

**Audits of Body Worn Camera Footage
Pursuant to City Code 2.10.200
April 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 April 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 4,519 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 six 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 on the scene of a multiple vehicle accident. The body-worn camera recording is from what appears to be a backup officer whose involvement is limited to photographing the vehicles.

Findings

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

Case No. 2

Summary

Officers respond to a burglary in progress call and enter the home and make subsequent arrests of the burglary suspects.

Findings

The officers appear to materially comply with State and City Codes and Departmental Policy. However, it was noted that the video abruptly ended without an explanation. It is unclear from the recording whether the officer deactivated the camera, if the battery died, or if the abrupt ending is a function of Axon.

Case No. 3

Summary

Officers respond to a possible domestic dispute in an apartment complex and proceed to further investigate the matter. During the recording there are two instances where the officer mutes the recording. In the first instance of muting, the officer does not verbalize the reason for the muting but it appears he mutes the recording to engage in a conversation with other officers on scene. The officer then later enables the audio recording functions of his body-worn camera but appears to engage with one of the parties of the domestic dispute briefly before engaging the audio recording. In the second instance of muting, the officer also fails to verbalize an explanation for the muting. However, it was noted that it appeared the officer muted the camera to place a call.

Finding

Officers appear to materially comply with State and City Codes and Departmental Policy. The officer's muting of his body camera without providing a reason likely constitutes a technical violation because he appears to be conferring with fellow officers on scene, which is a permissible reason to deactivate a body camera 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

The body worn camera footage is from an officer who arrives on scene after the suspects are already by a fence, separated from what appears to be a stolen truck. The recording captures the officer gathering information and looking through the truck for tools, weapons, etc. The call concludes.

Findings

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

Case No. 5

Summary

A search of evidence.com revealed no body-worn camera recording associated with the random case number.

Finding

An inquiry was made to the Department to determine if it could locate any body worn camera footage attached to this case number. The Department responded that this case number should have a body worn camera recording, but that it could not find one. Without further investigation, it is unclear what policies and laws may have been violated. But it is worth noting that SLC Code requires certain officers to wear a body-worn camera and to activate it while on duty and engaged in a law enforcement encounter.

Case No. 6

Summary

The body worn camera footage captures an officer talking to an individual who is reporting a possible crime and a series of activity that he deems suspicious. The individual is concerned for his and his family's safety because of the recent suspicious activity he has experienced. The call resolves after the officer agrees to do a standby while the individual retrieves property from his home.

Finding

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

CONCLUSION

The matter involving the missing body camera recording will be referred pursuant to the body camera ordinance to determine the reasons why this recording cannot be located.