

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Sharon Walenga-Maynard
Sourcing Director

FROM: Sue Ciecwiwa, Buyer Specialist
DTMB – Procurement, Commodities Division

DATE: December 13, 2016

SUBJECT: Evaluation Synopsis for RFP #007116B0007029 Voting System Hardware, Firmware, Software and Service

Background Information / General:

This Request for Proposal (RFP) is for voting system hardware and firmware (tabulators and all related components, including those for use by voters with disabilities); related Election Management System software provided to counties; initial and extended service and maintenance; training and training documentation for county/local jurisdiction clerks and election staff and replacement components/consumables.

In 2002, Federal funding was allocated nationwide via the Help America Vote Act (HAVA), Pub. L. 107-252, for the replacement, modernization and standardization of voting equipment. At that time, the State of Michigan ('State') took on a coordinating role in the selection of optical scan as Michigan's statewide voting system. MCL 168.37. The State subsequently coordinated the development of the statewide bid process, contract award and the purchase of voting systems from qualifying vendors at the county level. Three companies were awarded optical scan voting system contracts in 2004 and 2005. In 2006, a single vendor was awarded a statewide contract for the purchase of accessible voting systems for use by voters with disabilities. After the expiration of these contracts, the State similarly coordinated development and implementation of a voting system extended service and maintenance contract. Two contracts were awarded to qualifying vendors in 2011, covering service and maintenance for all voting systems through June of 2019. Ownership of voting systems was granted to local jurisdictions (and in some cases, to counties - with agreement with their local jurisdictions) via a formal grant agreement.

In Michigan, elections are administered at the individual city/township ('jurisdiction') level, with 1,520 separate jurisdictions, in 83 counties, responsible for running elections. Counties often take on a coordinating role with their jurisdictions to assist with critical functions. During the 2004-2005 rollout of optical scan voting systems, Michigan County Clerks coordinated the selection of a single vendor system within each county.¹ Because of the need to coordinate disbursement of HAVA funds at the State level, the State worked with each county to coordinate purchasing timeframes, development of purchase orders and related payments directly to the vendors.

There is widespread support among the Michigan clerk community to now replace the voting systems that were purchased in 2004 - 2006. As Michigan has remaining HAVA funds available to support some portion of a statewide voting system replacement, the State plans to follow a process similar to the one instituted in 2004-2006. Voting system procurement will be handled via outright purchase – a leasing option will not be pursued. Given limited HAVA funding available, purchases will utilize a combination of Federal HAVA funding and an additional State appropriation and/or local funding component.

Bid Evaluation Method:

Responses to this solicitation were reviewed by a Joint Evaluation Committee (JEC) consisted of the following individuals:

Voting Members	
Sally Williams, Director Election Liaison Division Bureau of Elections, MDOS	Joseph Rozell Director of Elections, Oakland County
Timothy Hanson, Director Program Dev. Div., Bureau of Elections, MDOS	Marie Wicks East Lansing City Clerk
Kim Metzger Purchasing Manager, MDOS	Sue Ciecwiwa, Buyer Specialist DTMB, Procurement
Non-Voting Advisory Members	
Dave Tarrant, Elections Specialist Bureau of Elections, MDOS	Tom Luitje, Elections Specialist Bureau of Elections, MDOS
Melissa Malerman, Election Law Specialist Bureau of Elections, MDOS	Susan deSteiguer Director of Elections, Kent County

¹ The only exception to the single vendor system in each county was in Macomb County, who was granted an exception for four jurisdictions to continue utilizing an optical scan voting system that was different than the system selected at the county level.

Bidders:

The RFP was posted on Buy4Michigan on January 27, 2016 and was available for 48 days with a published due date of March 15, 2016. There was an optional pre-proposal conference call/webinar on February 3, 2016. The following Bidders submitted proposals in response to this RFP:

Bidder	City, State	Michigan Business	SDVOB
Clear Ballot Group, Inc.	Salem, OR	No	No
Dominion Voting Systems Inc.	Denver, CO	No	No
Election Systems & Software, LLC	Omaha, NE	No	No
Everyone Counts, Inc.	La Jolla, CA	No	No
Hart InterCivic, Inc.	Austin, TX	No	No

Selection Criteria and Evaluation:

- 8. **STEP 1 - MANDATORY MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS.** To avoid disqualification, the bidder must provide documentation to support the following:

Each proposed system shall have been tested and successfully completed, or be in the preparatory stages working towards completion of the testing and certification steps required by the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC). Proposals must include documentation of EAC certification or documentation thoroughly describing the current status (and expected certification date) for a system currently in the preparatory stages working towards completion of EAC testing and certification. This documentation must be submitted as part of the bid response, utilizing **Attachment 1.5A, Federal Voting System Testing / Certification Matrix.**

NOTE: Bidders who propose a system that is presently in the preparatory stages working towards completion of the required Federal testing and certification processes may be considered for contract award, and shall provide a copy of the EAC certification prior to final State certification and prior to a Purchase Order being placed for the system in any Michigan county. If a Contractor's proposed system is not EAC certified by January 15, 2017, the State reserves the right to terminate the contract and remove it from the program.

Special note regarding voting systems that allow for electronic transmission of unofficial election results: **Attachment 1.5A** allows for submission of both a proposed voting system for use in Michigan, which has (or is in the process of preparing for) EAC certification; and a modified version of the proposed Michigan system, which allows for electronic transmission of unofficial election night results. The State recognizes that the EAC does not certify the electronic transmission functionality; if a modified version of the proposed Michigan system is proposed to include the electronic transmission option, that modification must, at a minimum, be tested by a Federally-accredited Voting System Test Laboratory (VSTL). See **Attachment 1.5A** for additional details.

By submitting a proposal, bidders authorize the State of Michigan to independently verify the status of any proposed system's Federal testing and certification status with the identified VSTL and the EAC, and authorize the identified VSTL and the EAC to provide information to the State of Michigan.

Only those proposals that meet all mandatory minimum requirements will be considered for evaluation.

- 9. **EVALUATION PROCESS.** If the mandatory minimum requirements are met, the State will evaluate each proposal based on the following factors:

STEP 2 - TECHNICAL EVALUATION

	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Weight
1.	Technical Requirements - Exhibit A – Statement of Work, Attachments 1.1 – 1.4	50
2.	Service and Maintenance Requirements - Exhibit A – Statement of Work, Section 1.6	25
3.	Staffing, Experience and Performance - Exhibit A – Statement of Work, Section 3, Section 9.6, Section 9.7 and Section 9.8; Exhibit B – General Proposal Requirements, Section 6 and Section 7	10
4.	Rollout Plan and Training Requirements - Exhibit A – Statement of Work, Section 2.1, Section 2.2, Section 2.6, Section 6, Section 7 and Section 9.9	15
	Total	100

STEP 3 – STATE CERTIFICATION TESTING (PASS/FAIL). Proposals receiving 80 or more technical evaluation points will be scheduled for State certification testing (STEP 3). Sample data files and information regarding test ballot requirements for use in

preparing for State certification testing will be made available, upon request via email to the Proposal Manager, after the RFP due date of March 15, 2016.

