


AUDIT REPORT

A Performance Audit of the Interlocal Agreement Between the Salt Lake County District Attorney's Office and Salt Lake City

JUNE 2026



Chris Harding, CPA, CFE, CIA
County Auditor

Office of the Auditor
Salt Lake County

Audit Team

Audra Bylund, CIA, Audit Manager
Pete Busche, CIA, Senior Internal Auditor
JC Bailey, Internal Auditor

Audit Management

Chris Harding, CPA, CFE, CIA, County Auditor
Richard Jaussi, MBA, Chief Deputy Auditor
Roswell Rogers, Senior Advisor
Shawna Ahlborn, Audit Division Director

Audit Committee

Marty Van Wagoner, CPA, MBA



Office of the Auditor
Salt Lake County
2001 S State Street, Ste N3-300
Salt Lake City, UT 84190-1100
Phone: (385) 468-7200

www.saltlakecounty.gov/auditor/

Salt Lake County Auditor



Chris Harding, CPA, CFE, CIA
County Auditor

2001 S State Street, Ste N3-300, Salt Lake City, UT 84190
Phone: (385) 468-7200 www.saltlakecounty.gov/auditor/

AUDITOR'S LETTER

June 11, 2026

It is a pleasure to share with you the results of our performance audit of the Salt Lake County District Attorney's Interlocal Agreement with Salt Lake City. This audit covered the period from July 1, 2024, through June 30, 2025. Our objective was to provide reasonable assurance that the District Attorney's Office complied with the Interlocal Agreement to manage the Salt Lake City Prosecutor's Office. We also assessed internal controls related to payment processes, annual reporting metrics, and adherence to contractual obligations.

Overall, the audit found that key payment processes and contractual obligations were generally operating as intended. The audit also identified an opportunity to strengthen financial transparency and mutual accountability between the two entities. If Salt Lake County and Salt Lake City choose to renew this agreement, we recommend strengthening fee methodology documentation and adjustment mechanisms.

The report includes one low-risk finding and two related recommendations. Implementing these recommendations would provide a more transparent framework for evaluating fee adjustments, help ensure fees remain aligned with administrative costs and evolving service demands, and support mutual accountability between the two entities. Because any follow-up work is contingent on whether the agreement is renewed, we will not be scheduling a formal follow-up on these recommendations.

The District Attorney's Office management reviewed the report and agreed with both recommendations.

This audit was authorized under Utah Code Title 17, Chapter 69, "County Auditor", Part 3, "Powers and Duties." We conducted this performance audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions.

Thank you to the staff of the District Attorney's Office for their cooperation throughout this process. Please refer to the enclosed report for the full details of our findings and recommendations. If you have any questions, do not hesitate to reach out to me directly at 385-468-7200.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Chris Harding".

Chris Harding, CPA, CFE, CIA
Salt Lake County Auditor

CONTENTS

RISK CLASSIFICATIONS.....	2
BACKGROUND.....	3
OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE.....	4
AUDIT CRITERIA	4
METHODOLOGY	5
CONCLUSIONS.....	6
FINDING 1: OPPORTUNITY TO STRENGTHEN FEE METHODOLOGY DOCUMENTATION FOR THE 2028 AGREEMENT RENEWAL.....	8
COMPLETE LIST OF AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS	12
AGENCY RESPONSE	13



**A Performance Audit
of the Interlocal
Agreement Between
the Salt Lake County
District Attorney's
Office and Salt Lake
City**

June 2026

Objectives

The objectives of this audit were to provide reasonable assurance that the Salt Lake County District Attorney's Office and Salt Lake City Prosecutor's Office complied with the Interlocal Agreement for prosecutorial services. Our areas of focus included:

- Evaluating whether the partnership between Salt Lake County and Salt Lake City operates in alignment with established objectives and delivers value to stakeholders.
- Assessing internal controls related to payment processes and financial accountability.
- Reviewing performance metrics, service delivery effectiveness, and adherence to contractual obligations.

The scope of this audit was from July 1, 2024, through June 30, 2025, with select financial data reviewed on a calendar year basis to align with the DA's Office accounting methodology.

