

AAMPO FY26-27 UPWP	Subtask 5.24
ISSUED:	Friday, August 14, 2026, 12 p.m. CDT
PROPOSAL DUE:	Monday, August 31, 2026, 12 p.m. CDT

RESPONSES TO SUBMITTED QUESTIONS

Subject: Great Springs Project FM 482 Shared Use Path Feasibility Study

Questions listed below were those submitted in writing by e-mail to Darcie Schipull at darcie@greatspringsproject.org in response to either the FM 482 or FM 1102 Request for Proposal (RFP)s prior to the stated deadline of Friday, August 7, 2026, 5:00 p.m. CDT. This document constitutes the official record of all responses to questions. This document will be posted on Great Springs Project's website www.greatspringsproject.org by Friday, August 14, 2026 at 12:00 p.m. CDT.

1. The RFP specifies a 10-page limit for the study methodology; are there page limits for the overall proposal or any other individual sections?

ANSWER: The other items in the proposal do not have page limitations or font requirements. However, only one electronic document (.pdf) 10MB or less will be accepted.

2. The RFP requests "one paragraph summaries of qualifications and experience...for all personnel assigned to the project;" please clarify whether this means one paragraph per individual or one paragraph covering the entire team? Is this intended as a formatting requirement or a strict length limitation?

ANSWER: Under the Key Personnel section, the RFP requests a one-paragraph summary of qualifications and experience for all personnel assigned to the project. This should be interpreted as a summary addressing each assigned team member's relevant qualifications and experience. Please provide no more than one paragraph per individual.

3. Should we submit Attachment A as a separate Excel document or included within the one PDF submittal?

ANSWER: One PDF should be submitted.

4. Is there a target number of past projects from the applicant? Any limitations on length or format of related work experience?

ANSWER: No target number of past projects. There is no limitation or format of related work experience, however the electronic document can only be 10MB

5. Is pedestrian/bicycle traffic data collection required/expected and if so, what limits?

ANSWER: Pedestrian/bicycle traffic data compilation and collection is a relevant part of existing conditions assessment, however the incorporation of such data into the study and the method for collecting such data is to be proposed in the proposed study methodology section of proposals.

6. How frequent should survey points and cross sections be taken along corridors for topographic information? Every 50 feet, 100 feet or other spacing?

ANSWER: As stated in Task 4 of the RFP, survey control points and the potential for traditional survey is included in this study. The proposed method for such an activity should be detailed in a submitted proposal.

AAMPO FY26-27 UPWP	Subtask 5.24
ISSUED:	Friday, August 14, 2026, 12 p.m. CDT
PROPOSAL DUE:	Monday, August 31, 2026, 12 p.m. CDT

7. Does GSP or AAMPO have information on available Right-of-Way, or is parcel data acceptable as an estimate for the study?

ANSWER: Existing ROW information can be found at <https://www.txdot.gov/data-maps/right-of-way-maps/real-property-asset-map.html>. Parcel data can be reviewed at <https://gis.bisclient.com/comalcad/KS1.1>

8. Is current travel demand model information to be provided by AAMPO? Is it correct to assume there will not be travel demand modeling required, other than processing and interpreting model information provided?

ANSWER: The AAMPO travel demand model is available for analysis; it will be up to the consultant team to determine the needs of additional travel demand modeling.

9. For Attachment A, would you like the submitting firm to send the excel document filled out with the email submission, or would you like the information to be converted to a PDF and included within the proposal?

ANSWER: See #3

10. Will existing survey be provided, LiDAR, or topographic mapping for the corridor, or should the consultant assume field verification and collection of existing conditions will be required to support concept development?

ANSWER: Consultants should assume that field verification and collection of existing conditions will be required.

11. Should right-of-way recommendations remain at a planning level, or is parcel-level evaluation expected to support future preservation or acquisition efforts?

ANSWER: Parcel level evaluation is expected.

12. Is AAMPO willing to release a copy of the agreement?

ANSWER: This agreement would be available through an open records request.

