

**COBB COUNTY  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
ENGINEERING DIVISION**

**Johnson Ferry Rd at Shallowford Rd  
Intersection Improvements  
Project No. B2437, P.I. No. 0020001  
June 5, 2026**

**ADDENDUM NO. 3**

---

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS/BIDS WILL BE RECEIVED UNTIL  
June 11, 2026 – 12:00 Noon Local Time**

---

The following addendum hereby amends and/or modifies the RFP Documents and Contract Specifications as issued for this project. All Proposers are subject to the provisions of this Addendum. **Proposers shall acknowledge receipt of this addendum.**

**Electronic RFP** will be received via **Bid Express** at [www.bidexpress.com](http://www.bidexpress.com) on behalf of the Cobb County Board of Commissioners, **until 12:00 noon, June 11, 2026. NO BIDS WILL BE ACCEPTED AFTER THE 12:00 NOON DEADLINE.** No submitted bid may be withdrawn after the scheduled bid opening for a period of ninety (90) days.

**All bids shall be accompanied by an Electronic Bid Bond via Bid Express a Paper Bid Bond, or a Certified Check delivered in a sealed envelope, indicating the project name and project number, to Cobb County Procurement Department, 1828 West Oak Parkway, Marietta, Georgia 30062, BEFORE THE 12:00 NOON DEADLINE.**

**NOTE: Addenda and plan holder lists will be posted online at the following websites:**

**Cobb County Procurement Services**

<https://www.cobbcounty.gov/procurement-services/bidding-opportunities>

**Cobb County DOT**

<https://www.cobbcounty.gov/transportation/current-bids-rfps>

**Bid Express**

[www.bidexpress.com](http://www.bidexpress.com)

**Receipt of addenda must be acknowledged online at [www.bidexpress.com](http://www.bidexpress.com). It is the proposers ultimate responsibility to ensure that they have all applicable addenda prior to bid submittal and to utilize the latest bid schedule.**

Technical Proposals may be rejected if the requirements are not provided in accordance with the Request for Proposal (RFP). The County reserves the right to determine, at its sole discretion, if the Proposal responses meet the RFP requirements. Cost Proposals may be rejected if any of the Unit Prices are obviously unbalanced. The County will decide whether any unit prices are unbalanced either excessively above or below a reasonable cost analysis value determined by the Engineer, particularly if these unbalanced amounts are substantial and contrary to the interest on the County.

In an effort to meet Title VI requirements, contractors are encouraged to fill out the form in the bid package. This is strictly voluntary. Please place form in a separate envelope and deliver to Cobb County Procurement Department.

### **Addendum No. 3**

#### **Johnson Ferry Road at Shallowford Road Intersection Improvements**

**Project No. B2437, P.I. No. 0020001**

**June 5, 2026**

**Page 2**

#### **I. QUESTIONS/ANSWERS**

- Q. Please confirm that signal modifications at the Kroger entrance signalized intersection (P.I. 0020001) are included in the Design-Build scope and Contract Sum, and clarify what level of detection, cabinet, and communications upgrade is expected at that second location.
- A. Signal modifications at the Johnson Ferry Road/Kroger driveway are not part of the proposed project**
- Q. Please confirm the full longitudinal scope on Shallowford Road east and west of the JOSH intersection and identify the specific stationing limits for each of these scope elements.
- A. Limits of construction along Shallowford Road are from Sta. 199+95.00 to Sta. 216+00.00. Specific improvements and their stationing are identified in the Costing Plans.**
- Q. Please provide the Begin Construction and End Construction stations on each of the four project legs (Johnson Ferry N, Johnson Ferry S, Shallowford E, Shallowford W), as shown on the Preferred Alternative, and confirm these as the contractual scope boundaries for Form F pricing.
- A. Begin/End Project, Begin/End Construction, and Limits of Construction are as follows, and should be considered the contractual scope boundary:**
- **Begin Project: Sta. 104+75.00, Johnson Ferry Road**
  - **End Project: Sta. 113+50.00, Johnson Ferry Road**
  - **Begin Construction: Sta. 106+00.00, Johnson Ferry Road**
  - **End Construction: Sta. 113+15.00, Johnson Ferry Road (plans to be revised to move End Construction station from 112+87.25 to 113+15.00)**
  - **Limit of Construction (E): Sta. 199+95.00, Shallowford Road**
  - **Limits of Construction (W): Sta. 216+00.00, Shallowford Road**
- Q. Please confirm whether the GDOT Preferred Alternative dated March 2025 (Public Meeting Display), the Preconstruction Status Report, and the Introductory Presentation dated February 2025 published on the GDOT ArcGIS Hub are part of the Bridging Documents, or whether the Bridging Documents include additional materials not yet posted on the public hub.
- A. BidExpress contains all pertinent Bridging Documents for this solicitation.**
- Q. Please confirm (a) the limits of the ESA as designated in the NEPA document, (b) whether any proposed improvements fall within the 25-ft buffer and the mitigation approach, and (c) whether any USACE Section 404 permit or GA EPD stream buffer variance is required or has been obtained.
- A. The limits of the ESA are described on the Costing Plans Dwg. No. 04-0002 and are delineated throughout the plan set. No activities are permitted within the 25-ft state waters buffer, therefore no related mitigation is anticipated. Neither a USACE Section 404 permit, nor a GA EPD stream buffer variance are anticipated.**
- Q. Please confirm if Field Engineers Office TP-3 will be mandatorily required.
- A. A Field Engineers Office TP-3 is required, in accordance with the Sample DBA Section Three General Conditions, Special Provision Section 153.**