REPORT HIGHLIGHTS

Opportunity to Strengthen Fee Methodology Documentation for the 2028 Agreement Renewal

The audit identified an opportunity for Salt Lake County and Salt Lake City to strengthen documentation supporting the methodology used to establish and evaluate fees within the Interlocal Agreement. Although the current fee structure covered identified operating costs during the audit period, prosecutor caseloads have increased significantly in recent years, and the Agreement's fee adjustment provisions have not been formally utilized since implementation in 2018. The Agreement renewal scheduled for 2028 provides an opportunity for both parties to collaboratively document the workload, cost, and operational factors that support the Management Fee and Operating Fee. Formalizing this methodology would help support future negotiations, improve transparency, and provide a consistent framework for evaluating whether fees continue to align with service demands and operational costs over time.



Finding Risk Classifications

Classification	Description	Action
High Risk	<p>High Risk Findings indicate significant weaknesses in controls and compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essential controls are either missing OR are in place but fail to adequately address critical risks. • Procedures are either not followed consistently OR are completely missing. • Documentation and communication of controls, policies, and procedures are either lacking OR entirely absent. • Controls may not be in operation OR may not have been implemented. • Material non-compliance (or a critical instance of non-compliance) with legislative requirements (both state law and county ordinances), countywide policies, organization policies, and best practices is common, resulting in inadequate risk management. 	Urgent Corrective Actions are Necessary
Medium Risk	<p>Medium Risk Findings indicate weaknesses in control design and/or implementation, and occasional non-compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Controls are partially in place but may not fully address all aspects of key risks. • Documentation and/or communication of controls, policies, and procedures may be incomplete, unclear, inconsistent, or outdated. • Controls might not be operating consistently and/or effectively or may not have been fully implemented. • Occasional non-compliance with legislative requirements (both state law and county ordinances), countywide policies, organization policies, and best practices has occurred. • Risks are not being effectively managed, which could result in failure to meet organization objectives or could lead to a less effective risk management framework. 	Promptly Implement Recommendations
Low Risk	<p>Low Risk Findings indicate that controls are generally effective, with minor areas for improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Controls are effectively addressing key risks but may need minor improvements. • Documentation and/or communication of controls, policies, and procedures are generally adequate but might require minor updates. • Controls are generally operating effectively with minor inconsistencies. • Minor deviations from legislative requirements (both state law and county ordinances), countywide policies, organization policies, and/or best practices may exist. • Risks are generally well-managed, with minimal areas for improvement identified during testing. 	Implement Minor Improvements and Proactive Enhancements

BACKGROUND

The Salt Lake County Auditor's Office Audit Services Division completed a limited scope performance audit of the Salt Lake County District Attorney's Interlocal Agreement with Salt Lake City for the period July 1, 2024, through June 30, 2025. This section explains how the Agreement developed, how it is structured, and how the financial arrangement works.

Interlocal Agreement Overview

In July 2015, the Salt Lake County District Attorney's (DA) Office and Salt Lake City (City) entered into an Interlocal Agreement under the Utah Interlocal Cooperation Act (Utah Code §11-13-202 et seq.). The Agreement was a cooperative efficiency arrangement, not a traditional vendor contract. Both parties recognized that the criminal justice reforms enacted through House Bill 348 in 2015 created an opportunity to coordinate management of misdemeanor cases for increased efficiencies and more effective criminal justice administration. Under the Agreement, the DA's Office assumed responsibility for administering and managing the City Prosecutor's Office.

In May 2018, the parties amended and restated the Interlocal Agreement to formalize the DA's Office managerial role and relocate City Prosecutor staff to the DA's Office downtown building at 35 East 500 South. This amendment consolidated operational costs for City employees directly into the DA's Office budget, replacing the previous reimbursement-based model. The 2018 Amended and Restated Agreement (referred to herein as the "2018 Interlocal Agreement") remains effective through June 30, 2028.

According to City budget documents and management interviews, the Agreement was intended to support administration of justice, cost savings, and operational synergies. The co-location arrangement allows City prosecutors to work alongside DA attorneys on misdemeanor and felony-related matters. The City handles more cases in Justice Court than any other municipality or county in Utah, and its caseload has approximately doubled since fiscal year 2021.

Financial Structure and Fees

The City compensates the DA's Office through quarterly payments defined in Schedule A of the Agreement. These payments comprise three fees:

- **Management Fee:** Compensation for the DA's Office managerial oversight of City prosecutor operations, based on prosecution volume and staffing within the City's jurisdiction. The Management Fee increases by a minimum of 1% on July 1 of each fiscal year.
- **Operating Fee:** Payment for operational and maintenance costs associated with hosting City Prosecutor staff in the DA

Building, including costs commonly referred to as operating and maintenance supply and charges and services. The Operating Fee increases by a minimum of 0.5% each January 1.