13. As these corridor studies move toward implementation, does Great Springs envision using the recommendations and engagement approach developed through these projects to help inform future corridor studies along the Great Springs Trail, or should each corridor be considered independently?

ANSWER: GSP will always use information learned through previous studies to assist in improving future corridor studies.

14. Should the study include recommendations for strengthening connections between the trail and adjacent community destinations, such as downtowns, parks, civic spaces, local businesses, and cultural or historic attractions, or is the focus intended to remain within the trail transportation corridor itself?

ANSWER: Recommendations for strengthening connections would align with the needs assessment in Task 3 and the implementation plan in Task 5.

AAMPO FY26-27 UPWP	Subtask 5.24
ISSUED:	Friday, August 14, 2026, 12 p.m. CDT
PROPOSAL DUE:	Monday, August 31, 2026, 12 p.m. CDT

15. Can Great Springs describe the anticipated coordination process with the parallel Hunter Road Trail Development and Connectivity Study? Are there expected joint meetings, shared deliverables, or coordinated recommendations between the two efforts?

ANSWER: As described in the RFP, the consultant shall coordinate recommendations and concepts with the parallel CAMPO planning project; initial concepts plan development must align with CAMPO's project and incorporate designs recommended by CAMPO. This may involve joint meetings/work sessions between the project teams, coordinated recommendations between the respective studies, or other collaborative efforts to be identified through either or both of the concurrent MPO studies. The coordination structure will be determined following project initiation.

16. Will GIS datasets, public engagement information, and background materials from the Great Springs Corridor Study be provided to the selected consultant at project kickoff?

ANSWER: All work products from the Corridor Study and the Trails Plan will be made available to the selected consultant.

17. Is the intent of this study to identify a preferred implementation concept for the corridor, or to evaluate multiple conceptual alternatives through the conclusion of the study?

ANSWER: After a qualitative and quantitative review process, the consultant shall identify a preferred alternative, acknowledging that the preferred alternative may include elements of several preliminary concepts.

18. Does Great Springs anticipate the same level of public engagement for FM 482 as for FM 1102, or should the engagement strategy be scaled to reflect the corridor's size and complexity?

ANSWER: Each project will have an individualized public engagement plan, reflecting the needs of the corridor. The level of effort for such activities should be reflected in Appendix A.

19. As Great Springs looks toward future implementation, what would success look like from the perspective of someone using the trail? Are there particular experiences, community connections, or outcomes that you hope these corridor studies will help create beyond identifying the preferred active transportation improvements?

ANSWER: Success would be delivering a project that stakeholders, the public and implementation partners incorporate into existing transportation systems and visions. More information on the guiding principles of Great Springs Project Trails can be found on pages 12 – 14 of the Trails Plan:

<https://greatspringsproject.org/vision/>.

20. How do you envision these corridor studies informing future Great Springs implementation efforts?

ANSWER: As stated on pages 10 and 11 of the FM 482 and FM 1102 RFP's respectively, the implementation plans for these studies will, "recommended actions for efficiently executing the active transportation facility." These studies will determine the most viable path forward for building appropriate bike and pedestrian facilities along these corridors. Additionally, GSP will always use information learned through previous studies to assist in improving future corridor studies.

AAMPO FY26-27 UPWP	Subtask 5.24
ISSUED:	Friday, August 14, 2026, 12 p.m. CDT
PROPOSAL DUE:	Monday, August 31, 2026, 12 p.m. CDT

