

Questions and Answers:

1. **Question:** Spec. Section: 11 53 13, Part 2, Point 2.3.16 – The specified countertop material (Stoneware) is a proprietary product typically still used in Europe and is no longer available in North America since the last supplier stopped selling a few years ago. Is Durcon Performance Testing epoxy resin acceptable? This answer would also apply to all locations with the specification where “Stoneware” is specified. .

Answer: The specifications of the proposed epoxy resin do not meet the specifications. Alternative products will be considered as long as they meet or exceed the specification standards and design intent.

2. **Question:** Spec. Section: 11 53 13 Part 2, Point 2.6.1 – This specification point refers to Waldner’s method for service mount features (module). This method forces the user to reach to the very back of the fume hood to use the outlets as well as reaching through the apparatus assembly (specified as scaffold). Mott fume hoods do not allow this; instead use the standard North American method of side- wall mounting outlets with handles in the front posts. Is this acceptable? This answer would also apply to all locations where this statement occurs within the specifications.

Answer; Locating the valve and sidewall outlets at the front corner post is acceptable provided the required interior effective width is not less than noted in the specifications and exterior dimensions match the specifications and design intent. Lab Casework dimensions and quality must meet or exceed the specifications and design intent.

3. **Question;** Spec. Section:11 53 13 Part 2, Point 2.4.10 – This specification point refers to Waldner’s method for mounting cup sinks (module). This method forces the user to reach to the very back of the fume hood to use the water outlet and ‘drip cups” and reaching through the apparatus assembly (specified as scaffold). It also requires the user to control the water flow from a handle mounted below the front of the fume hood while simultaneously reaching the outlet in the back of the hood. Mott fume hoods do not allow this; instead use the standard North American method of “raised” cup-sink with side-wall mounting outlets within the side cove and handles in the front posts. This method prohibits countertop spills from entering the cup-sink (drip cup) without forcing the user into an unsafe working condition of reaching to the back of the fume hood. Is this acceptable? This answer would also apply to all locations where this statement occurs within the specifications.

Answer; Locating the cup-sink within the side cove and handles at the front corner post is acceptable provided the required interior effective width is not less than noted in the specifications and exterior dimensions match the specifications and design intent. Lab Casework dimensions and quality must meet or exceed the specifications and design intent.

4. **Question;** Spec. Section:11 53 13, Part 2, Point 2.6.2.1 – The specification point calls for the fume hood support to be an “H-frame support structure” for slide under cabinets. Since the base cabinets for acid and flammable storage under the fume hoods require exhausting, they need to be permanently fixed. Are fixed base cabinets, with no H-frame support, acceptable?

Answer; No, please provide h-frame and push-in under cabinets as specified. Design intent is for modularity and flexibility in reconfiguring the labs. It can be any structure necessary to make that intent happen.

5. **Question;** Spec. Section: 11 53 13, Part 2, Point 2.6.2.1 - This specification point appears to indicate the fume hoods require a "supplementary fan" to achieve the required containment levels. Mott fume hoods do not require this additional fan to meet the containment levels. Is it acceptable not to have these fans?

Answer; Alternative products will be considered as long as they meet or exceed the specification standards and design intent. Alternate products must provide Data stating that the product meets or exceeds "MD15128" Fume Hood Containment at 60fpm.

6. **Question;** Spec. Section: 11 53 13, Part 2, Point 2.6.4.1.4 – This specification point states the overall height of the fume hood must be 2700mm. Mott fume hoods do not have to be 2700mm in height to achieve the required "Interior Effective Height" of 1550mm. Is it acceptable to have a lower overall height?

Answer; The internal dimensions as specified are to be respected and maintained. The external dimensions can be lower as long as they meet the overall design intent and available space.

7. **Question;** Spec. Section: 11 53 13, Part 2, Point 2.8.5.3 – This specification point appears to indicate the fume hood control panel (as described in point 2.8.6.3.1.3) must be mounted on the hood yet still be explosion-proof. This product is not available from any control supplier in North America. Some European manufacturers claim "explosion-protected" design however do not state if that meets Class 1, Division 2 design standards. Please indicate source used at time of project design development so we may provide an equal product.

Answer; The fume hood control panel does not have to be mounted directly to the hood. It can be mounted adjacent to the hood (within 3 meters). There is no "source" used at time of project design. Explosion proof fume hoods and all listed associated components are to be rated for the noted hazardous classification rating as the entire High Bay Lab falls under this hazardous classification rating to suit the user requirements. Alternative products will be considered as long as they meet or exceed the specification standards and design intent.

8. **Question;** Spec. Section: 12 35 53 – General Statement: Specifications are unusual as they call for a mixture of steel and melamine casework. Since steel is a superior (SEFA tested) product, is it acceptable to supply all steel casework?

Answer; Yes, this is acceptable provided steel casework products meet or exceed "all" requirements / dimensions as per the specification and design intent.

9. **Question;** We would like an answer to the following issue that was questioned previously however never answered. Attached, from the original bid, is a copy of CCN#: E-X, dated 2019-06-14 (copy #1 attached) clearly indicating "Waldner" as the supplier of the "lab furniture and systems". This selection appears to have been made prior to the product being put out for public tender. After questioning it, addendum #4 (copy #2 attached) was released that included only the second page of CCN#: E-X with the word "Waldner" removed with no other information or explanation. The re-issued tender now includes the full copy of CCN#: E-X (copy #3 attached) with all information, including the names and dates, exactly the same as the original copy however the word "Waldner" has once again been removed. Please explain how a formal document can be "doctored" with no explanation or clarifications. It appears "Waldner" is still the selected product however bidders are no longer supposed to know that fact.

Answer; The provided CCN#: E-X has been uploaded as a reference document. It is not part of any work being provided under this Tender Package. It is a CCN (Contemplated Change Notice) created to be issued to the base building electrical contractor to make changes to the existing electrical infrastructure to accommodate additional power and circuits. To ensure adequate power, circuit infrastructure, and connections were being provided for some equipment, product data sheets of the equipment were provided to the electrical consultant as basis of design. This is why the name "Waldner"

was present. As the name "Waldner" has no relation to the electrical changes, the name has since been removed.