- Lease Fee: Payment for office space occupied by City employees within the DA's downtown building, calculated based on square footage and employee headcount relative to the building's bond costs.

The fee schedule was established through negotiation between the parties, approved by resolution of the Salt Lake County Council, and published in Schedule A of the Agreement. The Agreement also includes mechanisms in Sections 2(d) and 2(e) allowing either party to request fee adjustments based on changes in case volume, citations, arrests, staffing needs, or documented cost changes.

OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

The objectives of this audit were to provide reasonable assurance that the Salt Lake County District Attorney's Office and Salt Lake City Prosecutor's Office complied with the Interlocal Agreement for prosecutorial services. Our areas of focus included:

- Evaluating whether the partnership between Salt Lake County and Salt Lake City operates in alignment with established objectives and delivers value to stakeholders.
- Assessing internal controls related to payment processes and financial accountability.
- Reviewing performance metrics, service delivery effectiveness, and adherence to contractual obligations.

The scope of this audit was from July 1, 2024, through June 30, 2025, with select financial data reviewed on a calendar year basis to align with the DA's Office accounting methodology.

AUDIT CRITERIA

The primary criteria for this audit was the 2018 Interlocal Agreement (Salt Lake County Contract No. CA0000000000137, DA-SLCo DA's Office to Manage SL City Prosecutor's Office — Amended and Restated Agreement). Key provisions reviewed included:

- **Section 1(b):** Defines Management Services, which include overseeing prosecution of City cases, initiating case resolutions, and maintaining discretion to assign staff for efficient casework processing.
- **Section 2(a) and Schedule A:** Establishes the quarterly payment structure for the Management Fee, Lease Fee, and Operating Fee.

- **Sections 2(b) and 2(c):** Provide for annual automatic increases of 1% to the Management Fee and 0.5% to the Operating Fee.
- **Sections 2(d) and 2(e):** Establish permissive mechanisms allowing either party to request fee adjustments based on changes in case filings, citations, arrests, staffing needs, or documented cost changes. Requests must be submitted by February 15 (County) or August 15 (City) of each year.
- **Section 4(b) and 4(c):** The City remains responsible for salaries and benefits; the DA's Office covers professional expenses such as bar dues and licensing fees.
- **Section 6:** Requires the DA's Office to provide an annual report to the City summarizing services, case trends, and case disposition rates.

We also considered Salt Lake County Countywide Policy 1060: Financial Goals and Policies, specifically Section 4.5, which requires interlocal contracts for services to be established at a level reflecting the full cost of providing those services, and Section 8.0, which establishes internal control requirements for financial transactions.

METHODOLOGY

We used several methodologies to gather and analyze information related to our audit objectives.

Financial Allocation and Expense Testing

- **Direct and Shared Expenses:** We obtained detailed expenditure reports from County financial systems and selected a random sample of expenses to determine whether source documentation supported the expense amounts allocated to the City.
- **Operating Fee Reperformance:** We recalculated the full population of direct operating expenses and overhead costs for calendar year 2024, including the 0.5% annual increase, to assess whether the four quarterly Operating Fee payments covered the recorded costs.
- **Lease Fee Verification:** We reviewed the allocation methodology for the DA's Office downtown building, examining square footage and employee headcount, and recalculated the Lease Fee payment amount for 2025.
- **Unallowable Expenses:** We reviewed the full population of expenditure detail reports for FY 2024-25 to determine whether the DA's Office covered any unallowable costs on behalf of the City.

Payroll and Personnel Compliance

- **Payroll Verification:** We obtained a listing of all City employees working at the DA's Office downtown building and compared it to County payroll records, performing a full-population test to determine whether any City employees were improperly included on the County payroll.

Revenue and Payment Processing

- **Payment Timeliness:** We tested whether the full population of four quarterly payments made by the City during the audit period were received within 30 days after the end of the final month of the covered quarter.
- **Revenue Process and Payment Handling:** For the full population of four City payments made during the audit period, we reviewed the process for calculating, receiving, and depositing funds, including whether the Fiscal Manager reconciles deposits and that the Fiscal Director and Mayor's Financial Reporting Analyst approve transactions.

Management Inquiries

We conducted interviews and inquiries with DA's Office management to evaluate the internal control environment and oversight of the Agreement, including fee calculation processes, evaluation practices, and communication with City leadership.

Reporting Review

We reviewed documentation of communications between the DA's Office and City leadership regarding services, caseload trends, and operational performance, including budget presentations submitted to Salt Lake City for fiscal years 2024-25 and 2025-26.

