

**Audits of Body Worn Camera Footage  
Pursuant to City Code 2.10.200  
May 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 May 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 5,055 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***

Two officers respond to an apartment with a door open and encounter two females. The officers identify themselves as police officers and enter the apartment. One female, the complainant, informs the officers that she and her brother had a dispute. The lead officer goes to talk to the brother who is in another room. The subject officer (officer with the body worn camera video being reviewed) is the backup officer while the lead officer conducts the investigation. The complainant informs the subject officer that her brother pushed her several times and into the wall, which caused the TV to fall over. Complainant says her brother is mad because she supposedly owes him \$13. The complainant then goes to another room. Subject officer informs the lead officer that the complainant has moved to another room. The subject officer then speaks to the other female in the apartment, who is the cousin of the complainant and appears to be the person who tries to reduce conflict between the complainant and the brother. The subject officer talks to the cousin tries to provide some problem-solving education. The lead officer returns and speaks to the cousin and requests the number of the complainant’s mother, who will address the conflict when she returns from work. Officers depart the apartment and subject officer states that it is end of contact and turns off body worn camera.

***Finding***

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

The officers were in a difficult situation where they were encountering an allegation of domestic violence (brother pushed complainant several times). There were no visible injuries on the complainant and TV did not appear to be knocked over (TV was put back up or never was knocked over), which reduces the criteria for probable cause. However, the video perspective was from the subject officer, who was backup officer, and the details of the lead officer's investigation could not be seen or heard.

Both officers practiced good listening skills with all persons in the apartment and the subject officer was attempting to build rapport with the complainant's cousin.

## **Case No. 2**

### ***Summary***

Subject officer, who is the lead officer, arrives at a business parking lot. Subject officer approaches a male who is walking towards the officer. The subject officer informs the male (1) to sit down and asks him what he is doing in this location. Male 1 tells the subject officer that he was looking for cigarettes in a trailer. Backup officer arrives and subject officer walks around the parking lot because the call for service indicated two persons were trespassing on the property. Subject officer finds another male (2) sleeping next to the building. Subject officer leaves Male 2 asleep while he conducts a warrant check on Male 1. After the warrant check of Male 1, subject officer wakes up Male 2 and asks for ID and then conducts a warrant check.

After the warrant check, subject officer tells both Male 1 & Male 2 to leave because they cannot stay there as there are several trespassing signs all over the property and the owner has placed a trespassing complaint. Subject officer gives them a verbal "trespassing warning" and allows them to leave. Subject officer did find a 1/2 pill of contraband and stated that it would be disposed.

### ***Finding***

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

The subject officer listened to the persons in the case and gave clear and respectful directions.

## **Case No. 3**

### ***Summary***

Subject officer, who is the lead officer, arrives at the scene, which appears to be the parking lot of a strip mall. Fire Department and EMS personnel are already at the scene and speaking with a male who is sitting in his wheelchair. A woman is also standing next to the wheelchair. The EMS personnel inform the subject officer that there are not injuries on the male and both EMS & Fire Department personnel depart from the scene.

Subject officer asked the male to describe what happened. Both the male and female told the subject officer that a vehicle hit the wheelchair while the male was sitting in it, as well as ran over several items that belonged to the male that were placed in front of the wheelchair. The subject officer took several pictures of the damage and uploaded photos into the system. The subject

officer asked the persons to fill out paperwork for victims and witnesses. Subject officer patiently listened to the persons and answered the questions while providing information on the upcoming process of the case.

Subject officer walked to an adjacent building to request any videos from exterior security cameras but those cameras were not on. After collecting the filled-out paperwork, subject officer returns to his patrol vehicle and turns off body worn camera.

### ***Finding***

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

The subject officer displayed several procedural justice practices with the two persons, such as treating the persons with respect, showing empathy for the situation, and allowing space for the persons to provide voice by using active listening.

### **Case No. 4**

#### ***Summary***

Subject officer arrives at the scene where two other police officers are next to a male who is in custody, in handcuffs. The lead officer asks the subject officer to stay with the male while he stores an evidence bag. The lead officer returns and asks the male in handcuffs what he prefers to do with his vehicle (get it towed, ask someone to recover it later, etc.). The lead officer asks the subject officer to transport the male to jail and he would follow him there (it appears that the lead officer is in an unmarked car which is not suitable for transporting persons). The subject officer places the male in his patrol car. The majority of the video is the subject officer driving to the jail. Upon arrival, the subject officer transfers the male to the lead officer, returns to his patrol car and turns off the body worn camera.

#### ***Finding***

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

### **Case No. 5**

#### ***Summary***

Subject officer, who is the lead officer, arrives at the scene where it appears that there are several people staying in a makeshift campsite located on a grass strip, which is between the curb and the street. The subject officer approaches the campsite alone and uses firm & direct instructions to those in the campsite in what appears to be an attempt to establish control of the situation (the officer later explains to them why he is taking those specific actions).

Another police officer arrives to support the subject officer (subject officer is now the lead officer). It appears that the subject officer has seen and warned several of the people at the makeshift campsite the day before about this campsite violating City ordinance (the subject officer calls out

several of the people by name). Subject officer informs the unsheltered persons that they are in violation of city ordinance and that he is going to give them all citations.

Subject officer asks for ID from those in the campsite. The remainder of the body worn camera video is of the subject officer conducting warrant checks and writing citations. The subject officer informs each person, one at a time, why a citation was written, how to take care of the citation, and how they can avoid citations in the future.

One person was taken into custody because of a warrant, which was done by the backup officer. Once all the citations were written, the subject officer ordered the unsheltered persons to leave the premises, and they complied. Subject officer turns off the body worn camera.

### ***Finding***

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

Officers communicated well with each other to handle a complicated situation, keeping safety in mind, all while enforcing City ordinances and laws and still treating with dignity persons who appear to be experiencing homelessness.

### **CONCLUSION**

Of the five cases that were reviewed, the audit found that police officers appeared to materially comply with City Code, State law, and Police Department policies. Additionally, police officers practiced procedural justice at varying degrees when engaging with the public.