Bidders who do not request sample data files and test ballot requirements in advance, will be contacted to submit test ballots that will be used in certification testing, prior to the scheduling of certification testing. The test ballots must be submitted prior to the testing date. The deadline for submitting test ballots to the State will be communicated to qualifying bidders by the Proposal Manager in a separate email. See additional details in **Section 5 – State Voting System Certification Application** above and in Exhibit A, **Statement of Work - Section 1.5B and Attachments 1.5B(1-5)**.

Test ballots will not be required to be submitted until Bidders are notified that they have passed Step 2, Technical Evaluation.

Voting system certification testing and field test/mock election results will be evaluated on a pass/fail basis. Note that the technical review scoring (Step 2) may be revisited following the certification testing, and could have bearing on a company's consideration for best value pricing review.

STEP 4 – PRICING. Proposals receiving 80 or more technical evaluation points (Step 2) and the proposed systems that successfully complete all certification testing and field test / mock election steps (Step 3) will have pricing evaluated and considered for award.

The State may utilize all proposals, including pricing information, without regard to a proposal's technical score to determine fair market value, when comparing and negotiating prices. The State is not obligated to accept the lowest price proposal. The price proposal evaluation includes consideration of a qualified service-disabled veteran preference. Information related to qualified service-disabled veteran preference is located on www.buy4michigan.com under "Vendor Registration."

STANDARD CONTRACT TERMS. The State strongly encourages strict adherence to the Standard Contract Terms (**Exhibit D**). The State reserves the right to deem a bid non-responsive for failure to honor the Standard Contract Terms. Nevertheless, **the bidder may submit proposed changes (bidder must use track changes to identify specific proposed changes) to the Standard Contract Terms accompanied by a detailed explanation as to each change for State consideration; failure to do so will constitute the bidder's acceptance of the Standard Contract Terms.** General statements, such as that the bidder reserves the right to negotiate the terms and conditions, may also be considered non-responsive.

The State may, but is not required to, conduct an on-site visit to tour and inspect the bidder's facilities, require an oral presentation of the bidder's proposal, conduct interviews with bidders, or request additional price concessions at any point during the evaluation process.

Evaluation Results:

As specified in the RFP, a \$1,500.00 non-refundable application fee (check or money order payable to the State of Michigan) must also be submitted by the proposal deadline. **NOTE: Bidders that previously submitted bids and a deposit check for State voting system certification under RFP # 007115B0005741 are NOT required to submit another \$1500.00 deposit.**

The following bidder submitted a \$1,500.00 check for the non-refundable application fee.

	Clear Ballot Group
\$1,500.00 Application Fee Submitted	Yes

The following bidders previously submitted a \$1,500.00 check for the non-refundable application fee under RFP #007115B0005741.

	Dominion	ES&S	Everyone Counts	Hart InterCivic
\$1,500.00 Application Fee Submitted	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

STEP 1 MANDATORY MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

The bidders complied with the requirements under Step 1, as follows:

Attachment 1.5A, Federal Voting System Testing / Certification Matrix.

Step 1 Mandatory Minimum Requirements	Clear Ballot Group	Dominion	ES&S	Everyone Counts	Hart InterCivic
--	---------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	------------------------	------------------------

Therefore the JEC concluded all five bidders completed the Exhibit A, Attachment 1.5A: Federal Voting System Testing/Certification Matrix and passed Step 1, Mandatory Minimum Requirements and will proceed to Step 2, Technical Evaluation.

STEP 2 TECHNICAL EVALUATION (100 points possible)

Clear Ballot Group, Inc.

The JEC determined that CLEAR BALLOT GROUP, INC. (CLEAR BALLOT) could not meet the requirements of the RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the selection criteria noted in the table above.

The JEC noted the following deficiencies:

1. Technical Requirements (Exhibit A-Statement of Work, Attachments 1.1-1.4) **Score: 35 / 50**

1.1 Voting System Hardware Technical Requirements

A. Ballot Counter/Tabulator (A.1-A.27)

A.8 In the case of a blank or over voted ballot, the ballot is returned to the voter and the tabulator does not emit an audio signal to catch the voter's attention. An audible signal is reportedly part of a release to be added in the future.

A.17 The ClearVote system only allows for e-transmission from a laptop in the polling place to Election Central. Recommends use of a separate laptop in every precinct, which is an additional point of failure and additional cost in each precinct.

A.23 The process for reconciling write-ins in the precinct in an AV counting board using precinct tabulators requires use of a separate plug-in keyboard to be attached to the tabulator to enter valid write-in candidate names, before write-in processing may begin. Use of a separate plug-in keyboard attached to the tabulator for this purpose will be awkward operationally and potentially difficult for users. Concerns with training precinct inspectors to handle these duties at the closing of the polls on Election night.

A.26 Transport case is bulky.

D. Ballot Box (D.1-D.9)

D.1 Small capacity ballot box. Each ballot box can hold 1,000 ballots which is not sufficient for most precincts in Michigan. Michigan Election law allows for precincts as large as 2,999 registered voters. Would require the purchase of extra bags and to remove, seal, and replace the bags during the day.

Design issue - Rip-stop nylon around a metal frame is not durable enough for a 10-year life cycle. Two options for emergency ballot storage. One is an internal compartment; the other is an additional ballot box that is attached to the primary ballot box.

Not a freestanding unit, requires a table, requiring local jurisdictions to also arrange for and/or procure an additional item in every precinct.

1.2 Voting System Election Management System (EMS) Software Technical Requirements

A. EMS General Requirements (A.1-A.28)

A.22 The ability to manually update data, which is not yet available, will be part of the system submitted for final Michigan certification. This is a serious problem for provisional ballots that are determined countable after Election Day. There is no mechanism to enter these votes into the EMS system. The process for adding ballots needing to be tabulated after the polls have closed (consistent with the Election Law) will be a manual data entry process and is not yet available.

If a re-upload of data becomes necessary, e.g. additional ballots required tabulation, it appears that this must occur at the county level and may require full re-tabulation.