Where sampling was used, we applied either statistical random sampling or judgmental sampling. Results from judgmental samples apply only to the items tested and were not projected to the full population.

We considered the risk of fraud, waste, and abuse throughout the audit. We did not identify indicators requiring additional audit procedures. We did not identify any scope limitations that restricted our work. We determined that the evidence obtained was sufficient and appropriate to support the audit findings and conclusions.

CONCLUSIONS

Our audit of the 2018 Interlocal Agreement between the Salt Lake County District Attorney's Office and Salt Lake City found that it continued to support coordinated prosecutorial operations between the parties during the audit period. The DA's Office has co-located City Prosecutor staff in the DA Building and established a consistent billing cycle. Financial testing confirmed that payments are being made and received appropriately, no City employees were improperly included on County payroll, and the Operating Fee payments reviewed during the calendar year 2024 exceeded the DA's coded operating and overhead expenses tested by \$26,076.

Communication between the DA's Office and City leadership regarding services, caseload, and operational performance occurred through the City's annual budget process. These presentations reflect a working relationship in which information is shared actively and responsively with City leadership. Management from both the City and County stated that these matters are routinely discussed during the budget process and that the parties have not historically required separate written reporting under the Agreement. Based on the ongoing communication between the parties and the information provided through the budget process, we concluded the intent of the annual reporting requirement was being met during the audit period.

With the Agreement expiring June 30, 2028, the upcoming renewal presents an opportunity for both parties to strengthen the framework governing fee adjustments. While Sections 2(d) and 2(e) already allow either party to request changes to the Management Fee and Operating Fee based on workload and cost data, the methodology for calculating base fees has not been clearly documented, making those mechanisms harder to apply in practice. Caseload has grown significantly, approximately doubling since fiscal year 2021, further underscoring the need for a transparent, documented approach to fee setting that supports informed decision-making by both the County and City when negotiating future terms.

Implementing the recommendations in this report will strengthen transparency and mutual accountability between the two entities, and will better position both parties to negotiate the 2028 agreement with a shared, data-driven understanding of how fees relate to actual costs and workload.

FINDING 1 AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Opportunity to Strengthen Fee Methodology Documentation for the 2028 Agreement Renewal

Risk Ranking: **Low Risk Finding**

The upcoming 2028 Interlocal Agreement renewal provides an opportunity for Salt Lake County and Salt Lake City to evaluate whether the current fee structure continues to align with operational needs, workload demands, and service costs.

The Interlocal Agreement's fee structure was established collaboratively in 2015 and restated in 2018. The Management Fee was established to compensate the DA's Office for professional oversight and administrative costs associated with managing the City Prosecutor's Office, and the Operating Fee covers operational and maintenance costs associated with hosting City staff in the DA Building. Both fees carry automatic annual increases — 1% for the Management Fee and 0.5% for the Operating Fee — and Schedule A of the Agreement sets out the full payment schedule through fiscal year 2027.

The Agreement also recognizes that circumstances may change over the life of the contract. Sections 2(d) and 2(e) establish mechanisms allowing either party to request fee adjustments based on changes in case filings, citations, arrests, staffing needs, or documented cost changes. These are permissive provisions — neither party is required to use them — but provide a mechanism for evaluating whether fees remain appropriate as operations evolve.

Significant Caseload Growth

During the audit period, the DA's Office provided FY 2025-26 budget presentations to Salt Lake City documenting that caseload in the City Prosecutor's Office has grown substantially. According to the presentation, infractions, traffic offenses with mandatory appearances, DUIs, and other misdemeanors increased every year for the past four years, resulting in approximately twice the caseload on prosecutors compared to fiscal year 2021. The presentation stated that this growth predates any Downtown Safety Initiative efforts and reflects broader trends in case volume within Salt Lake City's jurisdiction.

Despite the reported increase in workload, neither party has used the fee adjustment mechanisms in Sections 2(d) and 2(e) since the 2018 Agreement was implemented. The DA's Office conducted a financial evaluation of 2024 operating costs and determined that the current Operating Fee covers actual expenses, with the City's payments exceeding recorded DA operating and overhead costs by approximately \$26,076. That evaluation is reflected in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Operating Fee Financial Evaluation (2024)

DA's Office Operating and Overhead Expenses	Amount
Operating Expenses	\$106,819
Allocated Overhead	\$130,339
Total DA's Expenses (2024)	\$237,158
Annual Operating Fee (2024)	\$263,234
Net Positive — City Operating Fee in excess of DA Operating Expenses	\$26,076

Source: DA's Office City Operations Budget, updated February 11, 2026. Audit Team confirmed amounts through independent recalculation.

