

**Audits of Body Worn Camera Footage  
Salt Lake City Police Department  
Pursuant to City Code 2.10.200  
October 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 October, 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 (BWC) recording based on a particular timeframe. Because of that limitation, a random number generator was used to identify 5 case numbers (out of 5,578 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. However, there are two videos where an officer may have committed one or more technical violations of Department policy related to the muting and/or wearing of his BWC.

**Body Worn Camera Reviews**

**Case No. 1**

***Summary***

Subject Officer, who is the backup officer, approaches a male (subject male) outside an apartment building on what appears to be the second floor. Another officer, who is the lead officer, goes to an apartment with a female resident, who is the subject male's wife.

The subject male, who is visibly upset, informs the Subject Officer that he and his wife had an argument and that he just wants to go stay at a hotel but needs to get his wallet first, and his wife does not want to give it to him. Subject male also said that his wife threw water on his Xbox. Subject Officer asks the subject male if anything in the apartment, besides the Xbox, was damaged or if there was physical violence during the argument. The subject male says neither occurred. Subject Officer practices active listening with the subject male, which de-escalates the situation and leads to the subject male stating that the water may have accidentally fallen on the Xbox.

The lead officer returns and begins to interview the subject male while the Subject Officer goes inside the apartment and interviews the wife, who is holding their 6 month old child. The wife tells the Subject Officer that the subject male arrived home intoxicated and they argued. In the process she accidentally spilled water on Xbox. The wife tells the Subject Officer that she called PD because she needed help with subject male but she did not feel unsafe. She also told the Subject Officer that nothing was damaged in the apartment and there was no physical violence. The wife told the Subject Officer that she does not know the location of the subject male's wallet but agreed to look for the wallet in the apartment.

The wife finds the wallet and the Subject Officer takes the wallet to the subject male. Subject male, who is much calmer, tells the Subject Officer that he is now willing to sleep on couch instead of staying at a hotel. Subject male informs Subject Officer that he is receiving professional help on certain personal issues.

The lead officer returns and informs the subject male that she spoke with his wife and that she wants him to stay in the apartment, on the couch. Both officers provide some advice to the subject male.

After discussion with subject male ends, the Subject Officer states "End of call" and turns off BWC.

### ***Finding***

All officers appeared to comply with State and City Codes and Police Department policy. Subject Officer was respectful and practiced active listening with the subject male, which contributed to the de-escalated of the situation. Officers established domestic relationship and investigated for possibility of domestic violence.

## **Case No. 2**

### ***Summary***

Subject Officer gets out of patrol car and approaches the subject male in a parking lot. The subject male says that he wants his vehicle to be towed to a specific auto shop but the tow truck that was dispatched informed him that he needs to take it to another auto shop. The subject male tells the driver of the tow truck that he will request another tow truck company to take his vehicle to his preferred auto shop and therefore should not tow his vehicle. The driver of the tow truck refuses to move his tow truck, which is blocking the subject male's vehicle and once again tells the subject male that he needs to tow the vehicle and take it to another auto shop.

The Subject Officer then talks to the driver of the tow truck, who tells the Subject Officer that he just does not want to be placed at the end of the towing list. The Subject Officer

tells the driver that he will call dispatch and see if they can keep him at the top of the towing list.

Subject Officer calls dispatch and describes the situation. Dispatch informs the Subject Officer that they will put the driver in front of line.

The tow truck then moves out of way and the subject male calls his preferred tow company. Subject Officer says “end of call” and turns off BWC.

### ***Finding***

The Subject Officer appeared to comply with State and City Codes and Police Department policy. Subject Officer was respectful to all parties, including the driver of the tow truck, the subject male, and dispatch and was able to get a quick resolution for the situation. Subject Officer also informed the subject male that his call was important and that the subject male should not apologize for calling PD for what the subject male referred to as a “minor” incident.

### **Case No. 3**

#### ***Summary***

Subject Officer is speaking to a female on phone in what appears to be a telephonic report follow up. The subject female is describing a situation where four boys come to her house to ring her house doorbell. The subject female called PD because one of the boys returned a few minutes later to ring the home doorbell again. The subject female informs the Subject Officer that she has home video that has recorded the boy coming to her door. The Subject Officer informs her that he will send link to download video. Subject Officer gets subject female’s information and documents the case. Subject Officer says “going off” and turns off BWC.

### ***Finding***

The Subject Officer appeared to comply with State and City Codes. However, Subject Officer appears to commit a technical violation from Police Department policy when he removed his vest, which has the BWC. Subject Officer was patient with the subject female and empathized with the situation.

### **Case No. 4**

#### ***Summary***

Subject Officer is walking with a store employee through a department store and into what appears to be the security room where other officers are already present and accompanying store security staff. The Subject Officer approaches the lead officer, who is placing handcuffs on a teenage male. The lead officer is interviewing the teenager but is hard to hear from the Subject Officer's BWC. It appears that the teenager was caught stealing a store item. The teenager is informed that he is being "trespassed" and is permanently banned from entering any of the department stores.

Both officers walk the teenager outside and into the lead officer's patrol car. The Subject Officer tells the lead officer that he will check on a policy and says "muting for private conversation" and mutes audio on his BWC. Subject Officer goes to his patrol car and appears to research a policy on his laptop. Subject Officer returns to speak to lead officer but audio is still muted. Subject Officer returns to his car to retrieve a document that appears to be a juvenile citation booklet.

Lead officer lets the teenager out of patrol car, takes off the handcuffs and appears to give a citation to the juvenile. Subject Officer gives teenager his backpack and they let the juvenile go. The audio is still on mute. Seconds before the BWC is stopped, the Subject Officer realizes that he forgot to unmute the audio.

## **Finding**

It appears that the officers involved in this case materially complied with all State Law and City Codes.

There may be two technical violations of Police Department policy requirements for the use of the BWC. First, the Subject Officer stated that he was muting the audio for "a private conversation" but actually walked away from the main police activity to his vehicle to work on his computer. Although muting is allowable by policy during periods of inactivity, the reason stated did not reflect the actual situation. Secondly, the Subject Officer forgot to unmute the audio until seconds before the BWC was turned off.

Both the Subject Officer & lead officer were fairly patient and respectful when faced with challenging behavior by the juvenile offender.

## **Case No. 5**

### ***Summary***

Subject Officer approaches a home and begins to speak with the subject male. The subject male says that his adult son, who lives close by, is harassing him and his tenants, who reside in a separate apartment building within Salt Lake City. The subject male tells the Subject Officer that the tenants are getting intimidated and telling him that they are concerned. Subject Officer tells the subject male that he will forward all the

documentation (recordings, notes, etc.) to detectives that are more knowledgeable about protective orders and are able to further investigate to determine if a crime has been committed.

Subject male informs the Subject Officer that there is a protective order already in place where the son can talk to subject male's wife but not him. Additionally, subject male says that the son has a pretrial hearing in a few days related to property damage. Subject Officer tells subject male to tell tenants to call PD if the son comes back and continues to harass them. Subject Officer provides the case number to subject male.

Subject Officer says "going off, end of contact" and turns off BWC.

### ***Finding***

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

### **CONCLUSION**

In three 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. However, in two cases, the Subject Officers appear to commit one or more technical violations of Police Department policy related to the use of the body worn camera.