A.25 ClearCast units transmit via secure FTP from the polling place to Election Central, where the results files are moved to the ClearCount system by air-gapped transfer. The cellular modem is not in the tabulator. The added requirement to have a laptop in every precinct to handle the e-transmission of data is unwieldy due to the additional equipment and processes required, an additional potential point of failure and additional cost in every precinct.

A.25. Use of the high-speed scanning solution in an AV Counting Board requires a closed local area network, which is unworkable in Michigan's structure (AVCB conducted at the city/township level in a physical space similar to an Election Day precinct – not at a central office location).

1.4 Voting System Accessible Voting System Component Technical Requirements

A. Accessible Voting System Requirements (General) (A.1-A.24)

A.9 Not much difference between small/normal/large font. Provided measurements in millimeters instead of fonts, as requested. The print appears too small. It does not appear that the system utilizes the entire screen space for candidates and proposals.

B. Accessible System – Use of Touch Screen Interface (B.1-B.2)

B.1 The print appears too small and much smaller than the current accessible system. It does not appear that they use the entire screen space for candidates and proposals. For the visually impaired, small print on the screen, and under-utilization of the screen space is a deficiency for the component of the system designed to help those that need large displayed print.

D. Reliability Requirements (D.1-D.10)

D.8 The accessible voting system includes one UPS battery that provides only two hours of service; a short battery life risks unavailability of the equipment to disabled voters in the event of a power outage.

Both printer options present challenges. If an inkjet printer is used, the backup battery required weighs 10.6 pounds. Note that the inkjet printer tested with the ClearAccess system is capable of duplexing a 17-inch ballot; Michigan ballots are often longer than 17 inches. This limits the ballot size and will require the use of a large laser printer. If a laser printer is used, the backup battery required weighs 112 pounds and comes with a transport cart. Transporting and arranging the larger printer could be extremely difficult for precinct workers. The laser printer tested with the ClearAccess system is capable of duplexing an 18-inch ballot.

2. Service and Maintenance Requirements (Exhibit A-Statement of Work, Section 1.6) Score: 20 / 25

1.6A Service and Maintenance

Current Michigan presence/level of experience is limited. Bidder has not serviced a tabulator-based system or a decentralized state where administration of elections occurs at the city/township level.

3. Staffing, Experience and Performance (Exhibit A, SOW §§ 3, 9.6, 9.7 & 9.8, Exhibit B §§ 6 & 7) Score: 3 / 10

3.3 Disclosure of Subcontractors

Clear Ballot has not worked with proposed subcontractors RBM or Scytl on previous contracts. Service Technicians' level of experience with the ClearBallot product is limited. Clarification response did not provide sufficient detail on the current experience level of the proposed technicians.

9.6 Key Personnel

Proposed project manager has no experience with the proposed Clear Ballot system.

B.6 Experience

Experience 1 relates to auditing an election and is not applicable.
Experiences 2 and 3 relate to vote by mail and is not a full representation.
Experiences are not within the size and scope for the work described in this RFP.

4. Rollout Plan and Training Requirements (Exhibit A SOW §§ 2.1, 2.2, 2.6, 6, 7 and 9.9) Score: 10 / 15

2.6 Training

Clear Ballot has partnered with, Scytl, a provider of online election training. Proposed a separate online training portal (outside of the State's e-learning system), as opposed to the requested approach – integration into the State online eLearning system.

9.9 Project Plan

Timeframes after contract award: vendor selection, purchase orders and deliveries are aggressive and unrealistic. Project plan roll up dates are inconsistent with the detail, e.g. training. Elapsed time for training courses in the plan are not consistent with the class durations noted in training course descriptions specified in Section 2.6 Training.

Total Score: 68/ 100

JEC Closing Assessment: Although Clear Ballot Group, Inc. proposed a system that may be viable in the future, the proposed product is under development and not currently in use in any state. At this time, the deficiencies noted above are insurmountable. Michigan, a large state which is pursuing a statewide contract, cannot rely on undeveloped functionalities to meet the contract requirements. Several points pose significant problems for local jurisdictions, including recommended use of an additional laptop in each polling location, limited size of the ballot box, complexity of the proposed e-transmission model, inability to add provisional and other ballots during the canvass, and lack of experience with a tabulator-based system in a state where election administration is decentralized.

DOMINION VOTING SYSTEMS INC.

The JEC determined that DOMINION VOTING SYSTEMS INC. (DOMINION) could meet the requirements of the RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the selection criteria noted in the table above.

1. Technical Requirements (Exhibit A-Statement of Work, Attachments 1.1-1.4) **Score: 44 / 50**

The JEC determined that overall the responses were mostly satisfactory but the following deficiencies were noted:

1.1 Voting System Hardware Technical Requirements

A. Ballot Counter/Tabulator (A.1-A.27)

A.11 Attaching the ballot box to the tabulator was sometimes difficult, may need some alignment guides. The addition of alignment arrows or a more prominent groove to slide and secure the tabulator is recommended.

A.15 Timeframe for auditory message when ballot is cast is lengthy (up to 12 seconds). Volume of audible alert is low and may be difficult for the average voter or worker to hear.

A.18 Ballot processing speed (20" ballot 3.3/min. image capture enabled or, 4/min image capture disabled) is slow and could require multiple scanners or tabulators for AV counting board (if a high speed option is not used).

A.23 The tabulators will divert ballots with write-in votes to the write-in bin for easy retrieval after the polls have closed; however, regular ballots must be removed and secured elsewhere before opening the write-in compartment. If not, ballots will be intermingled.

B. Ballot Requirements (B.1-B.7)

C. Memory Device (C.1-C.5)

C.1 Compact Flash Memory Card is older technology and is a major factor in the slower tabulator processing speed.

D. Ballot Box (D.1-D.9)

D.4 Location of the auxiliary bin (back) may be more difficult for voters, depending on the placement of the tabulator in the polling place.

D.9 Collapsible ballot box is not recommended, not easily assembled.

E. COTS Options (E.1-E.4)

F. Reliability Requirements (F.1-F.13)

F.13 The Democracy Suite system cannot automatically adjust for changes due to Daylight Savings Time (DST). Time zone, date, and time of the election event are pre-set during election programming and election file creation so that the tabulator time is adjusted according to the time of the election. Requires extra programming and adjustments if programming is completed prior to DST and the election occurs after DST.

1.2 Voting System Election Management System (EMS) Software Technical Requirements

A. EMS General Requirements (A.1-A.28)

B. EMS Programming (B.1-B11)

B.3 Programming multiple smart cards/keys for each precinct is required. This is a major process change and training issue for inspectors (voters should not be handling smart cards).

