Audits of Body Worn Camera Footage
Salt Lake City Police Department
Pursuant to City Code 2.10.200
August 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 August, 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 5 case numbers (out of 6,243 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 walks into a convenience store and is approached by the store manager, the Subject Female. Subject Female informs Subject Officer about an ongoing incident at the convenience store. In describing the matter, Subject Female indicated that she told a male in a truck not to park in front of other vehicles because it blocks their exit and instead, he should park in a parking stall. The Subject Female reported that the male drove his truck to block her car so that she could not leave and yelled and cursed at her and acted as if he was going to get out of truck. The Subject Female said that the male drove around the parking lot and again confronted her and again blocked her car. The Subject Female tells Subject Officer that the male finally left but returned another day. Subject Female asks Subject Officer what she can do. Subject Officer informs Subject Female that perhaps they can trespass the male and possibly use "road rage" laws against him. Subject Female says that she provided dispatch the truck's license plate and that she has the incident on camera.

Subject Female and Subject Officer review the video and she identifies the male and describes the incident. The Subject Officer asks Subject Female if she told the male that he was trespassed and Subject Female indicates that she told him four times. Subject Officer documents the description of the truck and the male. Subject Officer takes notes about the incidents and takes a video on his cell phone of the incident video he reviewed with Subject Female.

Subject Officer advises the Subject Female to not approach the male if he returns but suggests that she call the police and tell them that the male has been told that he is not allowed to be in the premises and that incident has been reported.

Subject Officer walks to patrol car and narrates as that he started the body camera recording after the store manager approached him while he was in the convenience store to purchase food. Subject Officer enters his patrol car and states "going off. End of contract" and turns off BWC.

Finding

Subject Officer appeared to comply with State and City Codes and Police Department policy. Subject Officer demonstrated understanding and patience towards Subject Female in addition to showing efforts to ensure an accurate understanding of what Subject Female had reported. The Subject Officer's willingness to be attentive and receptive to hearing Subject's Female's concerns appeared to alleviate the Subject Female's concerns and

frustrations that law enforcement did not immediately respond to her initial call during the incident.

Case No. 2

Summary

Subject Officer is inside an elevator with another officer. Multiple officers depart the elevator, walk down the hall, and approach another officer who is in front of an apartment unit door. Officers discuss the specific smells they have observed while in the hallway, including their observation that the odor is stronger near the door. The footage captures officers discussing that they had received information that a female lives in the apartment and a neighbor had previously observed on several occasions the female receiving medical care. Officers note that they attempted to get in contact with maintenance staff to enter the apartment but were unsuccessful.

Officers discuss making a forced entry into the apartment based on their belief that the female occupant has passed away. Subject Officer makes a phone call, possibly to a supervisor, and describes the situation. After the call Subject Officer tells the other officers on scene that they have permission to force entry on condition they "knock and announce" prior to the forced entry. Officers knock loudly and announce "we are here to check on your welfare. Come to the door if you are okay. If not, we are going to come in." One officer successfully forces entry through the apartment door. The officers enter the apartment through the door and conduct a quick sweep of the apartment but do not locate the female resident or anyone else inside. There is a cat in the apartment.

Subject Officer asks dispatch for crime lab to come to the scene. Subject Officer states on camera, "muting for conversation." Officers converse in the hallway. Subject Officer goes inside apartment and continues looking throughout the apartment. Subject Officer appears to speak with someone on his cell phone in the hallway.

Subject Officer unmutes audio and briefly speaks with a female that walks by him. The female states that she is there to retrieve her dog and inquires of the number of cats in the apartment. The female walks into an apartment unit and Subject Officer stays in the hallway.

Additional officers arrive and inform Subject Officer that the female resident is with her fiancé somewhere in Salt Lake City. The officer informs Subject Officer that he informed the female resident that police forced entry into the apartment based on the odors, believing she has passed. Crime scene personnel arrived and took pictures of the damaged door.

Subject Officer says "shutting off and going to make another phone call" and turns off BWC.

Finding

This matter should be referred pursuant to 2.10.200.E to determine if officers complied with laws and policies related to the entry into the residence. Additional review is important because it may glean additional facts necessary to determine compliance with law and policy.

Case No. 3

Summary

Subject Officer arrives in his patrol car to the scene and approaches three police officers who are with two males sitting on the park strip grass. One of the males, Subject Male One, is in handcuffs and another officer is removing and searching a backpack when the Subject Officer arrives. Officers pick up what appears to be small plastic bags near Subject Male One. Subject Officer begins speaking with the other male, Subject Male Two, who is not handcuffed and when Subject Male Two moves, bags with a white substance fall out. Subject Officer verbalizes that he believes the substance is meth and will field test it. Subject Male Two is then placed in handcuffs and makes a spontaneous statement denying that the substance is meth.

