

**Audits of Body Worn Camera Footage
Pursuant to City Code 2.10.200
April 2023**

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 2023. 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 4,802 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

An officer conducted a traffic stop of a vehicle that had registration canceled and returned a hit of no insurance. After speaking with the driver, the officer determined that the driver had borrowed the vehicle from his friends and that the driver was insured. The officer advised the driver to tell his friends to register the vehicle and obtain insurance.

Findings

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

Case No. 2

Summary

An officer was in his vehicle attempting to call an individual but only reached the caller's voicemail. After two unsuccessful attempts, the officer deactivates his camera.

Findings

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

Case No. 3

Summary

An officer is in his vehicle returning a call from a person who had reported that his bicycle was stolen from SLCC. The officer takes the report via telephone and concludes the call.

Finding

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

Case No. 4

Summary

An officer and a civilian employee respond to a call at a residence where it appears the homeowner has locked her dog in her vehicle. The officer and civilian employee manage to use tools to unlock the vehicle and free the dog to a grateful owner. The officer also turns down an offer of monetary appreciation from the owner and insists that it's part of his duty as a public servant.

Finding

The officer and civilian employee appeared to comply with State and City Codes and Police Department policy.

Case No. 5

Summary

An officer responds to a minor traffic accident where another officer was rear-ended by a motorist. Another agency responded to handle the reporting paperwork on behalf of the SLCPD. The matter concludes.

Findings

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

CONCLUSION

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