C. Ballot Programming & Layout Requirements (C.1-C.23)

D. Election Night Reporting (ENR) Capabilities (D.1-D.23)

D.2 Cellular modem is not internal must be connected by Ethernet cable. The remote transmission process requires the connection of a cellular modem via an Ethernet cable to the tabulator. There is no option for an internal cellular modem (only dial-up internally).

D.2 The "listener" software that receives the remote tabulator transmissions includes all equipment in the election even if it doesn't have transmission capabilities (ex. ICX). This could cause confusion on Election Night and it's recommended that the user have the ability to remove those devices. (Acceptable term negotiated.)

E. Reports (E.1-E.15)

F. Audit Capabilities (F.1-F.3)

G. System/Software Ownership (G.1)

1.3 Voting System Absent Voter (AV) Processing Technical Requirements

A. AV Processing (General) A.1-A.3)

B. High-Speed AVCB Tabulator (B.1-B.6)

B.1 Two options for scanners are available. A small and large scanner. The smaller scanner was only able to scan the 18" ballot in small batches. A continual stop and go process will lengthen ballot processing time on Election Day and is not consistent with the overall purpose of a high-speed tabulator, which is to process numerous absent voter ballots continuously, quickly and without interruption.

B.3 Adjudication must be done on a separate workstation, requiring two workstations in the AVCB. The workstation that has the Election files loaded could be used and is a workable solution; however an overall solution utilizing only one workstation is preferred and would require less expense and space for the local jurisdiction in each AVCB.

B.3 The adjudication feature requires a small network to be established. The network would include the ICC computer/monitor, scanner, printer and workstation(s). This requirement may pose problems in some AVCB locations (e.g., school gyms, churches), and may require local jurisdictions to find alternative space, which would be a challenge in some areas of the state.

B.6 Sensitive – piece of a ballot stub will halt the scanning with an error message. A continual stop and go process will lengthen ballot processing time on Election Day and is not consistent with the overall purpose of a high-speed tabulator, which is to process numerous absent voter ballots continuously, quickly and without interruption.

Scans multiple ballots before it discovers and alerts operator/poll worker of the problem which makes reconciliation more complicated. This may cause confusion in determining and finding the problem ballot, further lengthening the ballot processing time.

1.4 Voting System Accessible Voting System Component Technical Requirements

A. Accessible Voting System Requirements (General) (A.1-A.24)

A.6 Dominion presented a solution that required software to be installed on a laptop within the precinct (suggested EPB). The solution presents a potential problem with line administration and an issue in precincts where EPB isn't utilized.

Dominion was asked to present a solution where the county could create a single smart card per split (ballot style) for each precinct and this card could be used multiple times.

A.9 Not much differentiation between the small, normal and large font. For the visually impaired, small print on the screen is a deficiency for the component of the system designed to help those that need large displayed print.

B. Accessible System – Use of Touch Screen Interface (B.1-B.2)

C. Accessible System – Use of Paper Ballot (possible scenarios) (C.1.a., b., c.)

D. Reliability Requirements (D.1-D.10)

2. Service and Maintenance Requirements (Exhibit A-Statement of Work, Section 1.6) Score: 25 / 25

The JEC noted the service and maintenance requirements were adequately addressed with no deficiencies noted.

1.6A Service and Maintenance

1.6B Preventative Maintenance

1.6C Technical Support Response Requirements

3. Staffing, Experience and Performance (Exhibit A, SOW §§ 3, 9.6, 9.7 & 9.8, Exhibit B §§ 6 & 7) Score: 10 / 10

The JEC noted the staffing, experience and performance requirements were adequately addressed with no deficiencies noted.

3.1 Contractor Representatives

3.2 Customer Service Toll-Free Number

3.3 Disclosure of Subcontractors

3.4 Security

9.6 Key Personnel

9.7 Non-Key Personnel

9.8 Organizational Chart

B.6 Experience

4. Rollout Plan and Training Requirements (Exhibit A SOW §§ 2.1, 2.2, 2.6, 6, 7 and 9.9) Score: 12 / 15

The JEC determined that overall the responses were mostly satisfactory but the following deficiencies were noted:

2.1 Time Frames – Order Placement & Processing

No recognition of local jurisdiction's role in the testing and acceptance process. Page 30

2.2 Delivery

2.6 Training

6. Delivery

6.1 Delivery Programs

6.2 Packaging & Palletizing

7. Acceptance

7.1 Acceptance, Inspection & Testing

Bidder inaccurately assumes that the contractor will have a role in acceptance testing and submission of the acceptance testing form to the State. This is the responsibility of the local jurisdiction.

7.2 Final Acceptance

9.9 Project Plan

Good organization, phased approach; however, the draft project plan proposed did not include sufficient time for some key phases (e.g. delivery of ballots, ballot printing, logic and accuracy testing prior to the first use in relation to the Election Day).

Total Score: 91 / 100

ELECTION SYSTEMS & SOFTWARE, LLC

The JEC determined that ELECTIONS SYSTEMS & SOFTWARE (ES&S) could meet the requirements of the RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the selection criteria noted in the table above.

1. Technical Requirements (Exhibit A-Statement of Work, Attachments 1.1-1.4) **Score: 40 / 50**

The JEC determined that overall the responses were mostly satisfactory but the following deficiencies were noted:

1.1 Voting System Hardware Technical Requirements

A. Ballot Counter/Tabulator (A.1-A.27)

A.14 Lifetime ballot counter and the per-election public counter are the same font size, which may cause confusion for voters and precinct inspectors.

A.25 Top heavy when transporting fully assembled – there is a risk of the unit tipping or falling over when transported.

B. Ballot Requirements (B.1-B.7)

B.6 "ES&S recommends that all printers use ES&S CountRight™ ballot stock, which has been specially engineered to run on ES&S tabulators and meets all ES&S specifications for the equipment." Proprietary paper at an additional cost.

C. Memory Device (C.1-C.5)

D. Ballot Box (D.1-D.9)

D.3 Back door remains open for the cord to be plugged in (could be perceived as a negative or questionable by voters). Steps necessary to allow ballots to fall into the ballot box prior to the polls opening are cumbersome for precinct inspectors.

D.9 Ballots are required to navigate a C curve from the tabulator into the ballot box. The navigation of a ballot through a C-curve vs. dropping straight down into a ballot box may result in more tabulator ballot jams.

E. COTS Options (E.1-E.4)

E.2 ES&S ExpressVote ballot stock is a proprietary paper at an additional cost.

