

**Audits of Body Worn Camera Footage
Pursuant to City Code 2.10.200
February 2024**

SUMMARY

This memorandum constitutes a random audit, pursuant to City Code 2.10.200.E, of body worn camera recordings for the month of February 2024. 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 4,595 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

Officer arrives on scene where other officers are interviewing someone who is complaining of an assault. The complainant speaks Spanish and another officer is providing translation for the officers. The complainant alleges that he was struck by a stick and that he defended himself. Other officers indicate that other witnesses claim that the complainant was the aggressor toward his spouse and that the spouse was trying to get away from him. The subject officer concludes his involvement in the call since other officers are handling the situation.

Findings

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

Case No. 2

Summary

Officer arrives on scene whether officers from other jurisdictions have detained two women who were observed in a physical altercation. Officers speak to the witness officers and the women involved in the altercation. One officer confirms that there aren't any factors that would make this a potential domestic violence matter (the women state that they do not know each other). The women state that neither wants to press charges and the witness officers are unable to confirm whether there was an aggressor. The officers inform the women that they are free to leave and conclude the call.

Findings

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

Case No. 3***Summary***

Airport officer arrives in baggage claim area where medical personnel are treating a child who slipped, fell, and hit her head. Officer obtains information from a parent. Parents decline medical transport and medical personnel advise on signs to watch. Officer concludes the call.

Finding

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

Case No. 4***Summary***

Officers detain two individuals on suspicion of retail theft at a retail store. In conferring with security from the retail store, it appears that this is the first time either individual has been stopped on suspicion of retail theft. Store security indicates that they do not want to press charges. Store security takes photographs of individuals and officers release the two individuals.

Finding

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

Case No. 5***Summary***

Officer obtains security footage from a fast food restaurant regarding alleged theft.

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.