



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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 TO SOLICITATION

TO: ALL VENDORS

FROM: Charles Johnson, Procurement Manager

SUBJECT: SOLICITATION NUMBER: USC-RFP-1885-CJ
MASTER PLAN REVIEW FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA, UNIVERSITY
HOUSING FACILITIES

DATE: February 21, 2011

This Amendment **No.2** modifies the Best Value Bid only in the manner and to the extent as stated herein.

BIDDER SHALL ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF AMENDMENT **NO. 2** IN THE SPACE PROVIDED BELOW AND RETURN IT WITH THEIR BID RESPONSE. FAILURE TO DO SO MAY SUBJECT BID TO REJECTION.

Authorized Signature

Name of Offeror

Date

THE FOLLOWING QUESTION WAS RECEIVED FROM VENDOR A:

In section A. SPECIAL QUALIFICATIONS, #7, target dates are provided for the completion of Phases II and III.

QUESTION: Does the university have target dates for completion of Phase 1 and the final report?

ANSWER: Phase I completion should be April 15, 2011.

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS WERE RECEIVED FROM VENDOR B:

QUESTION: Section IV. Item D. Can you please provide information on the University of South Carolina travel policy?

ANSWER: Please click on the link below to access the University of South Carolina Travel Policy.

<http://www.sc.edu/policies/busf100.html>

QUESTION: Section IV. Item E. Does the Offeror need to provide project descriptions of three (3) similar projects or the actual, full Master Plan document? These documents often contain confidential material and cannot be shared.

ANSWER: Project descriptions will be fine.

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS WERE RECEIVED FROM VENDOR C:

QUESTION: Under Section VI. Award Criteria, the RFP indicates that the “Offeror’s Business Proposal” is one of the Evaluation Factors for which the offers will be evaluated: “Offers will be evaluated using only the factors stated below. Evaluation Factors are stated in the relative order of importance...Once evaluation is complete, all responsive offerors will be ranked from most advantageous to least advantageous.”

It is our understanding that submitting the requested information would be a violation of South Carolina Code of Laws, Section 40-3-300, as stated below:

“Architects shall not enter into a contract for professional services on any basis other than direct negotiation thereby precluding participation in any system requiring a comparison of compensation. Provided, however, an Architect may state compensation to a prospective client

in direct negotiation where architectural services necessary to protect the public health, safety and welfare have been defined.”

Please provide documentation for USC’s reason for being able to require compensation, or a “Business Proposal,” as part of the selection / evaluation criteria so that we are not in violation of the State’s Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulations by meeting the requirements of your request.

ANSWER: Based upon the application requirements, the procurement of Master Plan Review for the USC University Housing Facilities is being solicited as Goods and Services rather than as Construction. This solicitation is not restricted to architects but instead is open to any interested vendors that meet the qualifications set forth in the solicitation to respond to.

QUESTION: Under Section II “Instructions to Offerors” B. Special Instructions”: The proposal states that, for the electronic submission, the “File Format should be MS Word 97 or Later”. Our assumption is that PDF- formatted material is not acceptable, in this case. Please confirm that this is the case.

ANSWER: For the electronic copy of your proposal, we are asking you to create the proposal using Microsoft Word 97 or later and then save it as a Word document on your computer. After that, save the document as .pdf file and store it onto a CD.

QUESTION: We did not see a requirement for SF254/255 or SF330. Please confirm if any of these federal forms are required for the submission.

ANSWER: We believe the SF254/255 forms are useful in understanding the teams that are being formed. We would like to see them submitted with the proposals as long as it doesn’t make this a professional service. We have only seen these forms in connection with professional services.

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS WERE RECEIVED FROM VENDOR D:

QUESTION: Section III.D mentions that you are asking the Offerer to suggest a recommended process to guide the formulation of the master plan. It then outlines a four phased process, including deliverables. This four phased approach is also referenced in Section "Speciall Qualilfications" A.7 in connection with the development of the project schedule. Could you please clarify to what extent you might anticipate the Offerer adhering directly to the RFP's outlined process? Should this be considered a guide or a proscription?

ANSWER: Offerors should consider this section as a guide. We are looking for the format in Section IV (Information for Offerors to Submit) of the solicitation to be followed with limiting the creativity of Offerors.

QUESTION: Section IV.C asks the Offerer to "...provide information regarding projects similar in size and scope..." Later in Section IV.E, the RFP asks "... provide master plans that their company has completed for three (3) projects that were similar in size and scope to the project the University is soliciting for." Since project experience information is asked for in two places, could you please clarify the intent of the RFP

ANSWER: Item E. Offeror's Referenced Master Plans in its entirety has been removed from Section IV (Information for Offerors to Submit) of the solicitation. Also, the Evaluation Factors clause in Section VI. Award Criteria has been revised. Please refer to the last page of this amendment to find how the Evaluation Factors clause in Section VI. Award Criteria has been revised.

THE FOLLOWING QUESTION WAS RECEIVED FROM VENDOR E:

QUESTION: Are the ISES reports available for each building?

ANSWER: The ISES reports are for individual buildings and will be made available to the successful offeror (Contractor)

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS WERE RECEIVED FROM VENDOR F:

QUESTION: In reading the RFQ, it appears you are asking for fees for the master plan services. Am I reading that correctly? Typically that would follow a scope meeting that goes into more depth on the project.

ANSWER: Housing believes that the scope as us outlined in the solicitation is sufficient for all interested vendors to be able to bid.

QUESTION: I also would like to know how the Housing Master Plan may relate to the overall University Master Plan.

ANSWER: The Housing Master Plan will be a subset of and consistent with the University Master Plan.

QUESTION: Will the housing all be publically subsidized or are you considering private/public partnerships?

ANSWER: Housing like all Auxiliary Enterprises does not receive any public funding. All debt service is covered by student room fees which are considered B funds. We will consider all options including private/public partnerships.

QUESTION: We are seriously considering this project, but we also know that being local these days often carries the day. How important will local representation be in regard to this project?

ANSWER: We encourage all interested individuals/firms to use local representation when possible. It is not a requirement to list local representation in order to be considered for this solicitation.

Item E. Offeror's Referenced Master Plans in its entirety has been removed from Section IV (Information for Offerors to Submit) of the solicitation.

THE EVALUATION FACTORS CLAUSE IN SECTION VI. AWARD CRITERIA OF THE SOLICITATION HAS BEEN MODIFIED AND NOW READS AS FOLLOWS:

EVALUATION FACTORS – PROPOSALS (JAN 2006): Offers will be evaluated using only the factors stated below. Evaluation factors are stated in the relative order of importance, with the first factor being the most important. Once evaluation is complete, all responsive offerors will be ranked from most advantageous to least advantageous.

Offeror's Qualifications and Offeror's Relevant Experience and Verification of Previous Work Done
Offeror's Proposed Approach
Offeror's Business Proposal