F. Reliability Requirements (F.1-F.13)

G. Security (G.1-G.2)

1.2 Voting System Election Management System (EMS) Software Technical Requirements

A. EMS General Requirements (A.1-A.28)

B. EMS Programming (B.1-B11)

B.2 All services provided by such third parties must take place on-site at the counties' designated location and must be through the use of the county-owned secured computers and network system. On-site requirement is too restrictive. (acceptable terms negotiated)

B.6 The ability to report by splits is not yet available and anticipated in the next release, expected to enter Federal certification by early 2017.

C. Ballot Programming & Layout Requirements (C.1-C.23)

D. Election Night Reporting (ENR) Capabilities (D.1-D.23)

D.3 There are no safeguards in Electionware to permit the simultaneous transmission of precinct results and corresponding absentee voter results without overwriting each other. The fix for this problem is planned for a future release expected to enter Federal certification by early 2017.

D.7 and D.9 Although an optional requirement, the ability to classify precincts as partially reported will be added in the future release expected to enter Federal certification by early 2017.

D.12 The system requires use of a 2nd PC to continuously see precincts reported/not reported on Election Night; if only one PC is used, the user must continually interrupt the download process to update the EMS system; this change (from the current software version) resulted in the elimination of a valuable feature for users.

E. Reports (E.1-E.15)

E.1 Reports available in the EMS are inflexible and not visually appealing. Additional enhancements, flexibility, and a modernized look are expected in a future release planned to enter Federal certification by early 2017.

E.6 ERM reports can be exported and customized as needed; however, this must be done outside of the EMS system.

F. Audit Capabilities (F.1-F.3)

F.2 No EMS report to confirm firmware version by tabulator.

G. System/Software Ownership (G.1)

1.3 Voting System Absent Voter (AV) Processing Technical Requirements

A. AV Processing (General) A.1-A.3)

B. High-Speed AVCB Tabulator (B.1-B.6)

B.3 A separate device ("jogger") appears to be needed to be used to align ballots for processing in the most problem-free manner.

B.5 Equipment is sensitive and experiences problems with AV Ballots in real world conditions (e.g. folded ballots). Results in halting of the process during scanning.

B.6 The system only allows for a manual duplication and adjudication process; no online adjudication process is available.

1.4 Voting System Accessible Voting System Component Technical Requirements

A. Accessible Voting System Requirements (General) (A.1-A.24)

A.19 The voter must view each contest before going to the summary review and casting the ballot. This may require additional time for the voter to complete the voting process.

B. Accessible System – Use of Touch Screen Interface (B.1-B.2)

Straight ticket voting – if a voter votes straight ticket and (as allowed by law) votes for candidates in a different party in a single race, the system maintains the remaining straight ticket choices, but turns off the straight ticket vote indicator on the initial screen. This practice takes away the overall count for straight ticket voting, which is used in statistics summarizing the occurrence of straight ticket voting used for reporting purposes. Note: This has no effect on the tallying of individual votes.

C. Accessible System – Use of Paper Ballot (possible scenarios) (C.1.a., b., c.)

D. Reliability Requirements (D.1-D.10)

2. Service and Maintenance Requirements (Exhibit A-Statement of Work, Section 1.6) Score: 20 / 25

The JEC determined that overall the responses were mostly satisfactory but the following deficiencies were noted:

1.6A Service and Maintenance

A.4 If ES&S is unable to install the Update in conjunction with a routine maintenance event or other previously scheduled repair visit, ES&S may charge the State or Authorized User to install such Updates. (Acceptable term negotiated)

1.6B Preventative Maintenance

Payment for extra preventative services (more than once every two years) is due within 30 days of the invoice date; standard state term is 45 days.

1.6C Technical Support Response Requirements

Election Day services are less comprehensive.

Bidder does not anticipate equipment needing to be replaced on Election Day. (Acceptable term negotiated)

"e. These printers are not covered by ES&S's Warranty and/or Service and Maintenance Programs and are therefore subject to the warranty terms and conditions of the COTS purchase source." (Acceptable term negotiated)

Locals responsible for shipping costs if COTS components must be returned to the manufacturer.

3. Staffing, Experience and Performance (Exhibit A, SOW §§ 3, 9.6, 9.7 & 9.8, Exhibit B §§ 6 & 7) Score: 9 / 10

The JEC determined that overall the responses were mostly satisfactory but the following deficiencies were noted:

3.1 Contractor Representatives

3.2 Customer Service Toll-Free Number

3.3 Disclosure of Subcontractors

3.4 Security

9.6 Key Personnel

9.7 Non-Key Personnel

9.8 Organizational Chart

B.6 Experience

Experience 1 relevant, however not within the last 5 years.

4. Rollout Plan and Training Requirements (Exhibit A SOW §§ 2.1, 2.2, 2.6, 6, 7 and 9.9) Score: 13 / 15

The JEC determined that overall the responses were mostly satisfactory but the following deficiencies were noted:

2.1 Time Frames – Order Placement & Processing

2.2 Delivery

2.6 Training

6. Delivery

6.1 Delivery Programs

6.2 Packaging & Palletizing

7. Acceptance

7.1 Acceptance, Inspection & Testing

7.2 Final Acceptance

9.9 Project Plan

Initial plan shows acceptance testing occurring after the training (initial acceptance testing should occur at delivery). Duration of some steps appears to be too short, considering potential simultaneous implementation by many jurisdictions within each phase.

Total Score: 82 / 100

EVERYONE COUNTS, INC.

The JEC determined that EVERYONE COUNTS, INC. (EVERYONE COUNTS) could not meet the requirements of the RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the selection criteria noted in the table above.

The JEC noted the following deficiencies:

1. Technical Requirements (Exhibit A-Statement of Work, Attachments 1.1-1.4) **Score: 5 / 50**

1.1 Voting System Hardware Technical Requirements

A. Ballot Counter/Tabulator (A.1-A.27)

A.1 Central and polling place layout pages 5 and 6:

- Diagram provided via clarifications is incomplete and only includes ballot marking devices. Did not include central laptop/server/Master Poll Station Machine (MPSM), scanner/ballot box, switch/router.
- A minimum of five (5) grounded outlets are required for each polling location. There are two (2) required for the MPSM and switch, one (1) required for the Ballot Box, and two (2) required for every three Ballot Marking Device (BMD) booths. For a medium to large precinct with 15 voting booths, it appears 13 grounded outlets would be required. Typical polling places will not have that quantity of outlets available.
- Electrical cord management and complex setup by election workers is not feasible, hazardous, and not acceptable.
- Too many surge protectors, velcro cords to the legs, too much equipment.

A.6 Requires an election inspector to initiate each voting session at each individual voting station. Requires additional staffing in every precinct.

