

**Audits of Body Worn Camera Footage
Pursuant to City Code 2.10.200
January 2022**

SUMMARY

This memorandum constitutes a random audit, pursuant to City Code 2.10.200.E, of body worn camera recordings for the month of January 2022. 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 4,635 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 one matter where there may be material non-compliance with City Code, State law, and/or Department policy and that matter will be referred pursuant to City Code 2.10.200.E.

BODY WORN CAMERA REVIEWS

Case No. 1

Summary

Officers respond to a call from a mother who states that her 13-year-old son has runaway. Officers obtain information to help them find her son and then depart from the residence and conclude the call.

Finding

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

Case No. 2

Summary

Officers respond to an apparent domestic call between a man and a woman on the sidewalk adjacent to 500 South just west of Main Street. Officers speak to the man. The subject officer returns to his vehicle and discovers that the man has an outstanding Class A misdemeanor warrant. The officers indicate that they are not going to cite anybody for the matter, so long as the two agree to go their separate ways and stay away from each other (it does not appear that the officers had probable cause to issue a citation or make an arrest for a domestic violence offense). The officers further indicate that they are not going to book the man on his Class A misdemeanor warrant and the call concludes.

Finding

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

Case No. 3

Summary

Officers encounter a man on a bicycle at a downtown intersection. As the subject officer arrives on scene, the responding officer can be overheard advising the man on the bicycle to leave a woman, with whom the man on the bicycle has history, alone. Officers seemingly know the man and woman. There does not appear to be probable cause to issue a citation and the call concludes.

Finding

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

Case No. 4

Summary

Officer responds to a fast food restaurant where two other officers are interviewing employees. The officer arrives as the other officers are winding down their call. One of the employees appears to offer food to the officers as a gesture of appreciation. The subject officer appears to take up the offer. The camera ceases recording before it is shown whether the officer accepts the offer of free food.

Findings

This matter should be referred pursuant to City Code 2.10.200.E to determine whether the officer accepted, against City and Departmental policies, the apparent well-intentioned gesture of appreciation from the restaurant employees.

Case No. 5

Summary

Officers respond to a call where medical personnel are treating a man who is intoxicated and non-verbal at Washington Square. Officers stand-by while medical loads him into an ambulance for transport to a hospital.

Finding

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

CONCLUSION

One matter will be referred pursuant to the body camera ordinance to determine whether the subject officer impermissibly accepted a well-intentioned gesture of appreciation of free food from restaurant employees.

It should be noted that this audit reviewed only a single body camera recording for each the above-described matter, and that additional body camera recordings and police reports may provide additional context to what was observed. In other words, an apparent material violation of law or policy may not be such a violation when viewed with additional information from a case.