

**Audits of Body Worn Camera Footage
Pursuant to City Code 2.10.200
June 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 June 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 4,770 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

Video begins with officers talking to a victim. The victim's tools were stolen, and a suspect was found by one of the victim's employees. The officers go to a gas station where they identify the suspect's truck, the suspect, and the tools in the back of the truck. The suspect is arrested and the officer enters information into his computer before talking to the victim again. The officer verifies that the tools belong to the victim and concludes the call.

Findings

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

Case No. 2

Summary

The video starts with the officer calling a victim while in his car. During the call the officer obtains information related to a credit card fraud matter and answers the victim's questions (victim's credit cards were fraudulently used to spend hundreds of dollars at a gas station).

Findings

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

Case No. 3

Summary

Officers approach a homeless encampment and arrest a woman they were looking for. It appears that the woman robbed a CVS and had an altercation with an employee. The officers take the woman to a nearby parking lot, where she confesses. One officer tells her they need to *Mirandize* her and then they will talk some more. The officers *Mirandize* her and encourage her to seek help and ask her about her family and if she has any help she can seek. The officers are encouraging but let her know that due to the robbery, she will be going to jail. The officers are polite, compassionate, and encouraging to her throughout the interaction.

Findings

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

Case No. 4

Summary

Officers arrive at an apartment complex. When they find the apartment that is the subject of the call, a young man is standing with a knife outside the open door. He drops it immediately, and they interview him about what happened. The young man tells them about an argument with his father that became aggressive. His story changes a couple times, first that there was no actual violence, but then that he was hit in the face. Officers interview the father and tell him they need to issue a citation. One officer gives resources to the complainant and heads back to her car. She is called back by the other officer, who tells her that the story has changed and now the son says nothing happened. They decide not to give the citation and explain the process to both the father and son (separately).

Findings

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

Case No. 5

Summary

The body camera recording begins when the officer arrives after other officers have already responded and separated the victim and suspects. Victim alleges that one of the men stole his wallet. The suspect says he didn't steal it, he instead hit it out of the victim's hand. The officer interviews the suspect, and the bodycam turns off suddenly. From the recording, it did not appear that the officer turned off the body camera. A depleted battery or hardware defect can cause a body camera to stop recording and may have been an issue here.

Findings

It is unclear why the body camera deactivated, but it does not appear to be from an intentional act of the subject officer. The officers otherwise appear to comply with State and City Codes and Departmental Policy.

CONCLUSION

Of the five body camera recordings viewed, officers appear to materially comply with State and City Codes and Departmental Policy. It is unclear why the body camera stopped working in Case No. 5. If it is a device defect, the device should be identified and fixed or taken out of circulation. If the body camera merely lost battery power, the Department should remind officers to ensure that body cameras are to be charged prior to answering calls for service.