21. Should recommendations include trail-to-community connections and nearby destinations, or remain focused within the trail transportation corridor?
ANSWER: Recommendations for trail community connections would align with the needs assessment in Task 3 and the implementation plan in Task 5.
22. What level of placemaking recommendations is anticipated?
ANSWER: Each corridor could have multiple scales of placemaking interventions to be determined through the study.
23. How should coordination occur between FM 1102 and the adjacent Hunter Road Study?
ANSWER: See #15
24. What would success look like from the perspective of someone experiencing this section (these sections) of the Great Springs trail?
ANSWER: See #19
25. Can you help us understand how much survey work you're anticipating? Are you expecting light field reconnaissance, or more detailed data collection to support the alternatives and cost estimates?
ANSWER: See #6 and #40
26. When you say implementation ready, what does that look like to you? Are you expecting a preferred corridor with a funding and phasing plan, or something closer to concept-level design?
ANSWER: The use of the term "implementation focused" on page one of the RFP is not a statement of any necessary components of the study, but rather a statement of the intention and overarching goal of the study. Being that the products of this study, detailed in a submitted proposal, should serve primarily as documentation to support the completion of the proposed facility. This goal is applicable to all products within the scope of work - from the needs assessment to concept design - be created with implementation in mind.
27. Could GSP provide an updated link to Attachment A (Management Plan)? The link included in the RFP returns an error, and a copy does not appear to be available on the Great Springs Project website. We want to confirm we are using the correct form before submitting our proposal. Given that the questions deadline is today, would it be possible to extend the deadline for questions to three business days following the posting of Attachment A so that we have an adequate opportunity to submit any questions about the form prior to the proposal submission?
ANSWER: Links are available. Attachment A is the same document for FM 482 RFP and FM1102 RFP. Attachment A (<https://greatspringsproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2026/08/Attachment-A-Contract-Task-Summary.xls-RPFFORM.csv>) Attachment B (<https://greatspringsproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2026/08/Lower-Tier-Debarment-Certification-Form-002.pdf>) We will not be extending the question deadline.
28. The RFP specifies a 10-page limit for the study methodology section. Is there a page limit for the overall proposal submission?
ANSWER: See #1

AAMPO FY26-27 UPWP	Subtask 5.24
ISSUED:	Friday, August 14, 2026, 12 p.m. CDT
PROPOSAL DUE:	Monday, August 31, 2026, 12 p.m. CDT

29. Can GSP clarify the expected scope, platform, and deliverable for the travel demand model analysis tied to future roadway expansion, and identify who will provide those model files?

ANSWER: The model files will be available through AAMPO. The AAMPO uses a traditional four-step travel demand model. An analysis of the model should inform existing and future conditions of assessment.

30. Can GSP clarify the level of survey and ROW evaluation expected for the preferred alternative, including whether ROW mapping or title research beyond exhibit preparation is required?

ANSWER: See #6, #7, and #40

31. Overall page limit and font restriction: The Study Methodology section has a 10-page restriction. Are there page restrictions for the Cover Letter Key Personnel, Management Plan, and Related Work sections?

ANSWER: See #1

32. As a Prime for either FM482 or FM1102, are we considered a "third party"?

ANSWER: "Third Party" means an outside consultant or contractor who is hired to work on the planning/feasibility study.

33. If a firm submits on any of the feasibility studies, would that firm be precluded from the next phase – design and construction of the trail?

ANSWER: Great Springs Project seeks compliance with 23 CFR 172.7(b)(5)(iii), meaning any "consultant serving in a management support role may be precluded from providing additional services on projects, activities, or contracts under its oversight due to potential conflicts of interest." However, the RFPs for these planning studies do not request services constituting a "management support role", such as developing future RFPs or applying for grant funding. Furthermore, the production of planning study documents alone does not constitute activities performed in a "management support role" with Great Springs Project. Therefore, no third parties involved in the production of these planning studies would be ineligible to respond to future RFPs relating to these projects.

34. The link on page 12 of the RFP for the Management Plan requires a sign-in to the GSP website, for which we do not have permission. Will GSP make this document available another way?

ANSWER: See #27. The links have been updated and do not require a sign-in. Additionally, these links have been added to the webpages housing the RFPs for additional methods of access.

35. Is the project manager required to hold a Texas PE license?

ANSWER: No.

36. What is the page limit for the entire proposal? The Study Methodology section mentions a 10-page limit. Is there an overall limit?