The absence of documented methodology means that neither party has a clear, agreed-upon basis for evaluating whether fees should be adjusted — either up or down — as part of the 2028 renewal negotiations. The Management Fee, shown in Table 2, has grown from \$223,267 in fiscal year 2018-19 to \$237,002 in fiscal year 2024-25 through automatic annual increases, without a documented evaluation of whether the increase rate reflects changes in actual administrative workload or costs.

Table 2: Management Fee Amounts Since 2018

Fiscal Year	Management Fee Amount
2018-2019	\$223,267
2019-2020	\$225,499
2020-2021	\$227,754
2021-2022	\$230,032
2022-2023	\$232,332
2023-2024	\$234,655
2024-2025	\$237,002

Source: Schedule A of Interlocal Agreement CA0000000000137.

The 2028 Renewal as an Opportunity

The approaching renewal of the Interlocal Agreement provides an opportunity to address this gap. Documenting how the Management Fee and Operating Fee are calculated — including the cost drivers and workload factors that support them — would serve both parties by:

- Giving the County a clear basis for requesting fee increases if caseload or administrative costs continue to grow beyond what automatic increases cover.
- Giving the City a clear basis for requesting fee decreases if caseload declines or efficiencies reduce the cost of service delivery.
- Ensuring that future adjustments are grounded in data rather than requiring either party to reconstruct a methodology from scratch at negotiation time.
- Strengthening public accountability by making the fee structure transparent and verifiable.

The current fee structure was Council-approved and covered identified operating costs during the audit period; however, formalizing the methodology used to establish and adjust fees would provide a stronger foundation for the 2028 agreement renewal and future negotiations between the County and City.

We recommend that the DA's Office and City leadership should jointly develop and document the methodology used to establish the base Management Fee and Operating Fee prior to finalizing the 2028 Interlocal Agreement.

- At a minimum, this documentation should identify the key cost drivers and workload factors (such as case volume, staffing levels, administrative overhead, and building costs) that informed the original fee amounts.
- The methodology should be retained as a reference document to support future fee adjustment requests by either party under Sections 2(d) and 2(e) of the Agreement.
- This documentation should be reviewed and updated at each subsequent Agreement renewal.

AGENCY RESPONSE: Agree

IMPLEMENTATION DATE: TBD

SEE PAGE 14 FOR THE AGENCY'S FULL RESPONSE TO OUR RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that the DA's Office and City leadership should review the fee adjustment mechanisms in Sections 2(d) and 2(e) of the current Agreement and update the language in the 2028 Agreement to reflect current operational realities.

- The updated provisions should specify what data will be collected and retained to support future fee adjustment requests, including case volume metrics, staffing data, and operating cost documentation.
- Both parties should agree on a periodic review process — such as a joint annual check-in — to assess whether fees remain appropriate relative to actual costs and workload, even in years when no formal fee adjustment request is made.
- If the parties determine that certain metrics identified in the current Agreement (such as citations or arrests) are no longer the most meaningful cost drivers, the 2028 Agreement should replace them with metrics that better reflect how the partnership currently operates.

AGENCY RESPONSE: Agree

IMPLEMENTATION DATE: TBD

SEE PAGE 14 FOR THE AGENCY'S FULL RESPONSE TO OUR RECOMMENDATION

COMPLETE LIST OF AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

This report makes the following 2 recommendations.

Recommendation 1.1:

We recommend that the DA's Office and City leadership should jointly develop and document the methodology used to establish the base Management Fee and Operating Fee prior to finalizing the 2028 Interlocal Agreement.

- At a minimum, this documentation should identify the key cost drivers and workload factors (such as case volume, staffing levels, administrative overhead, and building costs) that informed the original fee amounts.
- The methodology should be retained as a reference document to support future fee adjustment requests by either party under Sections 2(d) and 2(e) of the Agreement.

This documentation should be reviewed and updated at each subsequent Agreement renewal.

Recommendation 1.2:

We recommend that the DA's Office and City leadership should review the fee adjustment mechanisms in Sections 2(d) and 2(e) of the current Agreement and update the language in the 2028 Agreement to reflect current operational realities.

- The updated provisions should specify what data will be collected and retained to support future fee adjustment requests, including case volume metrics, staffing data, and operating cost documentation.
- Both parties should agree on a periodic review process — such as a joint annual check-in — to assess whether fees remain appropriate relative to actual costs and workload, even in years when no formal fee adjustment request is made.

