funding strategies
- *Hybrid Approach:* Incorporate lifecycle cost planning into decision-making while balancing available funding and competing priorities, without fully funding all lifecycle costs
- *Pay-As-You-Go / Reactive Approach:* Address maintenance and replacement needs as they arise based on available funding, without a formal lifecycle-based funding framework

As the District develops a better understanding of lifecycle costs, these costs should be considered in program pricing. This does not require full cost recovery, but helps clarify the full cost of delivering programs, including facility use, overhead, and long-term asset replacement, as well as the level of subsidy supported by taxpayers. This approach supports more informed policy decisions regarding cost recovery and access.

NEXT STEPS:

Staff will incorporate Board direction into the development of the Master Plan and return with a draft plan for Board review at the June 24, 2026, meeting.