ANSWER: See #1

AAMPO FY26-27 UPWP	Subtask 5.24
ISSUED:	Friday, August 14, 2026, 12 p.m. CDT
PROPOSAL DUE:	Monday, August 31, 2026, 12 p.m. CDT

37. On page 2 of the RFQ, it states “Refer to the form in Attachment A. This form is available on the GSP website as an Excel document, and it must be completed and submitted with the proposal for the proposal to be considered.)” However, the form is not located on the GSP site.

ANSWER: See #27

38. Have the selection committee members been switched between FM 482 and FM 1102

ANSWER: Selection Committee Members for FM 482 are representatives from the following agencies: Great Springs Project, Comal County, City of Schertz, City of New Braunfels, AAMPO, Texas Department of Transportation. Selection Committee Members for FM 1102 representatives from the following agencies: Great Springs Project, Comal County, City of New Braunfels, AAMPO, Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Authority ("CAMPO"), Texas Department of Transportation.

39. May GSP confirm whether the terms and conditions of the prospective contract, in addition to the scope of services and proposed fee, will be subject to negotiation between GSP and the top-ranked Consultant?

ANSWER: Yes, GSP will negotiate with a selected consultant who is most responsive to the solicitation based on the terms and conditions of the proposed procurement.

40. For the preliminary survey, can the team use aerial, LiDAR, or mobile mapping instead of a traditional ground survey at this stage of the study?

ANSWER: Aerial, LiDAR, or mobile mapping at this planning phase would be sufficient if surveys will be produced by a professional surveyor and will include major control points, topography, existing infrastructure, existing vegetation, regulatory and property ownership boundaries, and other information necessary to support accurate concept design.

41. For property lines, does GSP expect a licensed surveyor to research deeds and records, or is county appraisal district / GIS parcel data acceptable?

ANSWER: See #11

42. For the environmental work in Tasks 3 and 4, is a desktop review of existing GIS and agency data sufficient, or does GSP expect field surveys and coordination with TxDOT's environmental division?

ANSWER: A desktop environmental review should be sufficient for this level of planning but would recommend some level of coordination with TxDOT's environmental staff and other local entities to ensure that recent changes to the area have been documented.

43. Is there a planned TxDOT widening or schematic for FM 1102 that the trail design needs to match up with?

ANSWER: GSP is not aware of a proposed widening project by either AAMPO or TxDOT for FM 1102.

AAMPO FY26-27 UPWP	Subtask 5.24
ISSUED:	Friday, August 14, 2026, 12 p.m. CDT
PROPOSAL DUE:	Monday, August 31, 2026, 12 p.m. CDT

44. For Task 2, is "at least three public meetings" three total events, each offered both in person and online? Or three in person plus three separate online meetings?

ANSWER: This is to be determined in coordination with the steering committee to ensure thorough public participation plan throughout the planning process.

45. What is the expected Notice to Proceed date? Does the FY26–27 UPWP funding have a deadline for spending that would shorten the 12–18 month schedule?

ANSWER: The notice to proceed date is anticipated in October 2026, there is no deadline for funding that would shorten the schedule.

46. Task 6 asks the team to present as an action agenda item. Does the study need to be formally adopted by a governing body to be considered complete? If so, which ones?

ANSWER: It will be formally adopted by both AAMPO and GSP.

47. Is there an overall page limit for the proposal, or does the 10-page limit apply only to the Study Methodology section? Are the cover letter, key personnel, management plan, related work, resumes, and attachments excluded from that limit? Are 11x17 pages allowed, and do they count as one page or two?

ANSWER: See #1. Additionally, "pages" refers to standard printing size pages, either "North American US Letter" sized (8.5 inches by 11 inches) or "Metric A4" sized (8.27 inches by 11.69 inches) in either a "landscape" or "portrait" orientation. Formatting 11x17 pages would count as a "spread" or equivalent to 2 pages.

48. On page 2 of the RFQ, it states "Refer to the form in Attachment A. This form is available on the GSP website as an Excel document, and it must be completed and submitted with the proposal for the proposal to be considered.)" However the form is not located on the GSP site.

ANSWER: See #27

49. Is the Attachment B: Lower Tier Participant Debarment Certification required for submission?

ANSWER: Yes