Honorable Secretary Williams and Pilot Election Review Committee:

On behalf of the Pitkin County Election Staff and myself, the following comments are submitted for your review and consideration in the State of Colorado Uniform Voting System vendor selection process. First, comments identify concerns regarding big-picture business processes when considering a UVS; the second and third group of comments share questions in reference to technical processes and past experience with one vendor, respectively.

When selecting a vendor, please consider the following business process points:
- Experience with multiple county implementations and the ability to assure successful outcomes
- Proven record with customer service efficiencies and effectiveness
- Organizational strength, not only fiscal, but also human resource capital. Does the vendor have seasoned and tenured staff, is there assurance of reliability into the future, etc.
- Flexibility and capability to address Colorado's innovative spirit and continuous improvements in moving elections forward by promoting a collaborative culture and can-do attitude
- Fair pricing strategies
- Simplicity and ease in utilizing the system; i.e., programming, set-up and tear-down, the ability for judges to address point(s)-of-failure, report generation, etc. Especially, when taking into consideration small and medium-size counties that experience a minimal judge pool and staffing resources that may not provide strength in technical and software skillsets
- Security, accuracy and transparency
- Proven success record implementing training strategies regarding a conversion, in addition to effective training materials for staff and judges
- Flexibility and capability to address small, medium and large county VSPC set-up/configuration; i.e., Pitkin County still has VSPC's that process between 400 – 600 voter on Election Day, and over 10% of voters still vote a flat ballot in person. Simplicity in operations is essential when working with limited human resource capital –both judges and county personnel, and limited space with VSPC's and storage

Questions in reference to technical operations (some concerns may have been answered, yet others may shed light on questions that may have not been asked):
- Ease in handling SCORE data integration with the system, and working with excess information from SCORE. Is the ballot style naming flexible with SCORE, especially with Everyone Counts.
- Programming precinct based elections versus style based.
- Ease in layout capability; i.e., editing, spacing between columns, no candidates for a listed race and does the race look similar on the ballot vs. ADA voting device, allow space/characters text for endorsements (candidates pledges to run only one term), are there character limits, can ballot footers be customized or removed, ability to edit again once generated, etc.
- Can a nonpartisan primary ballot be programmed? (Home Rule Charter)

- Does the ADA compatible equipment offer flexibility in programming the template features of the audio ballot; including, the ability to speed up, slow down, and pause the audio as the voters needs necessitate.
- Provisional ballot programming and processes.
- How does the system handle multi-page ballots in an election; i.e., scanning, images, audits, etc.; and, what is the largest ballot paper size that can be produced.
- Suppressing outcomes during tabulation due to death or withdrawal.
- What stopgaps are in place to prevent reprogramming of the election database after media has been downloaded; and, stopgaps to separate the upload of media and tabulation of results.
- Does the system provide various levels of administrative restrictions for authorized user.
- Capability in extracting various types of reports.
- Scanning equipment - does the system assure issues are resolved before judges proceed, therefore assuring elections balance.
- Safeguards to assure judges program the correct ballot style.

Past experienced with vendor:

In particular, these comments pertain to Election Systems and Software, and Pitkin County's experience with contracting their services. Based on our experience with utilizing ES&S as a vendor, we recommend to the committee and to the Secretary, that if ES&S should be selected, that at minimum a second alternate vendor also be offered to Colorado clerks for procurement of a voting system.

Pitkin County has utilized Diebold/Premier voting system equipment since 2001, with the addition of DREs in 2006 for ADA compliance, prior to the acquisition of this company by ES&S. The Accuvote equipment and GEMS election management system have performed as workhorses, and their time for replacement has come. Our support needs from ES&S have been typical and minimal, involving biannual maintenance visits, onsite training and support, and distance support from staff in ES&S's Omaha office.

The support has primarily been provided by one technician, Cory Dukarski. Cory has always provided prompt and exemplary service to Pitkin County. He however, is the sole point of contact for our legacy voting system. This raises significant concerns for our staff regarding ES&S's commitment to institutional knowledge, client support that is both broad and deep, and the confidence to rely on the detailed and potentially time consuming attention that our county may require during deployment of a new system.

Also relevant for your consideration when deciding ES&S's suitability to deploy new equipment is our attempt to work with ES&S on use of a signature capture and ASR machine. Again ES&S had one technician who possessed knowledge about this new piece of equipment known as the AccuVote Envelope Scanner (AVES). While sufficient training and documentation were provided for the equipment, it was not properly configured to work with SCORE and therefore would never be a suitable option for our county or others. This did not become clear until we were attempting to deploy it with the technician. We were provided with assurances that the proper files would be uploaded to us in order to integrate the equipment with SCORE; however, they were never provided in a timely manner,

and the equipment sits in our office, having never been used and despite multiple requests for ES&S to remove it from our limited workspace.

Finally, we additionally decided in 2015 to utilize a new print vendor for our mail ballot run. Pitkin County had selected ES&S through an RFP process in 2013. We encountered multiple setup errors and confusion with the ballots even though they were produced by their voting system. We had a debriefing phone call after 2014 with the company's leadership and were assured that better project management calendars and points of contact would be implemented. When it became clear in August of 2015 that they were not following through on these assurances, we switched vendors.

Our best experience with ES&S has been through their audio services department which has always provided prompt and accurate service.

Based on the above illustrations, we believe we have had thorough involvement with ES&S. It is our preference to not continue a working relationship with them for such an integral piece of election administration. Given the value of the contract for the State of Colorado, we kindly suggest that the committee provide considerable weight to a vendor who provides greater customer service and support.

Lastly, all vendors' systems and operations possess various strengths and weaknesses; and ultimately, the vendor selected to provide a uniform voting system for the State of Colorado should be the best fit to accommodate Colorado election processes and laws, now and into the future.

Respectfully submitted,

Janice Vos Caudill
Pitkin County Clerk and Recorder