

**Audits of Body Worn Camera Footage
Salt Lake City Police Department
Pursuant to City Code 2.10.200
December 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 December, 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 4,814 case numbers) from the month. If a case number had multiple recordings for that case number, a recording was randomly selected for review.

Body Worn Camera Reviews

Case No. 1

Summary

Subject Officer approaches an intersection with a vehicle accident and begins talking with several officers at the scene. Subject Officer asks the other officers for details regarding the accident. Subject Officer walks around the scene.

One of the officers, in Spanish, informs two males from one of the disabled cars that he will call a tow truck. Officer tells Subject Officer that the driver does not have a driver's license but has insurance. Subject Officer asks if the vehicle will be impounded.

Subject Officer asks the lead officer if he cited the driver. The lead officer said "no" because he does not have his laptop in his vehicle (perhaps is using a "loner" patrol car).

Another officer, who is wearing a High Visibility Vest, joins the Subject Officer and two other officers, and informs them that the tow truck is arriving in a few minutes. The other 2 officers are not wearing safety vest (unable to determine if the Subject Officer is wearing a safety vest because of the camera direction does not show what he is wearing).

The tow truck arrives. Subject Officer says "going off, end of contact" turns off BWC.

Finding

All officers appeared to comply with State and City Codes. However, there appears to be two violations of Police Department policies. The lead officer did not wear a high visibility vest while he was standing in the street intersection which is required by Police Department Policy under these circumstances. Additionally, the lead officer did not cite one of the drivers for not having a driver's license, despite department policy requiring that a traffic citation be issued in these circumstances.

One of the officers was empathetic to the driver and passenger of one of the cars in the accident.

Case No. 2

Summary

Subject Officer, who is a passenger in the patrol car (possibly an FTO) and another officer, who is driving (possible a trainee) meet another patrol car (with 2 officers; also possibly an FTO and a trainee) on a street corner. All officers approach two males that are outside a home. The trainee officer (lead) informs the two males that they are being detained for trespassing.

The trainee lead officer gets information from two males. The lead officer returns to the patrol car and appears to be conducting a warrant search. The FTO Subject Officer is walking around the scene, speaking to other officers.

Subject Officer returns to the patrol car to check on the trainee lead officer and guides him through the process.

Trainee lead officer informs the FTO Subject Officer that he will cite both males for trespassing. The FTO Subject Officer continues to teach trainee lead officer on how to use the system on the laptop.

Trainee lead officer asks the other trainee officer to bring the males one at a time to the patrol car to get their fingerprints. The trainee lead officer informs the males about the citations for criminal trespassing and the process on how to take care of the citations. The trainee lead officer directs the males to leave the property, which has trespassing signs on it. One of the other officers on the scene finds a syringe on the ground. Trainee lead officer places the syringe in a "sharps" container. Subject Officer mumble something and turns off BWC.

Finding

All officers appeared to comply with State and City Codes. There appears to be a violation of Police Department policy. The FTO used profane language while interacting with the Subject Officer and close to civilians.

Case No. 3

Summary

The Subject Officer, who is a trainee and also the lead officer, is with two other officers, one of which is his FTO. The three officers are inside the hallway of an apartment speaking with an adult female, the subject.

Subject female says she lives with her parents and a younger sister and she is in the lease agreement for apartment. Subject female informs the officers that she had an argument with her father and he keeps telling her to leave (kicking her out) the apartment. Subject female says that her father is aggressive towards her and her mother but her mother denies it. Subject female informs the officers that she has a video of her father pushing her. Subject Officer asks if subject female has the video and she shows him the video on her cell phone. Subject female then shows the video to the other officers. Subject officer asks her if she is physically hurt and if she has a place to stay if needed.

Subject Officer and FTO move to the side to consult each other about the case while third officer stays with the Subject female to fill out required documents. FTO is guiding the Subject Officer on how to proceed with the case, such as having probable cause with the video, no lethality assessment required because it is not Intimate partner violence but rather is domestic violence.

Subject Officer returns to the Subject female and informs her that he will now go to the apartment and talk with her father. Subject Officer then asks if she wants to talk to a social worker. Subject female says “yes” and that she also has therapist.

The officers go to the apartment and are invited in by the family (Subject female’s father, mother, and sister). The sister (16 yo) translates for the father in Spanish because he does not speak English. Father tells the Subject Officer that the Subject female is very rude and disrespectful to him and the mother. Subject Officer informs the father that they have a video of father pushing the subject female. The father admits to pushing the Subject female because she is so disrespectful. Subject Officer informs the father that it is still not reason to be violent towards the Subject female.

Subject Officer consults with FTO on possible options for the case. After speaking with the Subject female on her options, the officers return to speak with the father. Subject Officer informs him that he will be given a DV citation but is not going to jail. Subject Officer also

informs the father that the Subject female has decided to stay in the apartment with the family but she, as the victim, has allowed the father to also stay in the apartment. The FTO reminds the father that he cannot have any contact with the Subject female and because it is a small space in the apartment, recommends that they stay in each other's room to avoid any problems. The father says he understands.

