



U N I V E R S I T Y O F  
**SOUTH CAROLINA**

**AMENDMENT NO. 1**

**TO: ALL VENDORS**

**FROM: Damon Hightower**

**SUBJECT: USC-IFB-1624-DH (Re-Bid)**  
**Furnish and Deliver New Light Emitting Diode (LED) Fluorescent Light Tubes**

**DATE: January 29, 2010**

---

This Amendment No. 1 modifies the Invitation for Bid only in the manner and to the extent as stated herein.

**ITEM ONE: QUESTIONS RECEIVED WERE CONSIDERED BY THE UNIVERSITY. A DECISION WAS MADE TO ANSWER THE QUESTIONS BASED UPON THEIR VALUE TO THE SUCCESS OF THE SOLICITATION. SEE PAGE TWO FOR QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.**

---

BIDDER SHALL ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF AMENDMENT NO. 1 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

## PAGE TWO

### ITEM ONE:

#### THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS WERE RECEIVED FROM VENDORS:

**Question #1** Will the University of South Carolina be receiving the quantities all at one time or will they be ordered on a as needed situation?

**Answer #1** USC Salkehatchie would prefer to make order and receive one delivery.

**Question #2** We would like to confirm that this bid request is for product and delivery only, no installation is required.

**Answer #2** This solicitation calls for no installation.

**Question #3** Why is it a requirement that the lamps support a variable source driver without specifying a maximum percentage for Total Harmonic Distortion (THD) of the device?

**Answer #3** The reason for the variable input has nothing to do with total harmonic distortion. The intent is to prevent maintenance personnel from inadvertently mismatching tubes with improper voltage sources that will vary depending upon the particular building on campus. The cost of the individual tubes are expensive, so the intent is to minimize “frying” tubes that could be placed in a fixture in which the source voltage is higher than the tube rating.

**Question #4** I am assuming that the statement “*CE or ROHS certifications will not be accepted*” does not imply that products which possess those certifications will be eliminated?

**Answer #4** Yes, CE or ROHS will be a disqualifier.

**Question #5** Instead of 8’ tubes, we offer a retrofit kit that includes 2 4’ LED tubes with a supporting tombstone between them that will allow for higher lumens, lower power consumption, and similar or lower overall cost than 8’ tubes. The retrofit kit does not require any electrical modifications and is simple to install. The fixture maintains its UL listing after installing the retrofit kit and tubes. Will you accept this alternative?

**Answer #5** Note #4 in the IFB states that “*partial bids and/or retrofit kits for 8’ fixtures using 4’ tubes will not be accepted.*”

**Question #6** Does the University currently have these in use at the facility?

**Answer #6** Yes, but in very limited quantities. The units were evaluated for illumination compatibility in the classroom and corridor environments.

**Question #7** Have they been in use for any length of time?

**Answer #7** Yes, approximately 6 months without failure.

**Question #8** Is there any test info regarding the tubes? The IES has established testing minimums TEST LM 70-08 for the US Dept.of Energy on LEDs and LED fixtures, but I did not see any listed for these two products.

**Answer #8** Some manufacturers do provide testing results. However, the funding for this project does not require DOE testing criteria as a prerequisite.

**Question #9** Have they been tested?

**Answer #9** If the question is have our samples been tested? The answer is unknown. We did not request test information on the samples (although it may exist) since we were evaluating the concept in general (i.e.; LED tubular technology) and not the particular manufacturer or distributor's brand of tube.

**Question #10** Can you provide a manufacturer's name?

**Answer #10** There are manufacturers that can meet these minimum specs however it is not in the best interest of the University of South Carolina to reference any manufactures during this procurement.

**Question #11** With only 2 years of warranty has the University researched other applications where these were installed?

**Answer #11** While the technology has been around for nearly 20 years, documented performance in using LED fluorescent tube replacements is relatively new and limited. The two year warranty is somewhat standard, although some manufacturers and distributors have 3 and 5 year warranties. I believe you will see increased warranty timeframes as the industry develops further.

**Question #12** Do you have the basis of design: ie manufacturers name and part number these specs are coming from?

**Answer #12** The intent of this solicitation is not to be brand specific as the university is seeking a product that can meet the minimum specifications for this solicitation.

**Question #13** Regarding the requirement for variable input voltage to facilitate ease of installation based on existing system voltage, that is an inventory issue on the part of the vendor and should not be offered as a method of disqualification, especially when most multi-voltage drivers operate at 40% to 60% THD.

**Answer #13** If the bidder can obtain variable input tubes, but currently does not have the item in inventory, then that by itself is not a disqualifier. However, USC - Salkehatchie has a timeline to expend the federal funds, or the funds will be lost. While the timeline to fill the order has not been brought up previously, a reasonable length of time to fill the order is important. The intent is for USC- Salkehatchie to have the tubes installed as quickly as possible.