

**Audits of Body Worn Camera Footage  
Pursuant to City Code 2.10.200  
April 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 April 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 4,710 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 to a scene where another officer is speaking to a person who is sitting on a rock on the property of a business. When the subject officer approaches the person, the previous officer heads to her car to conduct a warrants check. While that officer conducted the warrants check, the subject officer engages with the person in conversation about the merits of Diet Coke or coffee in the morning. After a few minutes, the previous officer responds and tells the person that she is issuing him a citation for the drug paraphernalia that was in his possession. That officer also tells the person that she won't issue him a citation for the trespass to the property, but that he has to move along. The call concludes.

***Findings***

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

**Case No. 2**

***Summary***

Officer is driving her patrol vehicle and stops it to take a stolen vehicle report. The complainant tells the officer that he had purchased his vehicle in a private sale, was making payments, but that his vehicle was repossessed. The complainant mentions that the sale contract allows for repossession if the payee was in default. The complainant further mentions that the vehicle remains titled in the seller's name.

The officer advises that this is likely a civil matter and that he may have to pursue a civil remedy. However, she takes his information and the information of the seller. She advises that she will pass along the information to vehicle theft detectives. The officer provides a case number to the complainant, and he expresses appreciation to the officer for the call. The call concludes.

***Findings***

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

**Case No. 3**

***Summary***

Officers meet a person who is sitting on the curb, and she tells the subject officer that she is suffering from shortness of breath and a “systemic infection.” She appears to have called for medical assistance. She tells the officer that she is homeless and the subject officer asks her if she has tried to find space in the shelters. She indicates that because of a particular wound, she prefers to stay elsewhere. The officer tells her that an ambulance will arrive soon. Officers stay with her until she is taken by ambulance to a hospital. The call concludes.

***Finding***

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

**Case No. 4**

***Summary***

Officer encounters another City employee who is calling about damage to a City-owned, flashing speed limit sign trailer. The officer takes photos of the damaged sign and speaks to the employee about it. The officer provides the employee with a case number and the call concludes.

***Finding***

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

**Case No. 5**

***Summary***

Officer encounters a person at approximately 10 p.m. who is attempting to set up a tent in the park strip. The officer informs the person that he cannot set up his tent because it is against City ordinance. The person says he will take down his tent and move on. The officer returns to his vehicle and deactivates his camera after approximately 8 minutes of inactivity.

**Findings**

The officer appeared to comply with State and City Codes and Police Department policy. The officer, pursuant to State Code (Utah Code 77-7a-104(9)(b)), City Code (2.10.200.B.1), and Department Policy 422.3.4.1, states that he is deactivating his body worn camera after approximately 8 minutes of inactivity.

## **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.