

**Audits of Body Worn Camera Footage
Pursuant to City Code 2.10.200
September 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 September 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 5,143 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 that officers appeared to materially comply with City Code, State law, and Department policies.

BODY WORN CAMERA REVIEWS

Case No. 1

Summary

Officers are responding to a call on Main Street with a person who appears to be intoxicated. We learn that he was reported by nearby bar patrons that he was inside a bar making threats toward others at the bar. Officers attempt to speak to the person and ask him what happened at the bar, but he refuses and officers place him in handcuffs and seat him on a curb. Officers inform him that he is being detained while they investigate the threats at the bar. Officers ask for his name and he does not comply.

Officers conduct a *Terry* frisk and find containers of what appear to be illegal drugs in his front pockets. Person is belligerent, cursing at officers, and making threats that his child works for the National Security Administration (“NSA”) and implying a threat to the officers. Officers arrest person for public intoxication and possession of a controlled substance and paraphernalia. The call concludes as another officer transports the person to jail.

Findings

The officers appear to comply with State and City Codes and Police Department policy.

Case No. 2

Summary

Officers arrive at a housing facility and speak with a woman who has called them to lodge a complaint against a person who assaulted her. She indicates that a male acquaintance struck her in the arm and knocked her to the ground over an allegation that she took money from him. Woman denies a romantic relationship with the man and provides his information to the officers.

Officers walk over to the man's residence and ask to speak to the man. He agrees and invites them into his residence to discuss. The subject officer remains in the doorway while other officers speak to the man inside. Officers leave residence and begin walking back to their vehicles. The call concludes.

Findings

The officers appear to comply with State and City Codes and Police Department policy.

Case No. 3

Summary

Officer arrives at a hotel near Rio Grande Street and speaks to a person who the hotel wants trespassed from their property. The officer obtains the person's information and runs a criminal history and warrants check on his mobile data terminal ("MDT"). The person asks for the officer's information and the officer provides his name and badge number. Officer informs the person that he has been trespassed. Officer then speaks to hotel employees who tell him about the problems that this person has caused them. Officer tells them that the person has been notified that he's been trespassed and informs them how to indicate that a future trespass call is a priority. The call concludes.

Finding

The officer appears to comply with State and City Codes and Police Department policy.

Case No. 4

Summary

Video begins with officers speaking to a group of people outside a bar. It appears that the people outside the bar called police because they were concerned that they witnessed someone steal a car next to the bar. Officers obtain information from the bar patrons about the car and attempt to determine who might own the vehicle so that they can contact the owner. There is discussion with dispatch about who might own it (a person in West Valley City) and requesting West Valley City personnel to contact the owner of the vehicle. The call concludes.

Finding

The officers appear to comply with State and City Codes and Police Department policy.

Case No. 5

Summary

Officers have responded to a call in what appears to be a scrap yard. A man indicates that someone appears to have damaged a trailer that he was working on, perhaps in an attempt to steal tools or other valuables. However, the man confirms nothing was stolen and he just wanted a police report. Officers obtain information and conclude the call.

Findings

The officer appears to comply with State and City Codes and Police Department policy.

CONCLUSION

Of the five matters that were reviewed, the audit found that officers appeared to materially comply with City Code, State law, and Department policies.