A.17 Vote data and election data from individual Poll Stations is replicated back to the Central Server by physically returning the MPSMs to the Central Office. Everyone Counts defines central office as county, which is not reflective of the decentralized Michigan structure. Proposed central office structure and equipment requirements would not be workable at the local jurisdiction level. For example, this means Oakland County will be downloading results from 540 laptops on election night and handling the processing and tabulation of absent voter ballots. As another example, Kent County has 248 precincts.

A.18, A.19 AV and provisional ballots must be counted using Central Scan at the central location (county). This is not legally permissible in Michigan as provisional envelope ballots must be tabulated at the local level. These results are not available at the precinct level. The majority of jurisdictions in MI process AVs at the precinct level. All jurisdictions process provisional ballots at the precinct level.

No information was provided to describe how AVs processed centrally are combined with Election Day precinct totals.

A.22 Image processing settings for AV ballots are defined by an election administrator during election setup within eLect Administration. Thresholds for determining valid marks on the ballot are limited to three levels, high, medium and low and are determined by an election administrator. Recommendation is not provided; these threshold settings cannot be defined by individual users.

A.24 The ballot box can only physically store up to 2,000 ballots. In Michigan, the maximum number of voters per precinct is 2,999.

A.24 Tamper-evident security tape to seal off ballot box entry points is not workable given that ballots must be retrieved during and after an election.

B. Ballot Requirements (B.1-B.7)

B.1 Votes are tabulated by the MPSM, accessed on a BMD, after the voting period has closed. No voter selections are stored on the BMD or ballot box scanner. Votes are not tabulated from the paper ballots.

Ballot box/scanner which does not tabulate. It scans and deposit ballots in the ballot box.

The sample ballot provided was for the presidential primary (which contained only one race); not the general election ballot containing multiple races and proposals that was required.

C. Memory Device (C.1-C.5)

C.3 No options for processing additional ballots at the precinct after the close of polls.

C.4, C.5 The vendor defines the memory device as the MPSM laptop computer and does not provide any information related to security of the USB drive.

D. Ballot Box (D.1-D.9)

D.2 Ballot box compartment 2 (side) is too small to be used as an auxiliary bin. Capacity for ballots is unknown.

In the event of a power or Master Poll Station Machine (MPSM) failure there is no method to ensure adequate security for ballots that must be tabulated at the Central Office.

D.3 Removal of the security labels to clear a paper jam is not workable given likely sticky residue and the need to continuously record and reconcile seal numbers changes every time the tape is changed.

D.9 Ballot boxes consist of the scanning head unit that is removed from the ballot box base. The ballot box base consists of four (4) panels that slide into posts.

Current voting booths in Michigan cannot accommodate the footprint and the wiring required for the BMD/printer.

F. Reliability Requirements (F.1-F.13)

F.11 Everyone Counts recommends that backup hardware be available with rovers to ensure timely replacement. If the precinct is awaiting a replacement MPSM, voters will be provided a provisional ballot to be processed and scanned later at the Central Office. In the case of a MPSM, router, UPS or printer failure, Everyone Counts proposes use of a provisional ballot which must be tabulated at Central Office (county). This proposed solution conflicts with Michigan Election law and would likely require numerous printed multi-page paper AV ballots to be produced and provided to every precinct.

G. Security (G.1-G.2)

1.2 Voting System Election Management System (EMS) Software Technical Requirements

A. EMS General Requirements (A.1-A.28)

A.3 Severity 1 – Critical Election Day problem: “Typically requires bringing the election down. The client is informed and a new deployment is issued during a mutually agreed upon timeframe. If the election is brought down, the EAs ensure that the appropriate message displays for voters.” On Election Day, voters have no option to continue voting, which is unacceptable.

B. EMS Programming (B.1-B11)

B.5 According to Everyone Counts, “Using eLect Quad Audit, there is no need for a specific ballot to correspond to a specific tabulator program and manual verification of tabulator accuracy is not required.” The assertion that there is no need to test the programming logic is incorrect and violates Michigan Election Law and Rules.

C. Ballot Programming & Layout Requirements (C.1-C.23)

C.1 No detailed information on testing procedures was provided. The brief response to the clarification question does not demonstrate an understanding of the complex logic and accuracy requirements of Michigan Election Law and Rules.

1.3 Voting System Absent Voter (AV) Processing Technical Requirements

B. High-Speed AVCB Tabulator (B.1-B.6)

B.1 Tabulation of AV ballots needs to be processed from a central location connected to the Central Imaging Server. **This is a fatal error.**

B.1 Absent Voter Counting Boards, used to process absent voter ballots at the city / township (not county) level, is not currently available with the system. This illustrates a lack of understanding of Michigan’s election system.

2. Service and Maintenance Requirements (Exhibit A-Statement of Work, Section 1.6) Score: 12 / 25

Overall response restates requirements in each section with very little detail provided to demonstrate how Everyone Counts would meet the requirements.

1.6C Technical Support Response Requirements

Availability of Everyone Counts’ support is limited to the counties, with no indication of the need to provide service to local cities and townships. Everyone Counts does not recognize the decentralized nature of Michigan elections, or that Michigan does not utilize early voting.

3. Staffing, Experience and Performance (Exhibit A, SOW §§ 3, 9.6, 9.7 & 9.8, Exhibit B §§ 6 & 7) Score: 5 / 10

3.3 Disclosure of Subcontractors

Staffing descriptions show general skill sets, not detailed relevant experience involving elections or this RFP.

Clarification response did not provide any detail with respect to SIGMAnet’s relevant election experience that could be applicable to Michigan.

9.6 Key Personnel

Key personnel have previous election experience; however, did not provide detailed information that relates to Everyone Counts’ system proposed for use in Michigan.

9.8 Organizational Chart

A corporate organizational chart was provided which does not include a detailed staffing plan for the proposed project for Michigan.

B.6 Experience

Experience 1 is statewide, however voter registration is not applicable. Experiences 2 and 3 are not comparable in size or scope.

4. Rollout Plan and Training Requirements (Exhibit A SOW §§ 2.1, 2.2, 2.6, 6, 7 and 9.9) Score: 7 / 15

2.1 Time Frames – Order Placement & Processing

Response relates to service and warranty instead of order placement and processing.

2.6 Training

Training plan lacks specificity. Training audience is not specified in training course matrix and course descriptions are extremely brief. Focus is on counties, and does not specify nor seem to consider local jurisdictions or Michigan's decentralized structure.

6. Delivery

Lacking detail. Air shipments via UPS, FedEx.

No details regarding how shipments will be handled; e.g. direct shipments from the manufacturers?

7. Acceptance

7.1 Acceptance, Inspection & Testing

There is no explanation regarding the approach or the plan for acceptance testing and how this would be handled on all of the COTS components, and direct involvement by counties and local jurisdictions.