Officers retrieve a bag containing a white substance from the backpack.

One of the officers informs the others that the substances are counterfeit drugs and the officers discuss possible charges. Officers search Subject Male Two's person.

Officers appear to conduct a search of a backpack.

One of the officers returns to the two males and informs them that they being cited for drug paraphernalia and the officers take off the handcuffs.

Subject Officer abruptly turns off the body worn camera without verbalizing a reason for the deactivation.

Finding

This matter should be referred pursuant to 2.10.200.E to determine if officers complied with laws and policies related to the searches that occurred. Additional review is important because it may glean additional facts necessary to determine compliance with law and policy.

Additionally, there appears to be a violation of City Code when Subject Officer deactivates the body worn camera without stating the reason for deactivating and prior to returning to the officer's vehicle.

Case No. 4

Summary

Subject Officer's bodycam is activated while walking on the sidewalk towards another officer who is speaking with a Subject Female in front of a home. Another female is sitting on a rock next to the Subject Female. The home has yellow tape around the front of the house.

The Subject Female is describing medical circumstances of a family member. Crime lab personnel arrive on scene. Subject Officer informs another officer that he is at the scene to transport the two females. The Subject Officer states, "muting for officer conversation," and proceeds to approach two other officers to engage in a discussion. Subject Officer unmutes audio after a brief conversation with the two other officers. Subject Officer then approaches the two females and informs them that he will transport them to the Public Safety Building. Subject Officer moves his patrol car closer to the scene and the two females get into the back seat. Subject Officer informs dispatch that he is transporting two female witnesses from the scene to the Public Safety Building and states the vehicle's starting trip mileage.

Subject Officer arrives at the location and walks the two females into the building. Subject Officer takes the Subject Female into an interview room while the other female goes to the bathroom. Subject Officer informs Subject Female that he will periodically check on her. Subject Officer leaves Subject Female in the room by herself. Subject Officer transitions the room based on the recent occupancy, marking it as "occupied," noting the Subject Female's name and the time she arrived, and specifying "no restroom."

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

Finding

Subject Officer appeared to comply with State and City Codes and Police Department policy. Subject Officer appropriately muted and unmuted his audio, stated mileage when transporting females, and provided detailed explanation to the Subject female before leaving her by herself in the interview room.

Case No. 5

Summary

Subject Officer arrives at the scene where another officer is already speaking with two males sitting on the curb. The officer informs the Subject Officer that one of the males, Subject Male One, had a pipe in his hand when she arrived on the scene. Subject Officer asks Subject Male One where the pipe is and the male hands it to the officer. Subject Officer recognizes the other male, Subject Male Two, from a prior arrest and the two engage in a brief conversation about that encounter. The Subject Officer helps Subject Male One stand up and searches him. Subject Officer then searches Subject Male Two. The other officer asks Subject Male Two why he has another person's wallet that had just been reported stolen. An officer searches Subject Male One's backpack. Subject Officer asks officer if he should start citations and goes to the other officer's patrol car and begins working on the laptop.

Subject Officer tells Subject Male Two to place his finger on the fingerprinting equipment and issues him a citation. Subject Officer shares information about resources to get "cleaned up," tells Subject Male One to put his finger on the fingerprinting equipment, and issues Subject Male One a citation. Both Subject Officer and the other officer place evidence in a bag.

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

Finding

This matter should be referred pursuant to 2.10.200.E to determine if officers complied with laws and policies related to the searches that occurred. Additional review is important because it may glean additional facts necessary to determine compliance with law and policy. Subject Officer employed "real-time" de-escalation techniques to help ensure Subject Male Two remained calm, despite apparent difficulties related to recent methamphetamine use. Additionally, the Subject Officer provided Subject Male One with information on accessing substance abuse treatment resources and offered detailed guidance on how to obtain his social security card and other identification to help pursue housing opportunities.

CONCLUSION

In two of the five cases that were reviewed, the audit found that police officers appeared to materially comply with City Code and State law, and Police Department policies. Three cases are being referred, in accordance with City Code 2.10.200.E, to assess whether officers adhered to applicable laws and policies concerning the searches conducted. Additionally, in one of the referred cases the officer appeared to commit a violation of City Code related to body worn camera deactivation.