

Audits of Body Worn Camera Footage
Salt Lake City Police Department
Pursuant to City Code 2.10.200
September 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 September, 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 Salt Lake City Police 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 case numbers (out of 5,870 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 driving in his patrol car using his speaker phone to talk with a Subject male. The Subject male says that a person threw rocks at his car while he was driving and the rocks almost hit his head and face. Subject Officer asks Subject male if he wants to press charges and the Subject male says “yes”.

Subject Officer arrives at the scene where the Subject male is standing next to another male. The Subject male says that another rock was also thrown at another person’s car. Another officer arrives and Subject Officer describes the incident to him. Subject Officer takes pictures of the damage on both vehicles for documentation. Subject male states that both cars are under his name. Subject Officer collects pertinent information from Subject male.

Subject Officer provides Subject male with the case number. Subject male takes Subject Officer to the location where rocks were thrown at the cars. Subject Officer takes pictures of the rocks thrown. Subject Officer explains the process to Subject male.

Subject Officer says “going off. End of contact” and turns off BWC.

Finding

Subject Officer appeared to materially comply with state law, city code, and SLCPD policy. Subject Officer was empathic with Subject male while documenting appropriate evidence.

Case No. 2

Summary

Subject Officer is walking with another officer to the door of an apartment building. A woman answers the door and states that she is the Subject female’s mother. The mother informs the officer that the Subject female is inside the apartment. The mother asks the officers if they want to enter the apartment. The officer says “yes.” The officers enter the apartment and see the Subject female sitting on a couch crying. The officer asks the mother if there is anybody else in the apartment and if there are any weapons. The mother states nobody else is in the apartment and there are no weapons present. The officer asks the mother if the officers can walk around the apartment to see if there is anybody else present in the other rooms. The mother says “yes.” The officers walk around the apartment and do not find anybody else in the apartment. They return to engage the mother and the Subject female.

The Subject female says she just called her ex-husband to speak to her daughter. The officer informs the Subject female that she is in violation of the state law regarding Electronic Communication Harassment because she contacted her ex-husband after the officer had specifically told her not to contact the ex-husband. The officer informs the Subject female that because this is a domestic violence case, he is required by law to act. Officer informs Subject female that he is going to give her a citation and that she is not going to jail at this time. He instructs her to follow him outside to his patrol car so that they can fill out documents. The Subject female continues to cry and state that she doesn't understand. The officer again instructs her to follow him to his patrol car. The mother encourages the Subject female to go with the officer to his patrol car. Officer explains that he will not put her in handcuffs. The officers and the Subject female leave the apartment, and the Subject female is instructed to sit on the curb while the officer goes to his patrol car.

The Subject Officer stays with the Subject female and again informs her that she will be given a citation today but also explains possible outcomes when she goes to court. Subject Officer explains to Subject female several times what she is allowed and not allowed to do under the protective order.

Subject female tells Subject Officer that her ex-husband pushed her against the wall last night. Subject Officer asks if she is hurt or injured. Subject female does not have visible injuries. Subject Officer goes to the other officer and informs him that Subject female is stating that her ex-husband pushed her against the wall and that they may need to follow up on this accusation. Subject Officer returns to the Subject female and patiently listens to Subject female's description of her experiences with her ex-husband, allowing her to de-escalate on her own.

The officer returns to speak with Subject female with the citation and informs her that she is getting a citation for Electronic Communications Harassment. Officer patiently explains to Subject female the process, several times, to ensure Subject female understands.

The officer then asks Subject female about the ex-husband pushing her against the wall last night. Subject female describes the incident. Officers ask her questions to clarify the incident, but Subject female's description of the incident is scattered.

Officers ask to speak with the mother as the Subject female goes inside the apartment. The mother walks out, crying and she walks away with the other officer. The other officer and the mother are heard speaking with each other at a distance from the Subject Officer. The Subject female comes out of the apartment and begins to ask Subject Officer questions, with different situations on when she can or cannot have contact with her daughter but not violate the protective order. The officer and the mother return. Officers again explain to the Subject female the process and mother also explains to the Subject female what is

allowed. The officers disengage with the Subject female and the mother after final explanations of what Subject female is allowed to do.

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

Finding

Officers appeared to comply with state law, city code, and SLCPD policy. The officers were extremely patient and empathetic with Subject female and attempted to provide guidance to both her and her mother.

Case No. 3

Summary

Subject Officer is stepping out of his patrol car and begins speaking with two persons across the street, a male and a female, who are standing next to a car. Subject Officer instructs the two individuals to sit on the curb, but the individuals do not immediately comply. Subject Officer tells them to follow orders and sit on the curb while they wait for another officer to arrive. The individuals sit and say that something is in the window of a house across the street. The Subject Officer asks the persons who the car belongs to and the male states that the car is his.

Another officer arrives and states that he will get information from both individuals and will conduct a warrant check on them while the Subject Officer goes to speak to the homeowner.

