

## **CENTRAL KENTUCKY BUSINESS PARK AUTHORITY**

### **Request for Qualifications**

#### **Due Diligence Services**

#### **Addendum 1**

<b>Question:</b>	<b>Answer:</b>
1. Is the cultural historical survey mentioned in the RFQ a full survey or just a records review?	The Cultural Historical Survey is just for above ground resources, and the Archaeological Survey is non-intrusive, not a full Phase 1 Archaeological Survey.
2. Can the submission deadline be extended to September 5, 2025?	Unfortunately, we are unable to grant an extension to September 5 <sup>th</sup> due to the Authority's meeting schedule.
3. Given the Authority's composition from multiple jurisdictions (Lexington-Fayette, Scott County, Madison County, and the City of Berea), please clarify the decision-making structure for design approvals. Will approvals be centralized through the Authority's board, or will individual member entities retain review or veto rights over specific components of the master plan or engineering deliverables?	The approvals will be centralized through the Authority's board, as the board is also the entity issuing the RFQ.
4. Will the Authority provide a structured mechanism for collecting and integrating stakeholder feedback (such as surveys, comment periods, or advisory committee reviews) during the master planning phase? If not, would the Authority be open to the design team proposing a framework for stakeholder input and iterative design refinement?	The Authority expects regular updates to the Authority's sub-committee and MWM but is open to the design team proposing meeting times and a framework for stakeholder input.
5. Given the potential for future rail service and preliminary discussions with CSX, would the Authority prefer the conceptual master plans to	CSX has shown preliminary designs for how they would bring rail to the property. Once an engineering firm is selected, the Authority intends to introduce the team to

include a dedicated rail corridor or easement placeholder to preserve flexibility for future rail integration? If so, are there any preliminary alignment preferences or constraints from CSX that should inform this design?	CSX, and will then decide whether they want to offer the opportunity for rail service.
6. What future development/end users are anticipated for this Business Park? Heavy industrial or light industrial users, or a mix?	The business park anticipates a mix of both light and heavy industrial users. We anticipate lot sizes to range from 20-60 acres. For example, see Hyster-Yale who sits on 50-acres and EQI who sits on 5-acres. Both are examples of the users we anticipate seeing.
7. Is the preferred primary access point of the development off of Menelaus Road or Farristown Industrial Drive?	Main access is anticipated off Menelaus Road. However, we also see the opportunity of improving JC Chambers Way for another/improved access point.
8. Is there a significant gravity sewer main near this site?	Yes, the property is well served from a sewer perspective.
9. A significant portion of the property is in the Silver Creek Floodplain along the eastern boundary; does this development intend to explore encroachment into the floodplain?	No, engineering will be used to determine the developable acreage on the property, and it is not the intention of the Authority to encroach into the land located within the floodplain.
10. Scope of Work Item D specifies ASTM 1527-13. The current standard is 1527-21. Is the old standard preferred?	Yes, please use the old standard in your proposal and pricing. If your team is selected, the Authority and engineering team can discuss if the standard needs to be adjusted.
11. Do you need certifications of insurance from sub-consultants as well?	If selected, certifications of insurance will be needed for the sub-consultants.
12. Does the entire scope have to be included for a firm to be considered?	No, the entire scope does not have to be included for a firm to be considered.