

LIVORNA PARK IMPROVEMENTS — AMAC BUDGET & DESIGN REVIEW

Alamo Municipal Advisory Council | Meeting Prep: March 4, 2026 | 65% Design Stage
Prepared for AMAC Review of Contra Costa County Public Works / Stantec Design Package

1. Executive Summary

The Livorna Park Improvements project has reached the 65% design milestone with a total project cost estimate of \$4,092,064. The documents reveal several material inconsistencies and cost drivers that AMAC should formally question before authorizing progression to the 95% design phase. Key concerns are summarized below and detailed in subsequent sections.

Top-Line Findings:

- The contingency is simultaneously described as '~10%' (project summary) and '20%' (OPC label) — but the actual math yields only 10.5%. This discrepancy must be resolved.
- Splash pad installation (\$221,000) is 6x the cost of the actual splash pad equipment (\$35,000) — an unusual ratio requiring itemized justification.
- The playground + splash pad together consume 54.6% of the entire construction budget (\$1,559,558 combined).
- The entry arbor/columns alone are priced at \$115,000 — a single decorative feature representing nearly half the entire walls & structures budget.
- Design fees total \$441,555, of which \$87,000 is County internal overhead that may not have been originally communicated to AMAC.
- The digital kiosk conduit (for signs not being built) costs \$30,000 — an amount that demands itemization if only conduit is being installed.

2. Total Project Budget Summary

Category	Amount	% of Total	Notes / Concerns
Construction Contract	\$3,295,509	80.5%	Includes ~10% contingency per project summary
Construction Management	\$340,000	8.3%	Full-time inspection ~10+ months
Design (Stantec + County)	\$441,555	10.8%	\$86K spent; \$269K Stantec remaining + \$87K County internal
Environmental (CEQA)	\$15,000	0.4%	NOE in process
TOTAL PROJECT COST	\$4,092,064	100%	

3. Construction Cost Category Breakdown

The following table breaks down all construction categories from the 65%-level Opinion of Probable Construction Costs (OPC) prepared by Stantec on 2/20/2026. Flagged items are color-coded by severity.

Category	Cost	% of Const. Total	Flag
Site Preparation	\$54,000	1.9%	
Demolition	\$85,065	3.0%	
Grading, Drainage & Utilities	\$133,724	4.7%	
Paving	\$174,922	6.1%	
Site Furnishing	\$227,160	8.0%	● \$20K shipping line item; 20 benches @ \$3K ea.
Lighting & Kiosk Conduit	\$45,000	1.6%	● \$30K for conduit only (signs deferred)
Playground	\$1,096,654	38.4%	● Largest single item – 38% of construction
Water Features (Splash Pad)	\$462,904	16.2%	● Very high – installation 6x equipment cost
Sports Courts	\$115,410	4.0%	
Walls & Structures	\$245,325	8.6%	● Entry arbor \$115K alone
Restroom Upgrades	\$66,000	2.3%	
Landscaping	\$146,702	5.1%	
Mobilization (5%)	\$142,643	5.0%	
Contingency (Fixed per AMAC)	\$300,000	10.5%	● Labeled '20%' in OPC but only ~10.5%
CONSTRUCTION TOTAL	\$3,295,509	100%	

4. Top 10 Issues, Inconsistencies & Questions for Public Works / Stantec

The following issues were identified through cross-analysis of the Total Project Estimate, the 65% OPC, the Design Slide Deck, and the Project Schedule. Each has a specific question to raise at the meeting.

#	Severity	Issue	Detail	Question for Public Works
1	● Critical	Contingency math doesn't add up	OPC labels contingency '20% per AMAC' but the fixed \$300K on \$2.85M subtotal = only 10.5%. The project summary calls it '~10%.' Which is correct? A true 20% would be ~\$570K — a \$270K gap.	What is the agreed contingency rate? If 20%, the construction total is understated by ~\$270K.
2	● Critical	Splash pad installation cost is 6x equipment cost	Splash pad sprays/features = \$35,000. Installation = \$221,000. That's a 6:1 ratio. System costs add another \$113K. Total splash pad: \$462,904.	Has this been competitively bid? Is \$221K installation reasonable for this equipment? Request itemized breakdown.
3	● Critical	Playground costs consume 38% of construction budget	At \$1,096,654, the playground alone is more than a third of the entire construction contract. Equipment: \$442K, Install: \$142K, Freight: \$56.5K, Shade Sails: \$165K, Safety surfacing: \$245K.	Were shade sails (\$165K) and freight (\$56.5K) in the original scope? Could phasing or value engineering reduce this?
4	● High	Entry arbor/columns priced at \$115,000	Entry arbor is a single decorative feature in the Walls & Structures category. At \$115K it represents 47% of the entire walls/structures budget and is the 5th largest individual line item.	Is this a new scope addition vs. original design? Was this in the original budget? Can it be value-engineered or deferred?
5	● High	Construction Management at \$340K for 10 months	Full-time inspection is budgeted at \$340,000 over ~10 months = ~\$34,000/month or ~\$1,580/day. This is above typical public works inspection rates and worth comparing to alternatives.	Is this rate consistent with other County park projects? Could part-time inspection suffice for any phases?
6	● High	Design costs at \$441,555 — \$87K is internal County cost	Total design = \$441,555. Of remaining \$355K, \$269K goes to Stantec and \$87K is County internal overhead. The County's internal cost is nearly a third of the remaining design budget.	Is the \$87K County internal cost standard for this project type? Is this additive to what was originally scoped with Stantec?
7	● Moderate	\$30,000 for kiosk conduit on deferred/future signs	The 65% design explicitly states digital signs are 'future' and only conduit is being provided. Yet the OPC prices this at \$15,000 per location x 2 = \$30,000 just for conduit. Conduit typically costs a small fraction of this.	What exactly is included in this \$30K? If truly conduit only, this needs to be itemized and justified.

