

Printer replacement

For Barbara and the directors | September 14, 2026

The recommended determination is to go with Kyocera.

Kyocera demonstrated the color quality Development needs at a lower fixed cost. This recommendation combines Caylee's end-user evaluation with Michael's assessment of price and service.

The financial choice

Fixed payments	Kyocera	UBEO
Monthly total	\$463.62	\$650.00
63-month total	\$29,208.06	\$40,950.00

Kyocera is \$186.38 less per month: \$2,236.56 annually and \$11,741.94 over 63 months. UBEO starts 40.2% higher before usage.

Both offers cover 12 devices. Usage, taxes and any escalation are additional. These figures compare fixed payments; they are not total operating costs or savings against Xerox.

Quality and service

- Kyocera already demonstrated the needed color vibrancy and accuracy, including its standard setting, without trial and error or a custom color profile.
- UBEO says the Ricoh output can be adjusted, but PCC has not seen that adjusted output. Ricoh handled PCC's cardstock and glossy stock well in the earlier demonstration.
- Caylee had a very positive experience with UBEO's staff and recognizes its service infrastructure. She does not see a service advantage large enough to justify the price difference.

Decision requested

Approve Kyocera as PCC's preferred printer vendor and proceed to contract review. Barbara and the directors select the vendor; Michael then requests the contract for review before signing.

The decision uses the final offers and demonstrations already completed.

What the offers include

Fixed payments	Kyocera	UBEO
Equipment	\$348.62	\$529.62
Cloud software	\$80.00 / 4 KCPS licenses	\$120.38 / CloudStream
Readers / authentication and holders	\$35.00 4 readers, 3 holders	Main reader confirmed; included
Monthly fixed total	\$463.62	\$650.00
Annualized fixed total	\$5,563.44	\$7,800.00
63-month fixed total	\$29,208.06	\$40,950.00
Usage billing	Monthly, additional	Quarterly, actual usage additional

UBEO confirmed it cannot lower the equipment payment or include usage without increasing the monthly total. Fixed payments exclude usage, taxes and escalation.

Per-page rates

Print type / rate category	Kyocera	UBEO	1,000 pages K / U
Main color	\$0.0410	\$0.0500	\$41 / \$50
Court color	\$0.0725	\$0.0500	\$72.50 / \$50
Main B&W	\$0.0075	\$0.0070	\$7.50 / \$7
Court B&W	\$0.0155	\$0.0070	\$15.50 / \$7
K: MA5500ifx / U: Lexmark	\$0.0100	\$0.0120	\$10 / \$12
K: MA4500ix & PA4500x / U: Lexmark	\$0.0110	\$0.0120	\$11 / \$12

Examples illustrate rates, not projected volume. The last two rows compare rate categories. UBEO states a 5% annual cap on per-page service increases.

PCC's printing requirements

Everyday use: Simple secure printing, badge release and cloud printing at the main unit, shelter hotline, court and Bristol. Accurate donor-material color and main-unit stapling.

Scanning and deployment: Direct scanning to OneDrive / SharePoint; Wendy retains copy/scan and ordinary network printing. PCC / ATS controls Microsoft 365 deployment, with strong vendor involvement in training.

Earlier workflow preferences: Avoid a shared scanner account and duplicate scan-to-email work; keep ordinary printing simple. Mobile scan/copy across separate networks was a concern. Michael did not expect print quotas to be necessary.

Development and end-user perspective

Caylee's September 11 assessment, organized by topic.

Price and vendor arguments

- Reading the UBEO thread did little to change her impression, and she agrees with Michael's assessment.
- Even if UBEO's statements are based in truth and data, they sound like a carefully selected justification for the price premium.
- What UBEO suggests will happen with Kyocera remains hypothetical.

Print quality demonstrated

- The biggest distinction is that Kyocera already demonstrated the print quality PCC needs, including at its standard color setting.
- At the demonstration, that output required no trial and error, ongoing troubleshooting or specialty color-profile creation.
- UBEO's confidence that it can achieve the desired Ricoh output through adjustments is encouraging, but PCC has not actually seen that output.

Service experience and expectations

- UBEO makes a strong case for its service infrastructure, and she had a very positive experience with its staff during her visit.
- Nothing in the thread gives her reason to believe Kyocera's service would necessarily be inadequate, or UBEO's so exceptional that it would justify the substantial cost difference.
- Even if Kyocera's service were only marginally better than PCC's experience with Xerox, that would still improve everyday printing and troubleshooting.
- If Kyocera performs as demonstrated, it should reduce many of the everyday printing and troubleshooting issues that currently require support.

Overall value and qualifications

- From her experience and the Development/end-user perspective, she is still leaning toward Kyocera as the stronger overall value.
- She cannot assess the backend IT experience.
- She cannot assess the specific contract and service protections UBEO references.
- She defers to Michael on whether those factors materially change the comparison.
- She remains open to additional considerations and follow-up questions.

IT and commercial perspective

Michael's assessment of price, print quality and service. His support for Kyocera assumes comparable service.

Price and vendor arguments

- UBEO starts \$186.38 per month higher - over 40% - before either vendor charges for a page. General claims about a competitor's future charges do not eliminate that difference.
- The request was for usage included within the existing payment to narrow the gap. Adding paid usage to the contract later does not accomplish that.
- Annual service increases matter, but the comparison must use the actual written terms rather than assumed competitor increases.
- Calling Ricoh "the most tried & true device in the US" without supporting data is sales rhetoric; the assertion does not justify the fixed-payment premium.

Print quality and service

- Color vibrancy and accuracy matter for Development's donor-facing materials. He asked UBEO to verify the effect of calibration or color-profile changes.
- Earlier in the review, he was open to another Ricoh demonstration to show the desired output and the value of UBEO's support. The current management presentation proceeds on the demonstrations already completed.
- He and Barbara liked UBEO's overall solution, and he took Caylee's favorable impression of its staff seriously.
- He told Caylee he was deferring to her impression of UBEO. If she expected similar customer support and service, he agreed Kyocera was the better overall deal. UBEO's argument sounded mostly like sales rhetoric to him.

Research context for the Ricoh claim

Ricoh is a credible option. The research reviewed does not establish it as "the most tried & true device in the US."

DataMaster, June 2025: The Best Print Productivity award includes the proposed IM C4510; it supports productivity, not a US-wide long-term reliability claim.

Keypoint Intelligence, 2019: Zero misfeeds over 200,000 impressions concerned the older IM C4500. It is a different model, and zero misfeeds does not mean zero failures or service calls.

Keypoint Intelligence, 2025: The IM C3010 award praised productivity, usability, scanning and OCR accuracy. It also concerns a different model.

Matt's market-share and customer-retention figures describe scale and customer relationships. They do not demonstrate a reliability advantage that explains PCC's additional \$186.38 per month.

Full comparison and supporting documents: [View the PCC printer comparison site](#).