

**Audits of Body Worn Camera Footage
Salt Lake City Police Department
Pursuant to City Code 2.10.200
Nov 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 November, 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 5,092 case numbers) from the month. If a case number had multiple recordings for that case number, a recording was randomly selected for review.

In four 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. In one case, the Subject Officer appears to commit a technical violation from Police Department policy when he removed his BWC from his vest and placed it on a cabinet during a field interview.

This report was prepared by Senior City Attorney, Betsy Haws.

Body Worn Camera Reviews

Case No. 1

Summary

Subject Officer walks into school and is approached by a young female (subject). A school official, a police officer and a SLCPD social worker are also present at the scene. The school official informs the Subject Officer that the subject female is diagnosed with autism. The subject female, who says she is 19 years old, informs the Subject Officer that, through the window, she saw a male pull down the pants of a child, which prompted her to call PD. The subject female says she saw nothing more because the blinds were pulled down. The officers and social worker are very supportive of subject female, as she tries to explain the situation.

After Subject Officer interviews the subject female, the Subject Officer goes outside and talks with the child that was thought to be the victim. The child, who is smiling and laughing, informs the Subject Officer that the entire situation was just a joke and that some boys, who are his best friends, were just dragging him around by his feet playing. It appears that the child had already informed other persons (school officials, police officers, social worker) about the playful situation before the Subject Officer arrived at the scene.

Several officers were outside of the school engaging several students in a positive manner and began passing out badge stickers to the students, who had requested the stickers.

The Subject Officer turns off BWC.

Finding

Officers appeared to comply with State law, City Codes and Police Department policy. All officers were respectful to all parties in the school, including staff and students.

Subject Officer was thorough and assertive during the investigation, but in a respectful way. Subject Officer was extremely empathetic with the subject female, who struggled to explain what she had observed and why she called PD.

Case No. 2

Summary

Subject Officer parks next to a sidewalk and is approached by a subject woman who shows her a truck with several broken windows. Subject woman informs the Subject Officer that she left her purse in the truck, and it was gone through, but it appears nothing is stolen from the truck except for some cash. The truck belongs to a male that is with the subject woman. Subject Officer takes pictures of the truck damage and informs the couple that it is unlikely that the offenders will be caught but will give them the case number for insurance purposes. Subject Officer turns off BWC.

Finding

Subject Officer appeared to comply with State law, City Codes and Police Department policy. Subject Officer was respectful, empathetic, and realistic about expectations with the victimized couple.

Case No. 3

Summary

Subject Officer and another officer (lead) meet with an older female (subject) and another female (daughter in law) in a house. Female informs officers that the subject female is supposed to get married today but there are some issues with the subject female's fiancé, who is in the garage. Both females inform the officers that the present issue is not due to any physical abuse between the couple.

The subject female says that the couple is not intimate or living together but have dated "off and on" for the past 6 years. Female informs officers that the male is over 20 years younger than the subject female. Female also informs the officers that the male slapped the subject female in the past. The subject female agrees that he did slap her once but said he will never do it again. The Subject Officer confirms that there was not any current violence. Female says the male is very controlling and has a "short" temper. The family and friends, including the church bishop, are worried about the relationship and the subject female's safety. Additionally, the female says the male has a court case and that he has a restraining order from a past marriage. Lead officer tells the subject female that he sees "red flags" and then goes to interview the male.

Subject Officer stays with the two females and listens to background related to the couple's relationship.

The lead officer returns and informs the subject female that the male will be leaving for now and asks the subject female what she would like for him to do. Lead officer informs the subject female that the situation can appear like elder abuse. Lead officer recommends that the subject female call a victim advocate and listen to different options to address the issue and possibly receive other services. The Subject Officer provides the subject female a victim advocate's contact information and stated that he would contact adult protective services and that they may open an investigation at their discretion.

Subject Officer says, "going off" and turns off BWC.

Finding

All officers appeared to comply with State law, City Codes and Police Department policy. The lead officer was patient and empathetic with the subject female, provided resources and advice, including the recommendation to reach out to protective services. Subject Officer was supportive and practiced active listening.

Case No. 4

Summary

Subject Officer (lead) and another officer run through a parking lot encounter a male (subject) who is running out of the store and presumed shoplifting. Subject Officer informs the subject male that he is being detained for shoplifting and places handcuffs on subject male. Subject male admits to the officers that he shoplifted some articles. The officers take subject male to the store security office.

Subject Officer takes off BWC and places it on what appears to be an office cabinet. Subject Officer sits on the desk and starts writing a report. Two other store employees join the officers and subject male. Subject male continually apologizes to officers and store staff for shoplifting. The subject male is hyper and is constantly talking. The officers allow the subject male to keep talking and eventually, the subject male de-escalates himself. Staff security inform subject male to not return to the store because he had already been trespassed before. A store employee has a document that he shows to the subject male and informs him that he cannot go to any of the department stores, including the parking lots, on a permanent basis. Subject male says he understands.

Lead officer takes the handcuffs off the subject male and gives him citations for trespassing and shoplifting. Lead officer informs subject male that he has to go to municipal court and lets the subject male leave the store.

Subject Officer recovers his camera and places it back on his vest. He says, “concludes case, end of contact” and turns off BWC.

Finding

All officers appeared to comply materially with State law. However, Subject Officer appears to commit a technical violation of Police Department policy and City Code when he removed his BWC from his vest and placed it on a cabinet and left it there throughout the interaction with the subject male. Subject Officer and backup officer were patient with the subject male and treated him with respect.

Case No. 5

Summary

Subject Officer approaches a male (subject) that is sitting outside on the corner sidewalk. Subject male tells Subject Officer that “you guys are looking for me. I don’t want to live anymore.” Subject Officer asks the subject male why he thinks the police are looking for him and why he doesn’t want to live anymore.

Subject male tells Subject Officer that people are telling him that police are looking for him. He says that last night police sent a canine after him. Subject Officer asks him if he wants to go to the hospital because of his statement of not wanting to live anymore.

Subject male says he hasn't taken his medications. Another officer arrives and stays with the subject male while the Subject Officer returns to his patrol car and appears to conduct a warrant and/or missing persons search for the subject male.

Subject Officer informs the subject male that there is no information in the system that he ran away from police. Subject Officer tells the subject male that he does have a warrant for possession of a controlled substance, but he does not want to take him to jail but rather wants to help him. The back up officer informs Subject Officer that the subject male told him that he took lots of medications.

Both officers tell the subject male that they just want to help him and would like for him to go to the hospital where he can get food, get warm, and get medical attention. The subject male agrees to go to hospital. Officers call for an ambulance. The ambulance arrives and the subject male voluntarily gets in and once it departs, the Subject Officer says, "going off, End of contact" and turns off BWC.

Finding

Officers appeared to comply with State law, City Codes and Police Department policy. The officers were extremely respectful of subject male, empathic towards the situation and caring for his needs.

CONCLUSION

In four 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. In one case, the Subject Officer appears to commit a technical violation from Police Department policy when he removed his BWC from his vest.