

**Audits of Body Worn Camera Footage
Pursuant to City Code 2.10.200
September 2021**

SUMMARY

This memorandum constitutes a report of the audit, pursuant to City Code 2.10.200.E, of body worn camera recordings for the month of September 2021. The ordinance requires that any findings of material non-compliance with state law, City Code and Police Department policy to be referred to the Chief of Police, the Mayor, the Council Chair, the Mayor's Chief of Staff, and the City Attorney.

The system used by the Department, at the time this audit was conducted, cannot randomly generate a body worn camera recording based on a particular timeframe. Because of that limitation, a random number generator was used to identify 5 case numbers (out of a potential 4,905 case numbers) from the month. If a case number had multiple recordings for that case number, a recording was randomly selected for review.

Of the five matters that were reviewed, the audit found no matters where there was material non-compliance with City Code, State law, and/or Department policy.

BODY WORN CAMERA REVIEWS

Case No. 1

Summary

Officers appear to be investigating a hit and run and this particular body camera recording captures a portion of the conversation with the victim of the hit and run. It begins in the middle of the discussion, so the first 30 seconds of the recording does not have audio. It appears that the subject officer realized in the middle of the discussion that he needed to activate his body camera.

Officers speak with the victim about the behaviors of the likely suspect and advise the victim to not confront the suspect, but to call police. After this brief discussion, the call concludes.

Finding

The officer appears to materially comply with State and City Codes and Departmental Policy. This recording did not capture the entire conversation between the victim and officers, as the first 30 seconds of the recording does not have any audio. The subject officer had multiple recordings from the same matter, so there may have been an issue with the officer's camera. It may be worth checking to see if any equipment issues may have affected other recordings and to remind the officer when he is required to begin recording.

Case No. 2

Summary

Officers arrive at the Geraldine King Homeless Resource Center on a call where a woman in a wheelchair is in visible distress. The woman, who is crying, states that she suffers chronic pain. Other information indicates that she might have intentionally swallowed something that could cause her harm. Medical

arrives within a few minutes and they begin treating the woman. Medical place her on a gurney and transport her into an ambulance.

Finding

Officers appear to materially comply with State and City Codes and Departmental Policy.

Case No. 3

Summary

This recording involves an arrest check by an SLCPD sergeant at Wal-Mart. The sergeant meets with 2 other SLCPD officers regarding a suspect who has been taken into custody and is sitting in the back of a patrol vehicle. During the encounter, the sergeant mutes his audio from the 47 second mark until approximately the 12 minute and 15 second mark for a “private conversation.” During that time, the officers are seen conversing and the sergeant consulting a pocket guide on criminal offenses.

The sergeant unmutes when approached by a member of the public. After a few moments, the sergeant approaches the suspect in the back of the patrol vehicle and inquires as to his physical condition and health and advises him of the likely charges for which he will be booked at the jail. After that encounter, the officer mutes his camera at the 16 minute and 43 second mark without providing a reason. The officer then walks to his car and the call concludes.

Finding

Officers appear to materially comply with State and City Codes and Departmental Policy.

The sergeant’s muting of the audio of his body camera recording likely constitutes only a technical violation because the sergeant appears to be muting to consult with fellow officers, which is allowable under State law. In the first instance of muting, the sergeant stated that he was muting for a “private conversation,” which is not a permissible reason under State Code. However, the sergeant appeared to mute for the purpose of consulting with his fellow officers about the matter, which would be an allowable reason under State Code (“to consult with a supervisor or another officer”). In the second instance, the sergeant failed to provide a reason when muting his body camera, but as before, he appeared to be consulting with his fellow officers on the recording, which would be allowable under State Code. The officer should be reminded that he is allowed to mute his body camera “to consult with a supervisor or another officer.”

Case No. 4

Summary

This recording involves a manager of an apartment complex seeking police assistance in trespassing two individuals from a building. The officer advises the two individuals of such and the call concludes without any citations or arrests.

Finding

Officers on scene appear to materially comply with State and City Codes and Departmental Policy.

Case No. 5

Summary

Officers are dispatched to an apartment to investigate a domestic disturbance that was reported by a third party. Officers knock on the door and obtain permission from the male to enter the apartment and speak to the male and his wife. Officers engage in discussions with the male and female and do not appear to obtain any information that an act of domestic violence occurred. The officers leave the apartment.

Finding

Officers appear to materially comply with State and City Codes and Departmental Policy.

CONCLUSION

Of the five matters reviewed, officers appear to materially comply with State and City Codes and Departmental policies.