

SALT LAKE CITY CORPORATION

OFFICE OF THE CITY COUNCIL

February 2, 2005

Mr. Richard P. Brady, President
Matrix Consulting Group
2470 El Camino Real, Suite 210
Palo Alto, California 94306

Dear Richard,

At the Salt Lake City Council meeting held February 1, 2005, the City Council adopted a motion to authorize the Council Chair to sign a letter of engagement for a management and operational audit of the Justice Court performed by the Matrix Consulting Group in cooperation with the National Center for State Courts. Matrix Consulting Group, Inc. will be the contracting agency with the City, and the National Center for State Courts will be a subcontractor.

This will confirm that Matrix Consulting Group, Inc. has agreed to a scope of service including but not limited to the following:

- Evaluate effectiveness and efficiency of court service levels, workload and staffing levels to the public as well as relating to other justice system functions.
- Evaluate the allocation of personnel and other resources.
- Evaluate the effectiveness of administrative processes, systems, policies and procedures.
- Evaluate the court's costs versus revenues, identifying factors and causes of any significant changes.
- Examine how the Court compares to other jurisdictions and to 'best management practices'.

Council Members Carlton Christensen -District One; Van Turner -District Two; K. Eric Jergensen -District Three
Nancy Saxton -District Four, Council Vice-Chair 2005; Jill Remington Love -District Five
David L. Buhler -District Six; Dale Lambert -District Seven, Council Chair 2005

451 SOUTH STATE STREET, ROOM 304, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84111

TELEPHONE: 801-535-7600, FAX: 801-535-7651

February 2, 2005

Page Two

The attached audit scope further describes the extent and expectations of the City Council. The maximum fee amount for the audit as authorized by the City Council is \$70,000. The City Council is looking forward to working with you in this endeavor.

Sincerely,

Dale Lambert
Chair, Salt Lake City Council

DL/sj
Attachment

cc: City Council Members
Mayor Ross C. "Rocky" Anderson
Rocky Fluhart
Steve Fawcett
Mary Johnston

Salt Lake City Justice Court Audit Scope

The auditors are to provide an independent and objective evaluation of the Salt Lake City Justice Court and identify opportunities for improvement. The audit shall include, but not be limited to, analyzing, evaluating and making recommendations for the items described below:

1. Determine the extent to which the original goals (when the Court was established) bring focus to issues that are important to City neighborhoods and the extent to which control over scheduling of police officer and prosecutor time is being achieved.
2. Compare Salt Lake City's Justice Court operations with at least 10 other similar courts and utilize auditor's own resources from past court audits to determine best management practices.
3. Review management's written procedures for consistency with best practices.
4. Appraise the effectiveness and efficiency of operations and determine areas where economy and efficiency can be improved and processes can be streamlined.
5. Explore alternatives for setting of the judges' calendars to make it most efficient for everyone including prosecutors, police officers, and the public.
6. Review the screening processes and other prosecutorial discretion to establish priorities given limited resources and offer suggestions to improve efficiencies.
7. Describe the steps that the public goes through from the date of a traffic citation to the trial including meeting with a hearing officer, arraignment, pretrial hearing, and trial. Repeat the process for a low-level criminal offense. Indicate the average number of days between steps and the average public waiting times for each step. Also include the court and prosecutorial processes that do not involve the public such as sending notices and conducting screenings. Compare this process to best practices.
8. The Council desires to improve the process for those coming to court and to reduce waiting time. In light of the information developed in #7, determine if more can and should be done to make a better process for those coming to court, to reduce waiting time, to eliminate the appearance that those who hire attorneys receive preferential treatment, and to make it more convenient for the public.
9. Determine actual caseload numbers by type of case. Determine the number of cases that are resolved at each level of court involvement. Evaluate service delivery and caseflow management.

10. Determine whether improvements can be made so that the public has greater access to prosecutorial resources during waiting periods, such as prior to pretrial hearings, to discuss their cases and determine options to resolve issues prior to trial.
11. Assess quality and efficiency with which current services are being provided from the perspective of the public, defendants, defense attorneys, jurors, and others directly involved with the court.
12. Determine whether there can be a more streamlined approach to adjudication of citations and minor criminal matters.
13. Review interaction with city agencies and other entities. Identify alternatives for coordination and improvement.
14. The Justice Court has experienced some difficulties with the court's computer software. This has caused several problems including some scheduling frustrations for the court and prosecutors. The court has been addressing this software problem. Review the improvements to the computer system and make any additional recommendations. Assess the use of technology and automation.
15. Evaluate staffing levels, compare to other courts, and identify whether efficiencies can be implemented as alternatives to increasing the number of court employees. Include in the review the number of full-time and part-time judges.
16. Determine why the City has accumulated a large accounts receivable balance and indicate whether this is typical of other courts. Evaluate the Justice Court's collection process and compare this process to best practices.
17. Determine whether the Justice Court's processes are contributing to jail overcrowding and whether changes in procedures can result in expediting the resolution of charges against inmates.
18. It appears that some of the approaches of the Justice Court are more restrictive than the District Court, and this is creating an increased workload for the Prosecutor's Office. The court has been striving to eliminate unnecessary procedures such as filing of "informations." Evaluate the success the court has achieved in creating efficiencies and streamlining processes.
19. Justice Court employees do not generally provide their names to the public or they provide only their first name. Determine whether this is a generally accepted practice with other courts.
20. Review the Justice Court's involvement in the expungement process to see if there can be efficiencies gained.
21. Review the sentencing of community service compared to other courts.

22. Meet with City Council or staff prior to commencing the review to obtain direction on key issues and concerns.