9.9 Project Plan

Timeframes for training are insufficient.

Logic and accuracy testing is listed in the project plan, but not addressed in the technical proposal.

Does not recognize multiple counties in each implementation phase.

Total Score: 29 / 100

JEC Closing Assessment:

Everyone Counts' proposed system does not meet several of Michigan's core RFP requirements. While Everyone Counts claims to understand Michigan Election Law and procedures, their proposed system includes several fatal flaws, including the requirement of central count processing for all absent voter and provisional ballots; there is no backup or contingency plan in the polling place to permit voting to continue in the event of any equipment failure or power outage; and the assertion that tabulator program testing is not necessary. The proposed polling place layout and electrical requirements are unrealistic and potentially hazardous. The expectation that precinct workers could successfully configure the equipment on Election Day is unrealistic. The system configuration would likely require a professional IT department to successfully set up individual precincts.

Everyone Counts essentially proposed a Direct Recording Electronic (DRE) touch-screen voting system with a paper trail, which would preclude the implementation of a uniform voting system in the state of Michigan, as required by law.

HART INTERCIVIC

The JEC determined that HART INTERCIVIC, INC. (HART INTERCIVIC) could meet the requirements of the RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the selection criteria noted in the table above.

1. Technical Requirements (Exhibit A-Statement of Work, Attachments 1.1-1.4) **Score: 39 / 50**

The JEC determined that overall the responses were mostly satisfactory but the following deficiencies were noted:

1.1 Voting System Hardware Technical Requirements

A. Ballot Counter/Tabulator (A.1-A.27)

A.1 The tabulator start up process is lengthy and takes a total of approximately 15-20 minutes. When polls by law must open at 7 am, workers arrive early, but time is of the essence and 20 minute startup process is a negative.

A.14 The size of the font on the ballot counter appears small. The tabulator lists 3 counts: ballot, sheet, and lifetime which may prove confusing for voters and election inspectors. Election workers utilize the ballot counter on the display to continually confirm that the precinct is in balance throughout the day (number of ballots tabulated vs. number issued). For some election workers, a very small font may be difficult to read.

A.23 The stored image of recorded write-in votes is limited and problematic if the voter's writing exceeds the space allotted on the ballot.

B. Ballot Requirements (B.1-B.7)

B.2 Vote targets appear to the left of candidate names or proposition choices and are inconsistent with current Michigan ballot production standards and would result in an inconsistency statewide. This is workable, but less than ideal as it relates to the State coordinating information and instructions for voters and election workers.

B.2 The vote targets appear as rectangles instead of ovals and are inconsistent with current Michigan ballot production standards and would result in an inconsistency statewide.

B.2 The maximum ballot length is limited to 17". This limitation would guarantee the need for a two-page ballot in many Michigan jurisdictions in statewide general elections in the even years. Two page ballots create great complications for election workers in their ability to tabulate and balance precincts (must balance number of ballots issued to number of voters); The State tries to avoid two-page ballots wherever possible. This also results in increased ballot printing costs for local jurisdictions.

B.6 Ballot print vendors must complete and pass an annual Hart ballot printing test using Hart's exclusive official ballot paper for ballot production. An initial certification test for ballot print vendors is acceptable, instead of annual.

C. Memory Device (C.1-C.5)

D. Ballot Box (D.1-D.9)

E. COTS Options (E.1-E.4)

F. Reliability Requirements (F.1-F.13)

F.8 Tabulator batteries must be physically removed and charged prior to every election. Typically tabulator batteries remain internal and are continually charged. Having to remove them and charge them prior to every election is another step, requires extra space and equipment and is especially problematic for large jurisdictions (e.g., Detroit has 500 precinct tabulators)

F.13 The system cannot automatically adjust for changes due to Daylight Savings Time (DST).

G. Security (G.1-G.2)

1.2 Voting System Election Management System (EMS) Software Technical Requirements

A. EMS General Requirements (A.1-A.28)

A.28 The EMS software has no automated functionality for the development of the chart of predetermined results used in pre-election testing.

B. EMS Programming (B.1-B11)

C. Ballot Programming & Layout Requirements (C.1-C.23)

C.21 There is no current process for creating uncommitted presidential primary candidate positions that do not rotate. This capability is on the Verity product roadmap, with an estimated release timeframe of the first quarter of 2018. This notable deficiency documented could be a deal breaker if not resolved in 4 years. The bidder has provided a plan and timeline which is clearly achievable and approved by Bureau of Elections.

D. Election Night Reporting (ENR) Capabilities (D.1-D.23)

E. Reports (E.1-E.15)

F. Audit Capabilities (F.1-F.3)

G. System/Software Ownership (G.1)

1.3 Voting System Absent Voter (AV) Processing Technical Requirements

A. AV Processing (General) A.1-A.3)

B. High-Speed AVCB Tabulator (B.1-B.6)

B.5 Did not provide the suggested replacement rate between proposed high speed scanner and precinct tabulator, e.g. one high speed tabulator in lieu of X precinct tabulators.

1.4 Voting System Accessible Voting System Component Technical Requirements

A. Accessible Voting System Requirements (General) (A.1-A.24)

A.2 An access code must be manually entered to begin the voting session on the Verity Touch Writer. Current process for setting up the ballot is cumbersome and impractical and will be confusing for some voters.

A.8 No text to speech capability.

Accessible key pad utilizes a wheel for many of the selection steps vs. multiple arrow keys which seem to be preferred by many disabled voters.

B. Accessible System – Use of Touch Screen Interface (B.1-B.2)

C. Accessible System – Use of Paper Ballot (possible scenarios) (C.1.a., b., c.)

D. Reliability Requirements (D.1-D.10)

2. Service and Maintenance Requirements (Exhibit A-Statement of Work, Section 1.6) Score: 20 / 25

The JEC determined that overall the responses were mostly satisfactory but the following deficiencies were noted:

1.6A Service and Maintenance

The State requires onsite repair whenever possible. The Hart model proposed seems to indicate that repairs will occur at Hart headquarters (Austin, Texas) and not onsite.

1.6B Preventative Maintenance

1.6C Technical Support Response Requirements

3. Staffing, Experience and Performance (Exhibit A, SOW §§ 3, 9.6, 9.7 & 9.8, Exhibit B §§ 6 & 7) Score: 8 / 10

3.1 Contractor Representatives

3.2 Customer Service Toll-Free Number

3.3 Disclosure of Subcontractors

The proposed service subcontractor (PSI) has no current Michigan voting system support and maintenance experience. Proposed service subcontractor is a printer, whose staff will require training to service voting equipment.