The FTO and the third officer guide trainer Subject Officer on how to fill out the paperwork. FTO re-explains to the father the requirements of citation to ensure that he understands and can avoid further problems.

Suddenly, the subject female decides to go to her older sister's house and will stay in her room until her older sister arrives to pick her up. FTO gives the Subject female "blue victim's card" with legal services.

Subject Officer turns off BWC.

Finding

All officers appeared to comply with State and City Codes. There appears to be violations of two, and possibly three, Police Department policies. The Subject Officer twice muted the BWC audio without stating reason for muting. Additionally, the officers did not use a certified interpreter to translate officer communication with the Spanish speaking male, who is the offender and the father of the Subject female, who is the victim. Rather they used the father's 16 yo daughter to translate.

Lastly, it was not obvious from the Subject Officer's BWC if the officers collected videos from the Subject female's cell phone as evidence of DV.

The officers were respectful and empathetic to all persons in this complicated case. The officers provided resources and advice to the Subject female, who was the victim.

Case No. 4

Summary

Subject Officer is in a sports arena with several officers from different agencies. One of the police officers (Lead Officer) is speaking to a female (Subject Female). Lead Officer leaves Subject Female with Subject Officer so she can consult with another officer. Subject Female tells Subject Officer that a male in the sports arena has a gun on him. Subject Female says that the male is an ex-boyfriend and that he showed her the gun on his belt and she just ran away. She stated that the male has pulled a gun on her in the past.

Lead officer returns to speak with Subject Officer that it will be a DV investigation. Subject Officer speaks on phone, possibly with dispatch, and gets a case number.

Lead officer asks Subject Officer to get documents for witness statement. Subject Officer walks outside to his patrol car and gets the documentation. Subject Officer leaves the documentation with the lead officer who is interviewing Subject Female, possibly doing a lethality assessment.

Subject Officer turns off BWC.

Finding

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

Case No. 5

Summary

Subject Officer gets out of his patrol car and is approached by a male (1st Male). The 1st Male tells the Subject Officer that his son's car was hit by another person (2nd Male) while driving. The 1st Male informs the Subject Officer the 2nd Male does not have insurance. Subject Officer then interviews the son regarding the incident.

Subject Officer then interviews the 2nd Male. The 2nd Male informs the Subject Officer that the son hit his car and may have the incident on his dash camera. The 2nd Male admits that he does not have insurance or a valid driver's license. Subject Officer asked if 2nd Male has been smoking marijuana because his eyes appear as if he's been using. The 2nd Male says "no" and indicates he is just very tired.

Subject Officer provides appropriate vehicle driver exchange documents to both parties. 1st Male asks Subject Officer if 2nd Male inebriated. 1st Male informs that he saw another car pull up next to the 2nd Male's car and they put something in that car and then the other car left the scene.

Subject Officer returns to patrol car and appears to conduct a warrants check.

Subject Officer informs the 2nd Male that his car will be impounded because he does not have insurance and will also get cited for not having a license and insurance. Another officer, the backup, arrives at the scene and discusses assessing for possible DUI with the 2nd Male. Subject Officer says "mute real quick for conversation" and mutes audio.

Subject Officer returns to 2nd Male, unmutes and informs him that he will conduct some tests to assess his ability to drive. Subject Officer asks for permission and the 2nd Male agrees. Subject Officer conducts a couple of tests and the backup officer conducts a third test.

Subject Officer says mute for conversation. Subject Officer unmutes and returns to patrol car. Subject Officer views damage on son's car. Subject Officer returns to patrol car to fill out documents on laptop. Tow truck arrives at the scene.

Subject Officer informs 2nd Male that his vehicle will be towed and that he will be cited for lack of insurance and not having a driver's license. Subject Officer informs 2nd Male that he can take out of his vehicle whatever property he needs before it gets towed. The 2nd male informs the Subject Officer that his girlfriend is on her way to pick him up.

Subject Officer returns to patrol car to print out the citation. Subject Officer returns to 2nd Male, who is taking pictures of the property that will remain in his vehicle after being towed. Subject Officer gives 2nd Male citation and towing documents. A female arrives and begins speaking with the 2nd Male.

Backup officer asks Subject Officer if he conducted an inventory. Subject Officer says "Yeah. I looked as he was doing it". Officers wait for the vehicle to get towed. Subject Officer says "end of contact" and turns off BWC.

Finding

Officers appeared to comply with State and City Codes. There appears to be a violation of Police Department policy. Subject Officer did not conduct a thorough and detailed inventory of the 2nd Male's of the vehicle prior to impounding it.

The officers were extremely respectful of subject male, empathic towards the situation and caring for his needs.

CONCLUSION

In one 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 four cases, the Subject Officers appear to commit a variety of violations of Police Department policy.