

1. Q: Section 4.29b of the solicitation calls for the NAS to be submitted in 90 days. NAS spec references 45 days. Please confirm that for a project of this complexity, 90 days will be used.

A: See revised Specification Section 01 32 16.13 Network Analysis Schedules

2. Q: Section 230711-16-4A – The specs say to insulate the heat recovery exhaust air (HREA) at the upper floor only. Exhaust air fans 1,2,6 & 8 all have coils (2 are HREA and 2 are LEA (lab exhaust air)). Please clarify which exhaust air ducts that would require insulation. Typically if there is a coil at the exhaust fan then the duct supplying the fan would need insulation.

A: The specification does not say to insulate heat recovery exhaust air (HREA) in the noted specification section. It say to insulate “Concealed exhaust air duct serving heat recovery coils above ceilings at a roof level, unconditioned areas, and in chases with external wall or containing steam piping; 40 mm (1-1/2 inch) thick, insulation faced with FSK.” This would include exhaust ducts serving EF/1, 2, 6 and 8 which have heat recovery coils.

3. Q: For cabinet type BBO242235 (see QL0.0.2), please clarify if this cabinet requires a liner similar to what is typically provided in a corrosive storage cabinet

A: Yes, this cabinet type does require a cabinet liner.

4. Q: 123103, paragraph 2.5.A.2 appears to call for the mobile base cabinets to have INSET wood door and drawer fronts on a steel body. Wood door and drawer fronts are typically provided in overlay style only. Please confirm that inset style wood door and drawer fronts are required.

A: No wood doors and drawers are required. Provide metal doors and drawers. See Specification Section 12 31 03 and Specification Section 12 32 00.

5. Q: 123103, paragraph 2.5.A.7 calls for "retracting grab bar handles" at the mobile base cabinets. These handles are no longer available. Please confirm that the following fixed handles would be an acceptable substitute:

Mobile Cabinet Grabbar



The handle shown in this location would not allow for the addition of an add-a-drawer and may not fit under the benches and/or tables in the project.

The intention of the specification is for the casework manufacturer to provide a “retracting grab bar handle” as a means to be able to move the mobile casework more easily. We leave it to the manufacturer to provide the type of “bar” and/or “handle” that works with their mobile casework. We did not specify these particular items. If a specific mobile casework manufacturer does not have a grab bar or handle, then a custom-built grab bar needs to be provided to meet the spec requirements.

Please see below an example of retractable grab bar used before.



6. Q: RFI response #97 from Addendum 2 indicates that the wood door and drawer fronts on the mobile base cabinets are to match what is spec'd in 123200. 123200 does not indicate material type (ie veneer, species). Please clarify what wood veneer, species and finish to provide for the mobile base cabinets.

A: Same as item #4

7. Q: Details such as 27/QL0.0.6 call for "DP" divider panels at the desk assemblies. Please clarify what material these divider panels are to be made out of.

A: 1" Plexiglas. See Sheets QL2.3.1, QL2.3.2, QL2.3.3, QL2.4.1, QL2.4.2, QL2.4.3 and QL9.8.2.

8. Q: Detail 27/QL0.0.6 shows a large divider panel (DP-4) on the side of the desk assembly. Please clarify how this panel is to attach to the desk assembly, and indicate if it is to be removable for use in other locations.

A: See Sheet QL9.8.2.

9. Q: Could you please clarify which specification section indicates the material for the "Roof Walkway Pads" that are to be provided in the enclosed mechanical screen areas, as indicated by Note: 2.176 on Drawing AE2.1.5E.

A: The walk pads for roofing areas are in the roofing section 075216.13.2.4.

10. Q: Please provide direction for the following: Rooms 1-308 and 2-308 in the QL set reference elevations 2 and 3 on AQ3.10. There is no such sheet in this drawing set. Please provide elevations for these two rooms.

A: See Sheet QL2.4.5 and QL8.3.6.

11. Q: In the NETWORK ANALYSIS SCHEDULES – SPEC Section 013216.13 it states: "1.3 CONTRACTOR'S CONSULTANT: A. To fulfill all of the requirements of this specification section, the Contractor shall engage an **independent CPM consultant** who is skilled in the time and cost application of scheduling using (PDM)network techniques for similar sized construction projects. The cost of which is included in the Contractor's bid proposal price. This consultant shall not have any financial ties, business ties, affiliation with or a subsidiary company of the Contractor. The consultant is expected to provide unbiased professional services to the contractor and to VA's representatives in developing and maintaining the project schedule." This appears to be a conflict. The contractor is required to hire a consultant that works for both the contractor and the VA? Is the VA paying for a portion of the scheduler's services?

A: The Contractor is required to hire an independent CPM Consultant, acceptable to the VA.

12.Q: The NAS spec states that non-work activities should have a zero day duration. How can non-work activities have a zero day duration, yet the VA is allowed 20 days to review submittals? This appears to be a conflict. Please advise if non-work activities should have a duration.