Subject Officer speaks to the homeowner, who is the Subject female that called the police. The Subject female is standing in the front yard of a house and holding an infant. Subject female states that the persons were looking at her and speaking in a threatening manner. Subject female informs the Subject Officer that in the window of the house are two dolls, possibly Halloween decorations.

The other officer informs the Subject Officer that the persons are clear of warrants. The Subject Officer speaks with the two persons and asks why they were harassing the Subject female with the infant and they state that they were looking at the dolls on the window and trying to figure out what they were. Subject Officer informs them that they are illegally parked and antagonizing the homeowner, causing unnecessary alarm, and breaking the law through disorderly conduct. The Subject Officer states that he is worried that if he lets them go they will return to the scene and break the law again. The female agrees not to return but the male appears to be impaired by possible drug use and struggles to respond. Subject Officer asks the female if she has a driver's license and when she replies “yes” he asks her to drive them home. The individuals get into the car to leave the scene.

The officers approach the house to speak with the Subject female. A male, possibly the Subject female's partner, is in the front yard with the Subject female and is holding the infant. The officers inform the couple about what occurred with the individuals and what the couple may be able to do to keep unwanted individuals out of their property. Officers also inform the couple to call the police again if the individuals return and tell the police that the individuals have already been told not to return to the house by the police.

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

Finding

Officers appeared to comply with State statute, City code, and Police Department policy.

Case No. 4

Summary

Subject Officer is standing next to another police officer and is looking at the other officer's mobile phone. Subject Officer unmutes and the officers approach two individuals, a female and male, that are sitting on a curb in front of a business. The other officer informs the Subject female that she has a warrant for "theft" and "drug paraphernalia" in Roy, Utah. The officer and Subject female discuss the possibility of her having other warrants throughout Utah.

The Subject male, who has a strong accent, speaks to the Subject Officer with the aid of his mobile phone for translation. Subject Officer and the Subject male discuss why there is a "mugshot" of the Subject male on the internet.

The Subject male is fingerprinted, given a citation for trespassing and the Subject Officer provides him instructions on how to take care of the citation. The Subject female is fingerprinted, given a citation for trespassing and provided instructions on how to take care of the citation.

The other officer then places handcuffs on the Subject female and informs her that they will wait for a female officer to arrive to search her. The female officer arrives and searches Subject female. Subject Officer places Subject female's property in a paper bag. The other officer places Subject female in the patrol car.

Subject Officer informs them says "end of contact going off, policy 210 200" and turns off BWC.

Finding

Subject Officer appeared to comply with state statute, city code, and SLCPD policy.

Case No. 5

Summary

Subject Officer and another officer, possibly the Field Training Officer (FTO), cross the street and walk to a home where three young men are sitting in chairs in the front yard of the home.

Subject Officer asks for a specific person, and they say he is inside. One of the males goes inside to inform the person that police are asking for him. The Subject male walks outside and begins speaking with the officers. The officers ask Subject male if he speaks English. The Subject Officer starts to call for translation assistance but then the Subject male says his daughter, who is approximately middle school age, can translate.

Subject Officer asks if the Subject male reported his car stolen and he says “yes”. Subject Officer asks Subject male investigating questions regarding the stolen car. The FTO provides a form for the Subject male to fill out and then explains how to fill out form.

The officers ask the Subject male for a detailed description of the car and if he has the VIN and vehicle plate information. The Subject male says he doesn’t have any of the information because the vehicle registration is in the stolen vehicle. The officers go to the patrol car with the Subject male’s passport and driver’s license to find the registration. The FTO guides the Subject Officer on how to find the vehicle using the Subject male’s name.

Subject Officer explains to the Subject male that they found the vehicle in the system and once again explains how to fill out the forms. As the Subject male fills out the forms with the daughter’s help, the officers engage positively with children that are playing in the yard. Subject Officer explains to the Subject male the process if the vehicle is found.

Subject Officer walks across the street and joins the other officer who is speaking with a neighbor to see if his home camera may have recorded the incident. The homeowner says that he will get back to the Subject male if his camera has any information regarding the stolen vehicle. As the officers walk away from the home and to the patrol car, the FTO provides guidance to the Subject Officer on similar cases.

Subject Officer says, “end of contact, in the vehicle” and turns off BWC.

Finding

The officers displayed great engagement with all individuals involved in the case. The officers were extremely patient with the non-English speaking Subject male. The officers were creative and thorough on information gathering to identify the Subject male's stolen vehicle. The FTO was very positive in his mentorship method with the Subject Officer and set a respectful and positive example for how to engage with the public.

This matter should be referred, pursuant to 2.10.200.E, to determine if officers complied with the City's Language Access Administrative Policy. The officers appeared to comply with state law and city code.

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 SLCPD policies. One case is referred pursuant to 2.10.200.E to determine if officers complied with the City's Language Access Administrative Policy.