

Audits of Body Worn Camera Footage
Salt Lake City Police Department
Pursuant to City Code 2.10.200
February 2026

SUMMARY

This memorandum constitutes a random audit, pursuant to City Code 2.10.200.E, of body worn camera recordings for the month of February, 2026. 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 4,682 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

The Subject Officer was observed outside an apartment building when he approached three individuals gathered near an apartment door. An unoccupied gurney was nearby. A medical professional exited the residence and engaged in a discussion with one individual. Subsequently, both the medical staff and the individual entered the apartment. The Subject Officer followed them inside, where a medical assessment appears to be taking place. The Subject Officer exchanged information with the emergency responders. The body-worn camera was deactivated after the officer stated, "End of contact. Going off."

Finding

The Subject Officer appears to comply with State and City Codes and Police Department policy.

Case No. 2

Summary

The Subject Officer exited the patrol vehicle and approached another marked patrol car. The Subject Officer opened the rear door, revealing a male subject in handcuffs seated inside. The Subject Officer then proceeded to a different patrol vehicle, where another officer was standing outside searching another restrained individual, Subject Male. The Subject Officer opens the rear door of a patrol vehicle, observes a handcuffed male seated inside, secures the seatbelt around him, and then closes the door.

The lead officer informs of the presence of firearms, possibly in the Subject Male's vehicle. The lead officer indicated that they are probably looking at aggravated assault charges for Subject Male. The officers retrieved a pistol from a cardboard box within the patrol vehicle, secured the firearm and two magazines in a paper evidence bag, and placed the bag into the trunk of the patrol car.

The Subject Officer then entered her patrol vehicle, stated, "End of contact. Going off," and deactivated her body-worn camera.

Finding

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

Case No. 3

Summary

The Subject Officer is engaged in a conversation with another officer on a side street, while a different officer communicates with a male individual seated on the curb. It appears there has been a vehicle collision involving a truck and a trailer carrying a car, which is being towed by another truck. The male, who may be the incident's victim, walks away from the scene.

The Subject Officer joins the lead officer who is speaking with another male, Subject Male, who is seated on the curb. The lead officer informs the Subject Male that medical personnel have cleared him but notes he has minor bleeding, and inquires if he wishes to be taken to the hospital. The Subject Male states he does not wish to receive medical attention. The lead officer then asks the Subject Male if he is willing to perform sobriety tests; the Subject Male declines. Subsequently, the lead officer places handcuffs on the Subject Male and escorts him to the patrol vehicle. The female lead officer requests a male officer to search the individual; the Subject Officer conducts the search, and afterward, the lead officer escorts the individual to the back seat of the patrol car.

The Subject Officer proceeds to the Subject Male's truck to locate his phone. Upon opening the truck door, the phone is found resting on the dashboard. When attempting to remove the key from the ignition, the truck unexpectedly starts. The Subject Officer leaves the key in the ignition and the engine stops running. The Subject Officer then joins two other officers at the scene of the accident to assess the situation and discuss what may have occurred. During the conversation, the Subject Officer states, "I'm going to go on mute" and mutes the audio. It appears the officers continue their discussion regarding the incident.

Later, the Subject Officer returns to his motorcycle and follows a patrol vehicle. While riding, he unmutes the audio, states, "I'm going to end recording until we arrive at our location," and turns off his body-worn camera.

Finding

The Subject Officer appears to have committed a minor violation of City Code and Police Department policy by failing to state the reason before muting the Body-Worn Camera audio. Additionally, the Officer's failure to unmute the BWC audio throughout the remainder of the recording may constitute a violation of State and City Code, as well as Department policies. The lead officer treated the Subject Male respectfully, inquiring about his health and maintaining a professional demeanor during the arrest.

Case No. 4

Summary

The Subject Officer approaches the male subject, who is in handcuffs and seated on a bench. Two additional officers are present in the room. One officer informs the Subject Officer that, given their role in phlebotomy, the other officers will handle all other procedures. The Subject Officer explains to the male subject that the handcuffs will be removed and then guides him to a chair. The Subject Officer informs the subject about a consent form for blood collection. The subject consents and signs the form. The Subject Officer attempts to draw blood but is initially unsuccessful; however, the second attempt is successful. The subject then stands up and is re-handcuffed by another officer. The Subject Officer appears to put away his medical supplies and retrieves a label maker. Subject Officer says “going off” and then deactivates the body worn camera.

Finding

Subject Officer appeared to comply with State and City Codes and Police Department policy. However, there may have been a technical violation of Police Department Policy and applicable City code concerning the deactivation process at the conclusion of the law enforcement encounter, as the Subject Officer did not return to his vehicle or provide a stated reason for the deactivation. Subject Officer was professional and respectful with the Subject male while drawing out blood.

Case No. 5

Summary

Subject Officer was seated in a parked patrol vehicle, engaged in a phone conversation with the male subject who states he is a tenant of the property. The Subject Officer advised the male subject that she was awaiting the arrival of another officer before proceeding to his location. The discussion involved a potential trespassing incident concerning a female subject and the presence of other unhoused individuals entering his backyard. The Subject Officer explained the procedural steps related to the issue with the female subject.

The Subject Officer then conducted a short drive to the specified location while continuing the conversation. Upon arrival, the Subject Officer approached what appeared to be an unhoused female lying near the apartment building, informed her that her presence was not permitted on the property, and collected her information. The Subject Officer then returned to her patrol vehicle and muted the body-worn camera without providing an explanation. Subsequently, the Subject Officer appeared to perform a warrant check on the female subject. Subject Officer exited the patrol vehicle, unmuted the body camera as she is informing the female that she was being issued a “legal warning” and that she was

not allowed to return to the property; otherwise, she could be subject to arrest. The Subject Officer confirmed whether the female understood, and she responded affirmatively.

The Subject Officer then turned off the body-worn camera without providing any verbal explanation.

Finding

The Subject Officer appeared to comply with State Code. The Subject Officer appears to have violated City Code and Police Department policy by failing to state the reason before muting the Body-Worn Camera audio. Additionally, there may have been a technical violation of Police Department Policy and applicable City Code concerning the deactivation process at the conclusion of the law enforcement encounter, as the Subject Officer did not return to her vehicle or provide a stated reason for the deactivation. Furthermore, the Officer may have violated department policy by talking on the phone while operating a vehicle, in what appeared to be non-urgent circumstances.

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. In three cases, the Subject Officer appeared to commit a violation of the Police Department policy and/or City Code.