### Addendum No. 3

#### Johnson Ferry Road at Shallowford Road Intersection Improvements

Project No. B2437, P.I. No. 0020001

June 5, 2026

Page 3

#### I. QUESTIONS/ANSWERS (continued)

- Q. Please confirm the current NEPA document type, the date of approval, and the agency of original jurisdiction (GDOT or FHWA). Please also provide the list of environmental commitments from the NEPA document that must be carried into the Design-Build Documents, and confirm the Design-Builder's responsibility if NEPA reevaluation is required as a result of ATCs or design refinement
- A. NEPA document is a Programmatic Categorical Exclusion. The agency of original jurisdiction is the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT). The environmental commitments are listed on the Costing Plans Dwg. No. 04-0002. The Design-Builder is responsible for any NEPA reevaluations required.**
- Q. Please make available any wetland delineation, stream assessment, or jurisdictional determination reports prepared during preliminary engineering that will inform the Design-Builder's permitting and stormwater design.
- A. No wetlands were identified within the environmental survey boundary (ESB). A jurisdictional stream was delineated outside of the project limits, but within the ESB. This stream is delineated in the Costing Plans. All available documents related to ecological resources have been included in the design documents.**
- Q. Please confirm (a) whether Georgia Power transmission facilities are to be preserved in place without any relocation, (b) the status of any existing utility agreement with Georgia Power, and (c) the Design-Builder's coordination responsibility if design refinement creates a conflict.
- A. Transmission facilities are owned by Georgia Transmission Corporation, not Georgia Power. No impacts to transmission facilities are anticipated. A relocation agreement between Cobb County and GPC is currently pending. Should conflicts arise, Design-Builder will be responsible for coordinating relocation plan with utilities and prepare revised work plan and schedule(s) as necessary.**
- Q. Please confirm the extent and type of pedestrian facilities, ADA curb ramp requirements at all four corners of the JOSH intersection, and any ADA transition plan requirements.
- A. ADA-compliant curb ramps, per GDOT Construction Details, are shown throughout the Costing Plans. Please review the Costing Plans for additional details on ADA-compliant facilities and requirements.**
- Q. Please clarify the distinction between NTP1, NTP2, and NTP3 as used in Form M, including the specific Owner-authorized activities that commence at each NTP and the expected elapsed time between NTP2 and NTP3.
- A. See Sample DBA Article 6 for detail on activities required under each NTP.**
- Q. Please confirm whether existing and proposed signal phasing plans (splits, offsets, pedestrian timing, preemption if any) have been developed for both signalized intersections, and whether the Design-Builder's scope includes full timing optimization or only controller/hardware replacement.
- A. Cobb County will develop all signal timing internally.**

