

**Audits of Body Worn Camera Footage
Salt Lake City Police Department
Pursuant to City Code 2.10.200
May 2025**

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 2025. 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 five (5) case numbers (out of 5,623 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 is in a hallway outside a door facing another officer who is knocking on the door of an apartment and identifying themselves as SLCPD. The Subject female walks out and says her friend called the police. The Subject female says that the apartment is under her daughter's name and her daughter let the Subject female's ex-boyfriend stay in the apartment. Subject female says that she and her daughter live in another city but keep the apartment because the lease runs a few months longer.

Subject Officer asks for ex-boyfriend's name and requests assisting officers to check for any protective orders (PO). Subject Officer informs the Subject female that he needs to talk with ex-boyfriend, the Subject male, who is in the apartment. The Subject female walks into the apartment and Subject Officer follows her and says out loud, "we're gonna come in" as he walks into the apartment.

Subject Officer calls out to the Subject male and as he comes out of a room, Officers place handcuffs on him. The Subject Officer informs the Subject male that there is a protective order in place. Subject male says, in Spanish, that he was in the apartment only to get his belongings.

Subject Officer independently verifies the presence of a PO using the Mobile Data Terminal (MDT). Subject Officer locates the expired PO and an active Jail Release Agreement (JRA). The Subject male's presence with the Subject female is a violation of the JRA.

With the Subject female's consent, Officers view Subject female's phone and review text messages by Subject male to Subject female that shows additional instances of him violating the JRA. Subject Officer asks Subject female if the arresting police department explained to her how to waive the JRA. Subject female said she understood it but did not waive the JRA because her and the Subject male felt they needed time apart. Therefore, the JRA was not waived and the Subject male's presence in the Subject female's apartment was a violation of the JRA.

Officers walk with Subject female outside the apartment complex and inform her that the Subject Officer is going to conduct a lethality assessment, explained what it was, and that she does not have to answer the questions. Subject Officer states, "both muting, conducting lethality assessment". Both officers mute BWC since both officers are present with Subject female while conducting the lethality assessment. After the lethality assessment is completed, the Subject Officer provides her with documents. An officer explains to the Subject female that they, the police officers, do not have a choice about arresting the Subject male because he violated the protective order. Subject Officer

explains to Subject female that she needs to keep the documents because they show that she waived the new JRA.

The Subject female's daughter arrives at the apartment. Officers inform her that a pistol holster was seen in the apartment, and it gives them concern over the presence of a firearm in the apartment. Officers provide a form (possibly a consent to search) to the daughter of Subject female, explain it and ask for her signature if she agrees. After the daughter signs the form, the Subject Officer and other officers conduct the apartment search. Officers complete the search without finding a firearm. Subject Officer walks Subject female out of the apartment complex while other officers take the Subject male to jail.

Subject Officer walks to patrol car and says "end of contact. Going off" and turns off BWC.

Finding

Officers appeared to materially comply with state statutes and City codes. The Subject Officer appears to be in violation of Police Department policy by not unmuting immediately after conducting the lethality assessment. Officers were professional in managing a complicated and multi-faceted situation. Subject Officer demonstrated active listening skills and gave a clear explanation to the Subject female.

Case No. 2

Summary

Subject Officer is on a phone call and is speaking with the Subject male. Subject Officer has his BWC on a desk/table and facing a black bag. Subject male, who is an Uber driver, describes an incident where he and another vehicle nearly got into an accident. The Subject male states that the male driver of other car cuts in front of him, slams on his brakes and nearly causes an accident. The other driver then comes out of his car and starts yelling while banging on the Subject male's window and smashing the driver's side rear view mirror. Subject male informs the Subject Officer that he has a video of the incident. Subject Officer asks Subject male if there is damage to his car and Subject male states that rear view mirror seems to be working and no other damage to his car.

Subject Officer sends link to Subject male's email so that video can be downloaded as evidence. Subject Officer explains the process to the Subject male.

Subject Officer states, "end of contact on off policy 2 10 200" and turns off BWC.

Finding

Subject Officer appeared to comply with state law and City codes and Police Department policy. The Subject Officer did a lot of listening and explaining the process to the Subject male, as well as providing realistic expectations on the case. Subject Officer conducted a good investigation.

