# Audits of Body Worn Camera Footage Pursuant to City Code 2.10.200 May 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 May 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 4,990 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 material non-compliance with City Code, State law, and/or Department policy.

#### **BODY WORN CAMERA REVIEWS**

#### Case No. 1

#### **Summary**

The body worn camera recording captures an Officer having what appears to be limited involvement in the call which involves transporting a subject to jail. It is unclear whether the officer had additional involvement in the call and whether there is additional body worn camera footage capture that previous involvement. The video ends abruptly while the Officer is walking into the jail. During the transport the officer is observed using his MDT for what appears to be a law enforcement purpose.

### **Findings**

The officer appears to materially comply with State and City Codes and Departmental Policy.

# Case No. 2

#### **Summary**

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

## **Finding**

A search of Versadex confirmed that the case was closed as information only and nothing indicated there was a law enforcement encounter. Therefore, there was no recording created.

#### Case No. 3

## **Summary**

Officers arrive on scene at a Trax station on a call where a female may be suicidal indicating she is withdrawing from illicit drug use and suffering from Parkinson's disease and wants to "end it all."

Officers call for medical and were able to convince her to voluntarily seek help and be transported to the hospital. The Officers also offer the female additional social/support services. The officers handled the call with significant care and compassion towards the female in a state of distress.

## **Finding**

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

## Case No. 4

#### **Summary**

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

#### **Finding**

A search of Versadex confirmed that the case number was assigned due to an online report of lost property. Therefore, there was no law enforcement encounter necessitating the use of a body worn camera.

#### Case No. 5

## **Summary**

An officer responds to conduct what appears to be a follow-up investigation regarding a possible car accident. During the encounter the officer talks with a witness and takes photographs of a passenger vehicle.

## **Finding**

The officer appears to materially comply with State and City Codes and Departmental Policy.

#### Case No. 6

## **Summary**

Officer initiates a traffic stop for a vehicle running a red light, requests the driver's license, runs the license through the system, and quickly returns to the vehicle to issue the driver a verbal warning.

#### **Finding**

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

#### Case No. 7

# **Summary**

Body-worn recording captures what appears to be a welfare check at an apartment building. The officer knocks several times and later knocks again and announces that it is the Salt Lake City Police. No one answers the door.

# Finding

The officer appears to materially comply with State and City Codes and Departmental Policy.

# CONCLUSION

Of the five body camera recordings that were viewed, officers appear to materially comply with State and City Codes and Departmental Policy.