

Courts/Justice Administration Leadership Group E-Minutes

6/23/16

From: Schnelz, Rebecca
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2016 9:12 AM
To: Howden, Jennifer
Cc: Kaelin, Jeffrey M; Overall, Joanna J; Hysell, Betsy M; Toole, Joanie M; Gatt, Robert J; Cooperrider, John L; Stafford, Leigh-Anne; Bujak, Christina A; Oeffner, Kevin M; Hankey, Barbara M; McKenna, Janette M; Henderson, Brian M; Hardesty, Thomas G; Palulian, Barbara J; Brinker, Janet L
Subject: Re: Result of e-vote and New request for e-vote

Thank you everyone. We now have eight yes votes on each question. Motion carries.

Hope everyone has a great weekend.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 23, 2016, at 9:03 AM, Howden, Jennifer <howdenj@oakgov.com> wrote:

Clerk's office votes yes on both.

From: Kaelin, Jeffrey M
Sent: Wednesday, June 22, 2016 1:36 PM
To: Schnelz, Rebecca
Cc: Overall, Joanna J; Hysell, Betsy M; Howden, Jennifer; Toole, Joanie M; Gatt, Robert J; Cooperrider, John L; Stafford, Leigh-Anne; Bujak, Christina A; Oeffner, Kevin M; Hankey, Barbara M; McKenna, Janette M; Henderson, Brian M; Hardesty, Thomas G; Palulian, Barbara J; Brinker, Janet L
Subject: Re: FW: Result of e-vote and New request for e-vote

The Prosecutors office votes yes on both.

On Jun 22, 2016 1:01 PM, "Schnelz, Rebecca" <schnelzr@oakgov.com> wrote:

Good afternoon. I haven't heard from most of you regarding this new e-vote. Please review the information below and send me your vote.

Please note – if you voted last week, this is a new e-vote and you need to vote on the motions below.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Rebecca A. Schnelz

Probate Court Administrator

Oakland County Probate Court

1200 N. Telegraph

Pontiac, MI 48341

248-858-5603

From: Schnelz, Rebecca

Sent: Monday, June 20, 2016 3:22 PM

To: Brinker, Janet L; Bujak, Christina A; Cooperrider, John L; Gatt, Robert J; Hankey, Barbara M; Hardesty, Thomas G; Henderson, Brian M; Howden, Jennifer; Hysell, Betsy M; Kaelin, Jeffrey M; McKenna, Janette M; Oeffner, Kevin M; Overall, Joanna J; Palulian, Barbara J; Schnelz, Rebecca; Stafford, Leigh-Anne; Toole, Joanie M

Subject: FW: Result of e-vote and New request for e-vote

Last week a request for an e-vote regarding using unallocated hours was circulated by email. As you know, there were some questions raised and a “no” vote was cast regarding the process. The questions have now been addressed. In order to keep things simple for the record, I am determining that last week’s motion for an e-vote did not pass. (An unanimous “yes” vote is required to do an e-vote.)

Detailed below is a revamped motion for an e-vote and motion to utilize unallocated hours. Please be sure to read the email thoroughly as all of the language is considered to be part of the formal motion. Again, we are looking for a vote regarding the e-vote and a vote regarding the utilization of hours.

If you do not understand anything in the motion, please use “reply all” to ask your question.

The motions are as follows:

1. Approve an e-vote.

2. The total unallocated hours as of the last Courts LG meeting was 606. We recently approved two projects totaling 45 hours. Pursuant to the understanding below, the Prosecutor's Office has consented to the transfer of 773 hours from their imaging project to the unallocated budget, bringing the new total to 1,334 hours.

Information Technology is requesting approval of the allocation of 406 hours from the 1,334 available unallocated hours to the Imaging System Replacement RFP project for the following:

1. Statement of Work and contract review with Gartner Consulting
3. Detail estimating of the IT effort for implementation
4. Sizing of imaging projects requested during the 2017/18 Master Planning process that will be included in the Imaging System Replacement Program
5. Imaging Program Steering Committee Documentation

The language below clarifies the understanding underlying the Prosecutor's Office's approval to allow hours assigned for their pre-Laserfiche Oakdocs implementation to be used for Laserfiche implementation and should be considered part of the understanding underlying the vote on the two motions. The language is as follows:

In light of the planned transition from the Oakdocs imaging system to Laserfiche, the Prosecutor's OakDocs project currently underway will only provide a scaled back 'capture and retrieval of documents' setup in the current OakDocs system. Once the necessary Laserfiche framework is established, the Prosecutor's Office will be in the first group of County divisions to implement the Laserfiche system. The Prosecutor's Laserfiche system will not be limited to the scaled back 'capture and retrieval of documents' setup, but instead will include those Laserfiche features that the Prosecutor's Office determines would be beneficial to their system, after a full evaluation of their needs, and the functionalities available through the Laserfiche software, is conducted.

Because the initial Oakdocs setup for the Prosecutor's Office imaging project has been scaled back, pending the implementation of the Laserfiche system, approximately 773 hours attributed to this project will not be used during the present Master Plan. These hours will be transitioned to the Court's unallocated hours, for potential use implementing the Laserfiche imaging system transition; with the hours necessary for the Prosecutor's full implementation of the Laserfiche imaging system to be included in the allocations for the new Imaging Program.

Thank you all for your attention to this matter.

Rebecca A. Schnelz

Probate Court Administrator

Oakland County Probate Court

1200 N. Telegraph

Pontiac, MI 48341

248-858-5603