#	Severity	Issue	Detail	Question for Public Works
8	● Moderate	Furniture shipping listed as separate \$20,000 line item	\$20,000 for furniture shipping is a standalone line item separate from playground freight (\$56,500). This creates a risk of double-counting and lacks detail on what is actually being shipped.	What furniture is included in this shipping cost? Is there any overlap with other shipping/freight line items?
9	● Moderate	Property address inconsistency between 35% and 65% plans	35% design plans list the address as '801 Livorna Rd., Alamo, CA 94507.' The 65% design plans list '2615 Miranda Ave, Alamo, CA 94507.' This may reflect a corner lot, but should be confirmed with the County assessor.	Is there a formal address change? Does this affect permits, CEQA, or any legal filings already submitted?
10	● Moderate	Landscape trees removed vs. preserved creates scope/cost ambiguity	Between 35% and 65%, the design shifted from removing some trees to preserving them (and vice versa). Three landscape trees went from preserved to removed; two trees were preserved that were slated for removal. The cost impact of these changes is not isolated.	What is the net cost impact of tree changes? Were any arborist assessments required that add cost?

5. Project Schedule Overview & Risk Flags

The current schedule targets a park opening of July 13, 2027 with construction beginning September 16, 2026. Several schedule risks are worth noting.

Milestone	Dates	Duration	Risk Flag
65% Plans & Exhibits	Jan 27 – Mar 12, 2026	33 days	
65% County Review for MAC	Mar 13 – Mar 23	7 days	
Update Plans & Exhibits	Mar 24 – Mar 31	6 days	
MAC Meeting (next)	April 7, 2026	0 days milestone	Tomorrow 4/7
95% Plans	Apr 8 – May 5	20 days	
95% County Reviews	May 6 – May 19	10 days	
BOS Authorization to Advertise	May 12 – Jun 9	21 days	⚠ Overlaps 100% submittal
100% Submittal	May 20 – Jun 2	10 days	
Advertise & Bidding	Jun 24 – Jul 28	25 days	
Award	Jul 29 – Aug 25	20 days	
Construction Start	Sep 16, 2026	Mobilization 15 days	⚠ Only 6 wks post-award
Construction Period	Sep 16, 2026 – Jul 13, 2027	215 days	⚠ 7+ months, winter incl.
Park Opens	July 13, 2027	Target open date	✅ Target
Maintenance Period	Jul 14 – Nov 16, 2027	90 days	
Turnover to County	Nov 17, 2027		

Key Schedule Concerns

- BOS Authorization to Advertise (May 12 – Jun 9) overlaps with the 100% Submittal period (May 20 – Jun 2). This tight overlap risks delays if BOS approval is not obtained on schedule.
- Construction runs Sep 2026 through Jul 2027, spanning winter months in Alamo. The schedule does not appear to account for weather-related delays or any contingency time buffer.
- Award to Mobilization is only ~22 days (Jul 29 – Aug 26) — shorter than typical for a \$3.3M public works contract. Ask Public Works if this is achievable given procurement requirements.
- The 90-day Maintenance Period before County Turnover (Jul–Nov 2027) should be confirmed as a contractual obligation in the construction contract.

6. Recommended Questions for the Public Works / Stantec Meeting

Budget & Cost

- **What is the agreed contingency rate — 10% or 20%? The OPC and project summary say different things.**
- **Can Stantec provide an itemized breakdown of the \$221,000 splash pad installation cost? Why is installation 6x the equipment cost?**
- Was the \$115,000 entry arbor/columns in the original approved scope and budget?
- What does the \$30,000 kiosk conduit include? If only conduit, can this be itemized and reduced?
- Is the \$20,000 furniture shipping a separate cost from the \$56,500 playground freight, or is there overlap?
- What was the original budget for this project, and at what design stage did costs exceed that baseline?
- What value engineering options exist that could reduce cost without materially reducing the park's program?

Design & Scope Changes

- Which trees removed vs. preserved and what is the net cost impact of tree decision changes between 35% and 65%?
- The project address changed from 801 Livorna Rd to 2615 Miranda Ave. Does this affect any permits or filings?
- Have the shade sail specifications (\$165,000) been competitively bid, or is this a sole-source design spec?

Schedule & Next Steps

- Has the County confirmed BOS authorization will be ready in May 2026 to meet the bid advertising window?
- Does the construction schedule include any weather contingency for winter months?
- Is the 22-day Award-to-Mobilization window achievable under County procurement rules?