

**Audits of Body Worn Camera Footage
Salt Lake City Police Department
Pursuant to City Code 2.10.200
April 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 April, 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 5,253 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 is in a retail store and meets store personnel in an office, who are reviewing footage from the store's security cameras. The Subject Officer reports that he was unable to locate an individual, presumably suspected of involvement in the retail theft. The store personnel then present the Subject Officer with video footage showing the Subject Male taking and concealing merchandise beneath his coat before leaving the store. A staff member provides the Subject Officer with specific details of the stolen merchandise.

Additionally, a staff member informs the Subject Officer that, besides security camera footage, witnesses observed the Subject Male's concealment of the merchandise. The staff member describes the manner in which the Subject Male concealed the items and how the staff member tried to intervene. A staff member informs Subject Officer that he will return with the estimated value of the stolen merchandise. The Subject Officer gathers identification information from staff as well as details about the Subject Male. Another officer arrived on the scene.

The Subject Officer explains the procedures for submitting security footage to the police department.

The staff member returns with the cost estimate of the stolen merchandise. The store staff asserts that the Subject Male has previously taken items from the store but has not been formally trespassed. The Officers then exit the office.

Subject Officer says, "End of contact. Going off." and turns off the BWC.

Finding

The officers appear to comply with State and City Codes and Police Department policy. The Subject Officer was respectful and professional with the store staff.

Case No. 2

Summary

The Subject Officer parked behind an vehicle in an apartment complex parking lot and approached the driver, Subject Male. The Subject Officer explained that the vehicle was stopped because the registration indicated that the registered owner does not possess a valid driver's license. It appeared that the Subject Male did not speak English. The Subject Officer asked for the driver's license in Spanish, and the Subject Male provided a form of a driver's license. The Subject Officer then returned to the patrol vehicle to verify the license information.

A second officer arrived on scene and approached the stopped vehicle. The second officer relayed information to the Subject Officer that the Subject Male may reside in the apartment complex. The Subject Officer requested that the second officer obtain the Subject Male's address and phone number. The second officer returned with the information. The Subject Officer inquired whether the second officer speaks Spanish or was using the app, to which second officer responded a combination of both.

Using a translation app, the Subject Officer explained to the Subject Male that his driver's license is suspended, that he is being issued a citation, how to address the citation, and that the Subject Male needs to obtain a valid driver's license.

Subject Officer walks away from the vehicle and says, "I'm off. End contact." and turns off the BWC.

Finding

The officers appeared to comply with State and City Codes but may have committed a violation of Police Department policy as it relates to the use of a translation app. Subject Officer was respectful and professional with Subject Male, explaining why he was stopped and the process of addressing the issue.

Case No. 3

Summary

Subject Officer, sitting in her parked patrol vehicle, is speaking on the phone with the Subject Female. Another officer is standing next to the Subject Officer's patrol car. Subject Female provides the Subject Officer her location and both officers meet her outside an apartment complex.

Subject Female tells the officers that she was “couch surfing” in the apartment and she was told by the tenants that she had to leave after being gone all night. The Subject Female indicates that she needs to retrieve her personal property from inside the identified apartment unit.

The officers walk into the apart building and knock on the identified apartment unit door. After several knocks on the door, phone calls to the apartment, and no one answering, the officers walked out of the apartment and informed the Subject Female that nobody answered. Subject Officer informs the Subject Female that they are not permitted to go into the apartment. Officers ask for additional details about the situation and the Subject Female informs them that there no conflict, the apartment tenants had just not answered the door this morning for her to retrieve her personal property. The other officer informs Subject Female that the matter is a civil issue. Subject Officer provides the Subject Female possible options to address the issue. The Subject Female says that she has to go to Idaho and that her brother-in-law will be taking her to Idaho.

The Officers continue their efforts to reach the tenants including calling multiple phone numbers believed to be the tenants’. The officers did not have success in reaching the tenants.

Subject Officer explains to Subject Female all their efforts to reach the tenants but informed her they were not successful.

Subject Officer states“ Going off, end of contact” and turns off BWC.

Finding

Officers appeared to comply with State and City Codes and Police Department policy. The officers spent a lengthy amount of time problem-solving with the Subject female in an attempt to address the issue.

Case No. 4

Summary

The Subject Officer is riding a bicycle and stops in front of a store and approaches another officer and a male. The Subject male is holding a can of beer. The other officer informs the Subject Male that a call was received that someone was breaking into a car. The Subject Male responds that he did not break into a car. A third officer arrives. The Subject Male is asked to sit down next to the building and he complies. An officer collects the Subject Male’s information.

Subject Officer asks the Subject Male to give him the beer can and the Subject Male complies. The Subject Officer informs the Subject Male that he cannot have an open container. Subject Officer informs the Subject Male that the caller described a male wearing all black with maroon shoes and a black beanie, which fits the Subject male's attire, and that the caller reported that the person reached into a truck and grabbed a water bottle from a cooler.

One of the officers informs the Subject Officer that the complainants "don't wanna do anything" but just don't want the Subject Male to "mess around with their stuff". The officers discuss that there is an open container. An officer takes a photo of the can of beer. One of the officers stays with the Subject male making "small talk" and keeping him engaged.

An officer returns to the scene and informs the Subject Male that he is being cited for possession of an open container. The officers collect the Subject Male's fingerprints and then explain how to take care of the citation.

An officer informs the Subject Male that he is free to leave. As the Subject male stands up and starts walking away, one of the officers asks him if he has anything else illegal on him. Subject male says "no" and the officer asks the Subject male if he "would care if I checked" but the Subject Male simply walks away from the scene. The officer then empties out the beer can on a park strip.

The Subject Officer deactivates the BWC prior to mounting his bicycle at the conclusion of the law enforcement encounter.

Finding

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

Case No. 5

Summary

The Subject Officer and another officer, who appears to be a FTO, walk on the side of a street and then stand by an orange cone that is placed on the side of the road. Officers discuss shell casings from an incident that occurred the night before that were found and that Crime Lab is going to document the evidence. The other officer crosses the road and speaks with a male and then returns back to inform the Subject Officer that the male stated that he doesn't think any of the neighbors have cameras.

The officers walk up the street and appear to be searching for more shell casings and return to the scene. Subject Officer states that he will block the road where the shell

casings were found and moves his patrol vehicle to block street traffic from the scene. Subject Officer puts on a traffic safety vest. Crime Scene arrives on scene. The officers accompany the Crime Scene investigator as she walks up and down the street documenting evidence.

Officers engage a family across the street and the officers are given sports drinks. The Crime Scene investigator gives the Subject Officer the evidence that are placed in separate paper envelopes.

Subject Officer returns to his patrol car and states “End of contact, going off” and turns off BWC.

Finding

Subject Officer appeared to comply with State and City Codes and Police Department policy. The apparent FTO was supportive and provided teaching moments to the Subject Officer. The officers were supportive of the Crime Scene Investigator as she worked the scene. The officers also engaged community members.

CONCLUSION

In 4 of the 5 cases that were reviewed, the audit found that police officers appeared to materially comply with City Code and State law, and Police Department policies. There was one case that appeared to violate Police Department polices.