### Addendum No. 3

#### Johnson Ferry Road at Shallowford Road Intersection Improvements

Project No. B2437, P.I. No. 0020001

June 5, 2026

Page 4

#### I. QUESTIONS/ANSWERS (continued)

- Q. Please confirm whether this 365-day period is inclusive of GDOT or Cobb DOT winter/seasonal construction limitations (e.g., paving restrictions), and whether weather day provisions are addressed elsewhere in the DBA. Given the commercial operations nearby (Kroger, Publix), are there any restricted construction windows or holiday blackout dates that should inform the schedule?
- A. **See Sample DBA Section Three General Conditions, Special Provision Section 108 for project-specific provisions related to contract time under this agreement, including weather and time restrictions.**
- Q. Please confirm whether the 120-day FDD cap is measured from NTP2 (giving PDD + FDD together ≤120 days) or from PDD approval (making 120 days a cap on FDD alone).
- A. **RFP Form M provides a Not to Exceed 120 Days timeline for all required NTP2 activities (PDD+FDD).**
- Q. Please confirm this 90-day assumption is for scheduling purposes only and does not constitute a commitment by either party as to actual NTP1 timing.
- A. **90-days is an estimation for the timeline from Letting to Contract Award to be utilized for Proposal Schedule consistency and not intended to be a commitment as to actual timeline for Contract Award or NTP1 timing.**
- Q. Please confirm whether the Owner anticipates establishing a DBE goal prior to the Proposal Due Date, and if so, whether advance notice will be provided.
- A. **There are currently no DBE-related requirements associated with or anticipated for this project. Notice will be provided in the event of revision to the project requirements.**
- Q. Please confirm the acceptable scheduling software and file formats (e.g., Primavera P6, MS Project) for the Proposal Schedule submittal, and whether native files are required in addition to the PDF Gantt.
- A. **The Proposal Schedule may be developed using any commercially available scheduling software capable of producing a Gantt-style schedule. The Proposal Schedule shall be submitted in PDF format, and native schedule files are not required as part of the proposal submission.**
- Q. Please confirm whether any additional Proposal Schedule requirement is anticipated via Addendum, or whether this item can be disregarded.
- A. **There are no additional Proposal Schedule requirements outside of the requirements stated in RFP-ITP Exhibit C.**
- Q. Please confirm that any technical appendices, exhibits, and matrices beyond the Proposal Schedule, Schematic Plans, and Organizational Chart will count toward the 20-page Technical Proposal aggregate limit.
- A. **Per RFP-ITP Exhibit C, Appendices and exhibits containing graphs, any matrices and pertinent data, the Proposal Schedule (exclusive of the Proposal Schedule narrative), Schematic Plans, and Organizational Chart will not be counted as part of the page limit.**

**Addendum No. 3**

**Johnson Ferry Road at Shallowford Road Intersection Improvements**

**Project No. B2437, P.I. No. 0020001**

**June 5, 2026**

**Page 5**

**I. QUESTIONS/ANSWERS (continued)**

- Q. Please confirm that the Basis of D&C scope for SOV purposes is limited to the initial submittal and updates during Design, and does not include the ongoing PMP maintenance normally captured in A.3.a Project Management and Coordination.
- A. Per Form F Note 6, the line item provided for “Project Management Plan” (A.3.c) value shall include the price for all Submittals required by TP Section 2.3 (Project Management Plan) including all required component Submittals, versions, and updates, such as the Basis of D&C (which includes the Schematic Plan of Project).**
- Q. Proposers electing to opt out of Indicative Proposal Quantities by inserting 'N/A' — please confirm this opt-out does not trigger any escalation, price adjustment, or change order exclusion under the DBA.
- A. Disregard Form AA (Indicative Proposal Quantities) from the RFP-ITP – this form will not be utilized for this solicitation and no upload location has been provided.**
- Q. Please confirm the minimum insurance limits required under the DBA (General Liability, Auto, Professional, Builder's Risk, Pollution, Excess) so that Form X from the Proposer's insurer can be properly scoped and dated.
- A. See Sample DBA Section Three General Conditions, Section 103.09 for detailed insurance requirements under this agreement.**
- Q. Please confirm the form and amount of the Payment and Performance Bonds required prior to DBA execution (typically 100% each), and whether the Owner accepts dual-obligee bonds if the ASP is a joint venture or joint bidder.
- A. Refer to Exhibits D-1 and D-2 of the Sample DBA for Bond Forms to be utilized for this agreement.**
- Q. Please confirm whether the Owner's Reserved Rights under §8.1 include the ability to cancel the procurement after receipt of Proposals without reimbursement of any Proposer's proposal development costs.
- A. Confirmed.**
- Q. Section: Form F – Design Build Price Proposal
- Will it be acceptable to utilize the pavement design from the East Cobb Church development for the proposed turn lane?
- A. No modification of East Cobb Church’s turn lane is to occur during performance of project. All proposed pavement design must be up to current project standards as reflected in this solicitation.**
- Q. Would you please send us the existing signal timing database of the intersection of Shallowford Rd. And Johnson Ferry Rd.?
- A. Signal timing files will be available on BidExpress following this Addendum.**

### **Addendum No. 3**

#### **Johnson Ferry Road at Shallowford Road Intersection Improvements**

**Project No. B2437, P.I. No. 0020001**

**June 5, 2026**

**Page 6**

#### **I. QUESTIONS/ANSWERS (continued)**

Q. Please confirm if Design-Builder is responsible for coordinating and scheduling utility companies for proposed scopes (Gas & Electrical)

**A. Design-Builder shall be responsible for coordination with all utility owners as necessary for completion of project and related utility scopes.**

Q. Document: RFP Section: 2.6

Who is responsible for the utilities relocation and how we need to coordinate with Utility Company?  
Who is responsible if the utility(ies) is/are not adjusted in the prescribed amount of time?