Case No. 3

Summary

Subject Officer and another officer approach the Subject male, who is sitting on the sidewalk just outside the Salt Lake City International Airport. Subject Officer asks why Subject male is at the airport and he states that he was there for food. Subject Officer tells him that airport officials have seen him for a while and that he has been bothering people. An airport official joins the officers and informs the Subject male that he is trespassed for three months and if he returns before then, airport officials will call SLCPD. Officers allow the Subject male to walk towards the train so that he can depart the premises. Officers wait by the train to ensure that the Subject male gets on the train and departs the scene. The train departs and Subject Officer says something inaudible and turns off BWC.

Finding

Officers appeared to comply with State statutes, City codes and Police Department policy. Officers were professional with the Subject male and facilitated the trespass notice with airport officials. Officers ensured that the Subject male departed the scene.

Case No. 4

Summary

Subject Officer is driving in the patrol car. Subject Officer arrives at a scene of a high-risk traffic stop and parks behind another patrol car. Subject Officer unholsters his firearm and stands behind the patrol car for cover. Another officer is giving directions to the Subject male. Subject Officer then gives commands to Subject male in Spanish to put hands up and slowly walk to officers. Subject Officer places handcuffs on the Subject male. Subject male is compliant. Subject male only speaks Spanish. Officers request and wait for a translator to speak in Spanish with the Subject male.

Subject Officer goes to patrol car and calls Orem PD advising them that SLCPD has the stolen car that was reported and have in custody a male driver, even though the original report described a female suspect. Subject Officer speaks with the Records Department to notify the listing agency, Orem PD, to remove the car from NCIC as a stolen vehicle.

An officer and the Subject Officer conduct an inventory of the stolen car. Officers find the title of the stolen car with falsified documentation. The translating officer informs other officers that the Suspect male said he went to Unified Police Department to ask about the car and the Suspect female because he heard that she was in jail. Officers discuss whether this is an unfortunate situation for the Subject male, who says he has a picture of the female suspect's driver's license and other documents supporting his assertion that he legally purchased the car.

The officers state that they believe that the Subject male did think he bought the car legitimately and did not know it was stolen. However, the officers discuss the offenses committed by the Subject male, such as operating a vehicle without insurance and with a canceled registration. Subject Officer also informs the officers that the Subject male has an "NCIC out of ICE".

Subject Officer again speaks with Orem PD and is informed that the owner of the stolen car is coming to get his car. Subject Officer calls the owner of the stolen car. After discussing several options, the owner agrees that the car should be impounded by SLCPD and Subject Officer provides him with the impound information so that he can recover it later, once he registers the car with the DMV and obtains auto insurance. Subject Officer calls for a tow truck and returns to the stolen car with a laptop and completes the inventory. The Subject Officer states "muting until tow truck arrives" and mutes BWC. When the tow truck driver arrives and collects the car, the Subject Officer says, "car has been recovered by tow truck and going off contact" and turns off BWC.

Finding

Officer appeared to comply with State law, City codes and Police Department policy. Officers did a good job coordinating with outside agencies to reveal the totality of the situation.

Case No. 5

Summary

Subject Officer arrives at scene and puts on traffic vest and cones on one lane of a street. Subject Officer walks to a car and speaks to Subject male 1, who describes a vehicle accident. Subject Officer then walks to a truck and speaks to Subject male 2, who also describes what occurred through his perspective.

Subject Officer asks both Subject males if they want to exchange information or make a formal police report. Subject male 1 says he prefers to make a report since PD is already at the scene.

Subject Officer collects information from both Subject males, returns to his patrol car and prints off the “driver’s exchange forms”. The Subject Officer provides the forms to both Subject males with instructions. Subject Officer then takes photos of the vehicles. Subject Officer informs them that they are free to leave the scene and says “end of contact, going off camera” and turns off BWC.

Finding

Subject Officer appeared to comply with State law and City codes. The Subject Officer discussed the incident with the parties involved but did not appear to collect written statements from the parties involved or a written statement from the witness to a collision as required by Police Department policy. Subject Officer was empathetic with both Subject males, first asking if they were ok before investigating. Subject Officer did a good job providing driver exchange information to the Subject males and obtaining video evidence from a witness to the incident.

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. In two cases, the Subject Officers appeared to commit violations of Police Department policy.