



Land Resources & Environment Department
505 Broadway, Baraboo, Wisconsin 53913
(608) 355-3245 www.co.sauk.wi.us

November 2, 2022

Interested Consultants

Re: Sauk County, Wisconsin
 Great Sauk State Trail Master Plan
 Questions and Responses Update

To Whom It May Concern:

Attached are the updated questions submitted to Sauk County since the date of the RFP release on September 26, 2022. Also included are the county's responses. The last day to submit clarifying questions was October 28, 2022 at 4:00 p.m. Since questions are no longer accepted, this will be the last and final post for answers to clarifying questions and constitutes the final summary of question and responses. As a reminder, the request for proposals closing date and time is November 4, 2022 at 2:00 CST.

Question 1: We were reviewing the GST Trail Planning RFP and wondering what the County's Budget is for this project work?

Question 2: Is the County able to share the budget for the master plan with consultants? If so, what is it (without real estate acquisition)?

County response to Question 1 and 2: There are funds allocated to the project, however a specific budget has not been identified.

Question 3: Relative to Addenda #1 for the Great Sauk State Trail Master Plan, I have the following question:

The addenda references the creation of a "trail right-of-way plat showing the boundaries of all required lands for the construction and maintenance of the trail and implement a process for trail easement location identification and acquisition over public and private properties"

Is the County envisioning a formal plat of survey, traditional plat, Transportation Project Plat or are they envisioning one of the following (or combination thereof/something different)

- a) a conceptual display that would identify potential real estate needs by general area with the parcel boundaries identified and proposed conceptual acquisition area (e.g. "~ 15' width to allow for trail construction and drainage easement" ?
- b) a slightly more detailed display that would then identify:
 - a. Parcel property owner
 - b. Parcel boundaries
 - c. Parcel land use

- d. Detailed proposed acquisition area and estimated acreage (based on building a project corridor)

County response to Question 3: The county is requesting that at a minimum a more detailed display be prepared that shows:

- a. Parcel Property Owners
- b. Parcel Boundaries
- c. Identified constraints such as wetlands/floodplains, difficult road crossings, lack of potential easement access/public right-of-way width, slope, etc.

The county is not requesting a plat of survey, traditional plat, Transportation Project Plat nor is the county requesting land use data or detailed acquisition areas/acreage.

Question 4: Just in considering the overall project, providing a budget or budget range to potential responders provides them with valuable information regarding their team structure, potential partners, and scope and approach. Additionally, the understanding of the potential budget range allows responders to make informed decisions regarding their ability to respond to the RFP. As there is substantial time and effort required to adequately respond to this RFP, an understanding of the budget is critical to responders to justify the pursuit cost. The October 10th Response to Questions document states that “funds have been allocated to the project” without clarity on the amount of the allocation.

We kindly request that Sauk County provide either an anticipated budget range amount or the amount of current funds allocated for this effort. This information is important to all responders and will provide Sauk County with better overall and informed responses. I hope this makes sense and really appreciate your further consideration.

County response to Question 4: The primary focus of the RFP is to identify the most qualified consultant that has a demonstrated ability to deliver a successful planning process and trail master plan. The scoring criteria under Section 5. Proposal Evaluation of the RFP demonstrates the weight of scoring criteria which places a heavy emphasis on understanding of the project and technical design as well as project approach. Together these items constitute 50% of the score. While still part of the scoring criteria, the project budget only constitutes 15% of the score. Sauk County has not established a specific budget or budget range for the project, however Sauk County does believe that there is adequate funding available to be in a position to select the most qualified consultant.

Question 5: Under item #7 Project budget, it requests the following:

- Current hourly rates for staff.
- Current overhead rates for all team members.

Our billing rates per person include the direct hourly rate + overhead + profit. Instead of separating it out, would it be acceptable to list each person per billing rate and note that that rate is all inclusive and includes direct hourly rate, overhead rate and profit?

County response to Question 5: It is acceptable to list each person per billing rate and note that rate is all inclusive and includes the direct hourly rate, overhead rate and profit.

Question 6: It appears the rail lines are all active in the area- are there any known abandoned routes or rail lines that are inactive and, has the County begun any preliminary conversations with the railroad re: future segments of the Great Sauk State Trail?

County response to Question 6: To our knowledge there are no known abandoned or inactive rail lines that could be considered for trail use other than very small spur in the City of Baraboo. The County has had preliminary discussions with the Wisconsin Southern Railroad (WSOR) and WisDOT Rails and Harbors regarding trail crossings over active rail lines in the City of Baraboo and we have had limited discussions regarding a small shared rails with trails section in the City of Reedsburg in the vicinity of the trail head of the 400 State Trail. While not part of this project, the County is in the process of developing and finalizing agreements with WSOR and WisDOT Rails and Harbors for a half mile section of rails with trails with anticipated construction in Spring, 2023. Discussions with WSOR and WisDOT regarding acceptable rail crossings and potential rails with trails opportunities will be an important part of the planning process.

Question 7: Have any parcels or easements been obtained/ evaluated thus far? And, has any investigation or preliminary lists of willing landowners been developed?

County response to Question 7: The County has not conducted any type of evaluation for trail easement access nor has the County undertaken a process to identify willing/interested landowners. The master planning process should undertake such a process to be able to develop preferred and alternative trail routes.