**A. The Design-Builder is responsible for the relocation of CCWS facilities. All utility facility relocations, outside of CCWS facilities relocation, are the responsibility of their respective owner. Design-Builder shall be responsible for coordination with all utility owners as necessary for completion of project.**

Q. Document: RFP Section: 2.6

What stages are the different utilities in for their respective designs?

**A. 2nd utility submission plans, as shown in the 24- and 44-series Costing Plans, are complete. It will be the responsibility of the Design-Builder to coordinate with the utility owners as design is finalized.**

Q. Document: RFP Section: 2.6

Will the county provide UAS?

**A. No. See TP Section 1.10 and TP Attachment 1-3 for further UAS requirements.**

Q. Can you please clarify the requirements for geotechnical surveys for reports and soil survey? Section 8.3.1 states that "the Design-Builder shall determine the location, frequency and scope of all subsurface geotechnical investigations, testing, research, and any additional analysis the Design-Builder considers necessary to support its design approach and construction methods...". However, subsequent sections 8.3.3 and 8.3.3.5 state the Design-Builder shall perform a Geotechnical Engineering Reports and Soil Survey Reports. Soil survey reports are not typically required by GDOT for a minor project which includes intersection improvement projects with no significant change in grade. Is a soil survey required for this project?

**A. A soil survey is not required for this project.**

Q. Are the pavement layers shown in the typical section sufficient or will a pavement design be needed?

**A. The pavement layers shown in the typical sections are sufficient. A separate pavement design is not needed.**

Q. Is the \*.ITL file available to help reconstruct the x-sections.

**A. \*.ITL files will be available on BidExpress following this Addendum.**

### Addendum No. 3

#### Johnson Ferry Road at Shallowford Road Intersection Improvements

Project No. B2437, P.I. No. 0020001

June 5, 2026

Page 7

#### I. QUESTIONS/ANSWERS (continued)

- Q. Can you please clarify the requirements for geotechnical surveys for reports and wall investigations? Section 8.3.1 states that “the Design-Builder shall determine the location, frequency and scope of all subsurface geotechnical investigations, testing, research, and any additional analysis the Design-Builder considers necessary to support its design approach and construction methods...”. Section 8.3.3.1 states that “the Design-Builder shall perform a WFI for all new walls and wall extensions.” And section 8.4.5 adds an external global stability analysis for non-standard GDOT walls or GDOT walls within specific parameters. However, per GDOT’s recent memo on Standard Walls Usage without Wall Foundation Investigations, WFIs are not required on Walls 4949B, 4949c, 4949d and 9031L if all conditions in Section 5.8.2 of the Geotechnical Design Manual are satisfied. Will a WFI be required for any proposed wall?
- A. **A WFI is not required for this project, as currently shown in the Costing Plans. If the Design-Builder proposes a wall design that deviates from or is in addition to the plans, a WFI may be required at the County’s discretion.**
- Q. Can you please clarify the requirements for utility design as part of this project? Section 4.3.1 and 7.6 indicate that Utility Relocations Plans will be provided by Cobb County Water Systems (CCWS). Are any additional relocated utilities required to be included in the project and will CCWS be providing the final 44 series relocation plans?
- A. **CCWS facilities will be relocated by the Design-Builder. 44-series plans, as developed by CCWS, are included in the Costing Plans and not subject to Design-Builder modification at this time. Final 44-series plans will be provided by CCWS.**
- Q. Was QC /QA performed on the survey by GDOT or Cobb County? If so, is the QA report from the survey office available?
- A. **GDOT performed the database QA. Survey QA Report will be available on BidExpress following this Addendum.**
- Q. Page 52 Exhibit C shows the TP shall be submitted in accordance with this Exhibit C and labeled as directed in Exhibit H. Exhibit H references using Bid Express? Should this be Exhibit E or another Exhibit? This is also noted on Page 44 exhibit B – B.1.General instruction follow B and label as instructed in Exhibit H.
- A. **All Proposal submittals shall be organized, labelled, and submitted in accordance with the upload locations provided on BidExpress.**
- Q. What utility relocation plans if any will be required by the design team? Will the design team be responsible for developing new Section 44 plans or will the current ones be acceptable?
- A. **The Design-Builder will be responsible for the 24-series plans. The 44-series plans were previously developed by CCWS and not subject to Design-Builder modification at this time. Final 44-series plans will be provided by CCWS.**
- Q. Are the proposed strain poles required to be powder coated and/or decorative?
- A. **No.**

