SUMMARY

This memorandum constitutes a random audit, pursuant to City Code 2.10.200.E, of body worn camera recordings for the month of July 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 5,182 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
Airport officer responds to a call regarding damaged property. A motorist struck a card pedestal reader causing $1500 in damage. Officer documents the matter for a report and concludes the call.

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

Case No. 2

Summary
An officer responds to a traffic accident on 400 South between 500 West and 600 West. There were no injuries and the drivers decline medical attention. The officer gathers information from the drivers and takes photographs. Two tow trucks are called because the vehicles are not drive-able. Another officer stops by to assist and takes over the call. The officer concludes his role in the call.

Findings
The officer appeared to comply with State and City Codes and Police Department policy.
Case No. 3

Summary
Officers meet a couple outside of a downtown pub around noon. The couple called to report a stolen vehicle that they left behind the previous evening. Officers gather information from the couple to make their report. Immediately after asking the couple to fill out paperwork, the officer mutes his camera to speak to his fellow officer and wait for the couple to return with the paperwork. The muting officer failed to unmute his camera for about one and a half minutes when they returned with the paperwork, but unmuted mid-conversation with the couple. The officers advised them of their next steps and concluded the call when the couple walked away.

Finding
While the officer’s failure to immediately unmute his camera when the couple returned with their paperwork could be viewed as a technical violation of City Code and Departmental Policy, the circumstances show that it was likely unintentional as the officer unmuted his camera within a minute and a half of the couple returning and while speaking with the couple about the next steps to be taken in their investigation. Given the above, the officers appeared to materially comply with State and City Codes and Police Department policy. Officers should be reminded to be cautious and mindful when muting their cameras so that they do not unintentionally fail to unmute their cameras when required.

Case No. 4

Summary
Bike officers respond to a complaint from an unsheltered woman about being assaulted by another woman. The victim is emotional as she describes being bullied by the woman who assaulted her. Officers are supportive of her and assure her that she is not in any trouble for reporting the crime. The officer speaks to a man who witnessed the assault.

While waiting for information, the officer takes a phone call and mutes his camera. He unmutes his camera after the call and when he interacts with the woman. The call concludes after they gather the necessary information for the police report.

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

Case No. 5

Summary
An officer has just come on shift and is returning a call from a woman who has called in a burglary of her residence. Her safe with money and valuables was stolen. The officer mentions that her son also called in and told them that he was drugged and that he was robbed by two women. Officer indicates that he is on his way and that he should arrive at her house in 10 minutes. Officer deactivates his camera as he drives up there (he later reactivates his camera when he arrives at the house).

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 appeared to materially comply with City Code, State law, and Department policies. However, officers should be mindful of those instances when they mute a camera so that they do not forget to unmute their cameras when they are required to do so.