A: This question appears in reference to Section 2.1.D which states "Logic events (non-work) will be permitted where necessary to reflect proper logic among work events, but must have zero duration." Non-work activities or logic ties shall not have a duration

13. Q: In section 3.2 of the NAS spec, part A3, the following is stated: 3. Logic, time and cost data for change orders (CO), and supplemental agreements (SA) that are to be incorporated into the network diagram and computer-produced schedule. **Submit "Fragnets" for each CO and SA for VA approval prior to monthly parallel run.** Changes in activity/event sequence and duration should be made pursuant to the provisions of following Article, ADJUSTMENT OF CONTRACT COMPLETION. If the VA does not approve the submitted fragnet with each month, please verify that the contractor can still bill and be paid for the month's progress

A: Refer to VAAR 852.236 - 83(PAYMENTS UNDER FIXED-PRICE CONSTRUCTION).

14.Q: In the NAS spec, Out of sequence work is not allowed. Typically, the VA leaves activities at 99% to not allow the contractor to bill for completed work due to punchlist, etc. When this happens, other work will progress. Please verify that out of sequence work will be allowed.

A: Per the NAS Specification, "Activities that have progressed before all preceding logic has been satisfied (Out-of-Sequence progress) are not allowed except on a rare case by case basis, subject to approval by the contracting officer."

15.Q: NAS spec section 3.2E states that fragnets must not include RFI or non-work activities. If the non-work or RFI activity is delaying the progression of the work, how can this be excluded from the analysis? Please provide a written statement on how to handle this, should the referenced scenario occur.

A: The same specification section states “Note: If timely resolution of the RFI is potentially impacting the contract schedule, in contractor’s opinion, the contractor must provide tangible proof with CPM data and immediately submit in writing to the Contracting Officer’s review.”

16. Q: Spec section 233400.1.3.A shows a requirement for the fans to have Seismic Certification in compliance with OSHPD. There is no known fan manufacturer that has Pre-approved OSP certification for TAGS: 710-EF-1 thru - 8. These are high plume dilution laboratory exhaust fans with heat recovery and variable geometry discharge nozzle types. A complete list can be found at <http://www.oshpd.ca.gov/FDD/Pre-Approval/SpecSeisCertlrgeScr-nwModelCol.html> for clarification.

B) Spec section 233400.1.3.B reads, “...unit supplied for installation in this project shall **NOT** have been subjected to a shake table test.” This requirement will make any attempt at site specific shake table testing for site specific OSHPD approval for the fans a significant cost and time impact to the project. To satisfy this request, the project will then need to have at least 4 additional fans shake table tested and certified. Subsequently, these fans will be trashed since the spec will not allow the tested fan on site.

C) OSHPD monitors the construction, renovation, and seismic safety of CA hospitals and skilled nursing facilities. Its seismic compliance program emphasizes essential facilities like hospitals in California to remain operational after an earthquake.

Please confirm that given items A, B, and C above, that this Federal research facility does not require OSP certification for the Laboratory Exhaust Fans

A: Special seismic certification of the equipment is not an OSHPD requirement, it is a requirement of the IBC and ASCE 7-10 (referenced by the IBC). As indicated in the specifications, the equipment is to have special seismic certification in accordance with ASCE 7-10, Chapter 13. An OSHPD OSP is not required, but seismic certification per ASCE 7-10 is required. Frequently the two go hand in hand. As a laboratory facility, the VA categorizes this as a mission critical building. Therefore, they expect MEP systems to remain functional after an earthquake, much like a hospital. The special seismic certification required by the IBC and ASCE 7-10 ensures that the equipment can handle the earthquake shaking and remain functional.

17. Q: Spec section 233600 (air terminal units) and 233625 (air control valves) indicate a sole source to mate with Siemens’s Direct Digital Control System, also sole sourced per 230923.1.1.G. Please consider the following:

- a) Recently completed projects at VA Palo Alto campus have other approved TCC firms and their respective controls devices successfully integrated with the existing campus Siemens Apogee network.
- b) Other air valve manufacturers such as Titus, Price, Metal Air, and Phoenix with controllers that are native BACnet MS/TP which can integrate seamlessly with Siemens Apogee Network have been approved, most recently at VAPA B-100 at hybrid OR rooms and various other similar spaces to VMU project.
- c) The Siemens valve, both single duct air terminal and venturi style (#45/MH6.1.4, are manufactured by a competitor named above under an OEM agreement. In other words, the actual valve device itself would be an equal by several other manufacturers.

Is the specified sole sourced Siemens products in fact the intent of the owner?

A: It is not the design team's intention to sole source the air terminal units and air control valves. It is the intention of the design team to sole source the Siemens control components on these devices. Air terminal unit specification 23360 does not callout a manufacturer and air control valves 233625 are called out as Siemens or approval equal.