**Addendum No. 3**

**Johnson Ferry Road at Shallowford Road Intersection Improvements**

**Project No. B2437, P.I. No. 0020001**

**June 5, 2026**

**Page 8**

**I. QUESTIONS/ANSWERS (continued)**

- Q. The provided costing drawings show the overhead lane assignment signs mounted on a mast arm strain pole. Can these signs be mounted on steel strand wire and strain poles instead?
- A. The County prefers to utilize a mast arm in this design, however, consideration would be made for use of steel strand wire and strain poles, provided that the addition of a new pole foundation can be achieved within the existing ROW limits and without creating conflict with utilities.**
- Q. Can the fiber optic cable identified for relocation be installed underground in conduit instead of aerial?
- A. It would be acceptable to relocate the fiber trunk underground provided performance of such work is in compliance with all Cobb DOT Traffic Signal Specifications, including those covering communication equipment as stated in Sections 935 and 939.**
- Q. Please confirm (a) the preferred signal controller, cabinet, and detection standards (Cobb DOT, GDOT, or project-specific), (b) whether integration with the Cobb County Traffic Management Center is required, and (c) whether any fiber communications or ITS infrastructure installation is within scope.
- A. Existing Cabinet and Controller to remain per the Costing Plans. All detection at the intersection shall be replaced, including CCTV camera. Communications to the Cobb County TMC is already integrated into the existing cabinet and contents.**
- Q. Please clarify the process and timing for requesting Owner approval of a subconsultant proposed to serve on more than one Proposer team, and confirm that such a request can be made confidentially.
- A. Subconsultants may work on multiple proposer teams without prior approval, provided the proposer identifies such subconsultant(s) in its Proposal, and demonstrates that the subconsultant provides a specialized service or expertise required by the solicitation. However, the Lead Contractor and Lead Design Consultant shall be exclusive to a single proposer team and may not participate on multiple teams.**
- Q. Is providing the forms by the Prime contractor and prime design consultant sufficient? Do subconsultants need to provide the forms?
- A. Subconsultants forms shall only be provided for those subconsultants being utilized to meet the qualification requirements of this solicitation.**
- Q. Will an MS4 report be required or is the concept submittal sufficient?
- A. Refer to TP Section 12.3.8.2 for MS4 requirements.**
- Q. What is the expected timeframe between Bid Submission and Contract Award? Is this the same NTP1?
- A. The timeframe between Letting and Contract Award is anticipated to be around 90-120 days. NTP1 will be issued following Contract Award.**
- Q. Is a signal modification permit needed or has this already been approved? Would the design team be required to coordinate with Cobb or GDOT on obtaining this?
- A. No signal modification permit is required.**

**Addendum No. 3**

**Johnson Ferry Road at Shallowford Road Intersection Improvements**

**Project No. B2437, P.I. No. 0020001**

**June 5, 2026**

**Page 9**

**I. QUESTIONS/ANSWERS (continued)**

Q. Please confirm is Desing-Builder is responsible for onsite material testing at the jobsite (cylinders, compaction, etc).

**A. No. Onsite materials sampling and testing will be performed by the County.**

Q. Please confirm the use of Workzone Law Enforcement will be required for work in the vicinity of the controlled intersection, as per GDOT Specs.

**A. Yes. All Workzone Law Enforcement shall be Cobb County Police, Sheriff, or Georgia State Patrol.**

GCV/WCK/jan  


cc:

*Electronic copies:*

Cobb County Procurement  
Andrew Raessler, CCDOT  
Michael Francis CCDOT, Engineering  
Brook Martin, CCDOT, Operations  
Russ Ford, CCDOT, Traffic Engineering  
Karyn Matthews, CCDOT Engineering  
Project File



Gabriel Colon Vega  
Construction Manager

Wade Kelly, CCDOT Construction  
Dyan Merced, CCDOT Engineering  
Denise Hatabian, CCDOT, Construction  
Abigail LaHaie, CCDOT, Construction  
David Muller, CCDOT Utility Coordinator  
Ginny Mauldin, CCDOT Utility Coordinator