



UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

AMENDMENT NO. 10

TO: ALL VENDORS

FROM: Lana Widener

SUBJECT: USC-BVB-2360-LW
Elevator Preventative Maintenance and Repair Services of the Vertical
Transportation Equipment for the Columbia Campus

DATE: February 21, 2013

This Amendment No. 10 modifies the Best Value Bid only in the manner and to the extent as stated herein.

ITEM NO. ONE: **REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION**

“...we wanted to see if you would accept a statement to our bid or could we get additional clarification on Amendment 9. Still unclear at this time.

In reference to the code upgrades on existing elevator controller and/or equipment, it is our understanding that the contractor is limited to its responsibility for cost of upgrades or modifications to no more than the code under which the unit was under at the time of installation. Each elevator was installed under different codes that were in effect at the time of installation whether it be 1998, 2004, 2007 & 2010 code. In amendment #9 it is stated that if a controller was needed to be replaced then this would be considered a modernization and would be considered an upgrade at the cost of the university. In addition, many of the control systems were installed under 2004 & 7 codes which may only require software upgrades along with some minor fixture upgrades to bring them into the 2010 code without replacing the controller in its entirety and these too we are considering as upgrades and the cost of the University.

USC’S REQUEST FOR UNDERSTANDING TO REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION

I am not sure what the question is that you are asking for clarification. The original question goes back before Amendment #9 about code. USC wants the elevators code compliant. Please help me to understand what the question is that you have.

VENDOR’S RESPONSE TO USC’S REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION

- 1) All we need is clarification that USC means the units are compliant “FOR THE CODE THAT PREVAILED AT THE TIME OF INSTALL”.
- 2) Is it USC’s intent to require the elevator service provider to bring units currently “grandfathered” by prior code up to current 2010 code. ANY changes would be considered upgrades up to and including control system change-out. The State does not require existing elevators to be brought up to current code unless a full modernization is

performed. Additionally, any NEW elevators installed would be required to meet current code.

Basically, any code related changes to existing elevators would be at the sole discretion of USC and therefore would be considered a billable upgrade in our opinion. If you intend the Contractor to upgrade every elevator on campus, less controller work that you consider this a modernization, this would still cost thousands and thousands of dollars. Any bidder would have an extremely difficult time placing a price tag on such a request as part of bid.

USC'S RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION

It is the responsibility of the contractor to ensure that the elevators are code compliant. However, USC agrees that there are elevator units which are currently grandfathered by prior code up to the current 2010 code. Should these grandfathered units require repairs or such then, yes, that work would not have to be brought up to the 2010 code, but they must meet the code that they were installed under, at a minimum. If an upgrade to a grandfathered unit is required which requires the 2010 code be met, then the University will consider it as a modernization and this would be procured through USC's Construction Procurement department.

Yes, any new elevators installed are required to meet current code.

BIDDER SHALL ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF AMENDMENT NO. 10 IN THE SPACE PROVIDED BELOW AND RETURN IT **WITH THEIR BID RESPONSE**. FAILURE TO DO SO MAY SUBJECT BID TO REJECTION.

Authorized Signature

Firm

Date