3.4 Security

9.6 Key Personnel

9.7 Non-Key Personnel

9.8 Organizational Chart

B.6 Experience

Experience 4 relates to a different voting system (DRE).

4. Rollout Plan and Training Requirements (Exhibit A SOW §§ 2.1, 2.2, 2.6, 6, 7 and 9.9) Score: 13 / 15

The JEC determined that overall the responses were mostly satisfactory but the following deficiencies were noted:

2.1 Time Frames – Order Placement & Processing

2.2 Delivery

2.6 Training

6. Delivery

6.1 Delivery Programs

6.2 Packaging & Palletizing

7. Acceptance

7.1 Acceptance, Inspection & Testing

7.2 Final Acceptance

9.9 Project Plan

The structure of the proposed project plan was detailed, however it was somewhat hard to follow and included some unrealistic steps and dates (e.g. misses county selection process, hardware orders placed one week after contract execution).

Total Score: 80 / 100

Scoring Summary for Technical Proposal:

Technical Evaluation Criteria	Total	Clear Ballot Group	Dominion	ES&S	Everyone Counts	Hart InterCivic
Technical Requirements - Exhibit A – Statement of Work, Attachments 1.1 – 1.4	50	35	44	40	5	39
Service and Maintenance Requirements - Exhibit A – Statement of Work, Section 1.6	25	20	25	20	12	20
Staffing, Experience and Performance - Exhibit A – Statement of Work, Section 3, Section 9.6, Section 9.7 and Section 9.8; Exhibit B – General Proposal Requirements, Section 6 and Section 7	10	3	10	9	5	8
Rollout Plan and Training Requirements - Exhibit A – Statement of Work, Section 2.1, Section 2.2, Section 2.6, Section 6, Section 7, and Section 9.9	15	10	12	13	7	13
Total	100	68	91	82	29	80

Therefore the JEC concluded Dominion, ES&S and Hart InterCivic passed Step 2, Technical Evaluation and proceeded to Step 3, Certification Testing. Clear Ballot Group and Everyone Counts did not pass Step 2, Technical Evaluation.

STEP 3 – CERTIFICATION TESTING (PASS/FAIL). Proposals receiving 80 or more technical evaluation points were scheduled for certification testing (STEP 3). State Certification Testing was conducted over a two-day period with each bidder in May 2016 and a field test/mock election with all bidders was held on May 20, 2016. Bidders were evaluated on a pass/fail basis.

	Dominion	ES&S	Hart InterCivic
Step 3 Certification Testing	Pass*	Pass*	Pass*

The JEC concluded the three bidders passed Step 3, Certification Testing and will proceed to Step 4, Pricing.

*Note: while all three bidders passed Step 3, all were asked to pursue additional features and/or changes to their systems. These additional features did not affect their initial overall pass/fail status. Once the revised versions of these systems are reaching completion of testing at the Federal level (including the enhancements), an additional round of State testing will be completed on the final versions to be implemented in Michigan.

STEP 4 PRICING:

Pricing was evaluated for the three bidders that passed Step 3 – Certification Testing. Details of the original and negotiated pricing are on the attached Price Analysis worksheets. A summary of original and negotiated pricing is below. Pricing was based on the estimated usage specified in the RFP.

Original bid prices - Cost across 10 year contract term

Voting System Hardware, Firmware, Software and Service	Dominion	ES&S	Hart InterCivic
Tabulator/Accessible Devices, Purchase and Initial Service/Maintenance Period (Acquisition year + 4 Years)	\$44,222,435.00	\$37,649,481.00	\$52,097,860.00
Extended Service/Maintenance (5 Additional Years)	\$15,244,350.00	\$9,902,940.00	\$25,269,050.00
EMS Initial License Fee (Includes Service/Maintenance for Acquisition Year + 4 Years)	\$10,750,500.00	\$6,193,439.00	\$6,508,060.00
EMS Extended Service/Maintenance Fees (5 Additional Years)	\$7,515,000.00	\$6,777,660.00	\$3,818,100.00
TOTAL CONTRACT:	\$77,732,285.00	\$60,523,520.00	\$87,693,070.00

Pricing was negotiated with the bidders, with the following results:

Revised bid prices - Cost across 10 year contract term

Voting System Hardware, Firmware, Software and Service	Dominion	ES&S	Hart InterCivic
Tabulator/Accessible Devices, Purchase and Initial Service/Maintenance Period (Acquisition Year + 4 Years)	\$41,595,235.00	\$32,609,869.00	\$46,970,725.00
Extended Service/Maintenance (5 Additional Years)	\$14,559,375.00	\$9,191,300.00	\$24,824,060.00
EMS Initial License Fee (Includes Service/Maintenance for Acquisition Year + 4 Years)	\$7,233,886.00	\$4,849,006.00	\$9,711,860.00
EMS Extended Service/Maintenance Fees (5 Additional Years)	\$6,516,500.00	\$5,297,700.00	\$580,000.00
TOTAL CONTRACT:	\$69,904,996.00	\$51,947,875.00	\$82,086,645.00

The bidders offered prompt payment discounts, as follows:

Quick Payment Terms (Exhibit C Pricing, Section 4.)	
Dominion	N/A
ES&S	N/A
Hart InterCivic	1% discount off invoice if paid within 10 days after receipt of invoice

JEC Closing Assessment:

The JEC determined that the three recommended vendors each offers a viable voting system for the State of Michigan. By law (MCL 168.771a), county clerks, in consultation with each local jurisdiction clerk in that county, will select the voting system to be used in that county from those approved and certified by the Board of State Canvassers.

Award Recommendation:

The award recommendation is made to the responsive and responsible bidders who offer the best value to the State of Michigan. Best value was determined by the bidders meeting the minimum point threshold, passing the State certification testing components (Section 9, Step 3 above), and offering the best combination of the factors stated in Technical Evaluation Criteria, identified in **Section 9 - Evaluation Process**, including the degree to which the bidder agrees to the State's Terms and Conditions; the degree to which the proposed solution requires customizations; and price, as demonstrated by its proposal and other costs.

The JEC recommends a multiple-vendor award contract for Voting System Hardware, Firmware, Software and Service, as follows:

- Election Systems & Software, LLC in the amount of \$0.00*
- Dominion Voting Systems Inc. in the amount of \$0.00*
- Hart InterCivic, Inc. in the amount of \$0.00*

*NOTE: The total program amount is estimated not to exceed \$82,086,645.00. Actual award amounts to be determined after county selection which will occur in early 2017, after contract execution and will include a local funding component in the absence of additional state funding.