Question 8: How does the County see its role in engagement? We've worked with communities in the past that have collaborated on engagement- for example, our team has designed the engagement approach, event details, and provided materials and the County/ Client representative facilitates/hosts the event so all communication is funneled through County/client.

County response to Question 8: The County anticipates its role of engagement to be at a very high level and will undertake whatever role is needed, as identified by the consultant, to realize a successful outcome including the type of engagement approach described above. The County is also committed to responding to challenges and opportunities that arise from the planning process that are outside of the Scope of Work and which require additional meetings/conversations to solve/realize.

Question 9: The SCORP identifies a dotted route for the expansion of the GSST on some of the maps/graphics. Has that route/ other routes been investigated or identified; or is it primarily a graphic gesture?

County response to Question 9: This is a preliminary graphic gesture, however the county has had preliminary conversations with WDNR, WisDOT, WSOR, City and Town of Baraboo, Village of West Baraboo, UW Platteville Baraboo/Sauk County, Baraboo School District and the City of Reedsburg regarding trail routing ideas.

Question 10: Devils Lake State Park is currently part of the Central Sand Hills Ecological Landscape Regional Master Plan - how does the County see this process will coordinate/ impact/ engage with that effort?

County response to Question 10: The County has had preliminary discussions with WDNR regarding routing options through Devil's Lake State Park and in the immediate vicinity, however it is not clear what WDNR's preferences are at this time. The County will defer to the WDNR as to how they want to reference the GSST in the Regional Master Plan, however as part of the trail master planning process WDNR will need to provide feedback regarding their preferred GSST route through their affected properties and particularly Devil's Lake State Park.

Question 11: Has the County identified preliminary desirable trailhead locations or amenities within the communities along the GSST segments from SPRA to the 400 Trail?

County response to Question 11: Following discussions with municipal leaders in the Baraboo area and with UW-Platteville Baraboo/Sauk County and the Baraboo School District, a number of features have been identified that either should be connected by the main line GSST or be connected by a spur trail. Connecting to the UW Platteville Baraboo/Sauk County campus and the Baraboo intermediate and high schools has been identified as high interest from a recreational, alternative transit, and safe routes to schools perspective. The County also anticipates that the GSST will interact with the Baraboo River and as described in the Baraboo River Corridor Plan (<https://www.co.sauk.wi.us/cpz/baraboo-river-corridor-plan>). As part of the planning process, the County anticipates working with the selected consultant to engage these and all communities along the anticipated trail corridor to identify and agree upon respective trailheads and amenities.

Question 12: Please clarify what the R/W document will consist of. (Example would it just be aerial map showing anticipated R/W and amount of FEE/TLE/etc).

- a. Existing R/W will be established by GIS and not title work/and surveyor establishing the true R/W. Is this a correct assumption?

County response to question 12: The ROW will be established by GIS and will not include title/survey work as part of this process. See also question 3 and response.

Question 13: Some areas along the corridor may require field topographic survey to verify impacts. Do you want us to account for any field survey, if so, how many hours?

County response to question 13: The County will defer to the consultant as to what they feel is best practice to produce the desired product, however, to be able to identify a viable preferred trail route it is highly likely that field work will need to be conducted to identify challenges/opportunities that otherwise cannot be identified utilizing GIS data. The County requests that an itemized bid be provided for all services/costs. There is currently no estimated amount of hours for field work as the corridor has not been identified. See also response to question 5.

Question 14: Does the County want us to survey existing utilities? This would be beneficial to account for any utility relocations that would be compensable.

County response to question 14: Actual utility locations would be surveyed at the time that the county releases an RFP for trail construction plans, however a general idea of the location of utility easements would be beneficial to know such as electric, gas, etc.

Question 15: Does the County want us to include a subconsultant to review/clear the proposed corridor for archaeological/historical impacts?

County response to question 15: The County will defer to the consultant as to what they feel is best practice to produce the desired product. General impacts should be discussed in the plan as they relate to the identified trail route and an endangered/cultural resources review should be conducted. Depending on the findings of the initial review, the County and consultant shall discuss the need for additional professional services.

Question 16: Development Concept: As far as a “plan” it would help to get clarification on what is considered a plan. For example: title sheet – cross sections plan set or is a roll stock / exhibit more in the realm on what is needed? This would certainly dictate our level of effort on that front.

County response to question 16: The RFP is for a master plan and includes components of conducting public participation and coordination/negotiation with municipalities and stakeholders to reliably identify a viable future trail corridor including identified users, spur trails, connections to community features, etc. The master plan is not intended to provide any detailed construction plans, although the master plan may include exhibits to demonstrate how challenging areas may be addressed due to terrain or other limiting factors.

Question 17: 3.3.d: Identify Spur Routes: This seems very open-ended and a great place for scope creep. Can you please clarify anticipated locations. This will help clarify anticipated level of effort and cost.

County response to question 17: Based municipal, stakeholder, and public input, the planning process will identify spur routes. See also response to question 11.

Question 18: 3.3g: Are we to supply a full signing plan with this Master Plan project? Or just a general signing concept for the project?

County response to question 18: Wayfinding signage should be generally identified including design and location. Detailed design and location will be identified as part of future construction plans. The design of wayfinding signage should be consistent with the design of the exiting trail including color, texture and logos.