If the parties determine that certain metrics identified in the current Agreement (such as citations or arrests) are no longer the most meaningful cost drivers, the 2028 Agreement should replace them with metrics that better reflect how the partnership currently operates.

AGENCY RESPONSE



Ralph Chamness
Chief Deputy
Civil Division

Bridget Romano
Chief Deputy
Civil Division

Lisa Ashman
Chief of Administrative
Operations



SIM GILL
DISTRICT ATTORNEY



Jeffrey William Hall
Chief Deputy
Justice Division

Anna Rossi Anderson
Chief Deputy
Justice Division

June 3, 2026

Auditor Chris Harding, CPA
Office of the Auditor
Salt Lake County
2001 S State Street
Salt Lake City, UT 84121

Auditor Harding,

The Salt Lake County District Attorney's Office acknowledges receipt of the draft Interlocal Agreement Performance Audit and the associated findings pertaining to our office. We received the revised draft on May 26, 2026, following the Agreement to Facts meeting held on May 7, 2026, with you and members of your team.

We appreciate the time and effort your office dedicated to this review. Your staff were professional and collaborative throughout the process, and all communications were conducted in the spirit of continuous improvement.

We have reviewed the audit findings, and our responses are provided below. We would also note that the interlocal agreement between Salt Lake County and Salt Lake City was established to promote operational efficiencies and safeguard taxpayer resources, and we believe those objectives have been achieved. Additionally, the audit contains no findings indicating any misuse of County funds.

We will consider your recommendations in connection with any future negotiations and execution of a new interlocal agreement between Salt Lake County and Salt Lake City.
Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Sim Gill".

Sim Gill
Salt Lake County District Attorney

35 E 500 S, Salt Lake City, UT 84111
Telephone 385.468.7600 · Fax 385.468.7736 · www.districtattorney.slco.org

AUDIT FINDING 1: Opportunity to Strengthen Fee Methodology Documentation for the 2028 Agreement Renewal

RECOMMENDATION 1.1: We recommend that the DA's Office and City leadership should jointly develop and document the methodology used to establish the base Management Fee and Operating Fee prior to finalizing the 2028 Interlocal Agreement.

At a minimum, this documentation should identify the key cost drivers and workload factors (such as case volume, staffing levels, administrative overhead, and building costs) that informed the original fee amounts.

The methodology should be retained as a reference document to support future fee adjustment requests by either party under Sections 2(d) and 2(e) of the Agreement.

This documentation should be reviewed and updated at each subsequent Agreement renewal.

Agree or Disagree with Recommendation	Target date to complete implementation activities (Generally expected within 60 to 90 days)	Name and Title of specific point of contact for implementation
Agree	TBD	Anna Rossi-Anderson, Chief Deputy and Elizabeth Bayler, Admin & Fiscal Ops Director and Paul Fuller, Division Administrator

The District Attorney's Office will maintain thorough documentation of the key cost drivers and workload factors used to establish fee amounts in any future interlocal agreement with Salt Lake City. This documentation will be retained to support the fees contained in the interlocal agreement and to provide a basis for any future fee adjustments.

RECOMMENDATION 1.2: We recommend that the DA's Office and City leadership should review the fee adjustment mechanisms in Sections 2(d) and 2(e) of the current Agreement and update the language in the 2028 Agreement to reflect current operational realities.

The updated provisions should specify what data will be collected and retained to support future fee adjustment requests, including case volume metrics, staffing data, and operating cost documentation.

Both parties should agree on a periodic review process — such as a joint annual check-in — to assess whether fees remain appropriate relative to actual costs and workload, even in years when no formal fee adjustment request is made.

If the parties determine that certain metrics identified in the current Agreement (such as citations or arrests) are no longer the most meaningful cost drivers, the 2028 Agreement should replace them with metrics that better reflect how the partnership currently operates.

Agree or Disagree with Recommendation	Target date to complete implementation activities (Generally expected within 60 to 90 days)	Name and Title of specific point of contact for implementation
Agree	TBD	Anna Rossi-Anderson, Chief Deputy and Paul Fuller, Division Administrator

The District Attorney’s Office will review the fee adjustment provisions in consultation with Salt Lake City in any future agreement. We will consider incorporating provisions that specify the data to be collected and retained to support fee adjustments, as well as establishing a periodic review process in coordination with Salt Lake City.