

**Audits of Body Worn Camera Footage  
Salt Lake City Police Department  
Pursuant to City Code 2.10.200  
June 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 May, 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 5,072 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 arrives at a coffee shop and initiates contact with the employees present. The Subject Officer inquires of an employee whether the individual outside, Subject Male, is the individual that the business wants police to ask to leave.

The Subject Officer then exits the coffee shop and instructs the Subject Male that he cannot remain on the property, citing the presence of "No Trespassing" signage and confirming that he's not a customer. The Subject Male indicates willingness to leave the premises. The Subject Officer requests that the Subject Male to stay, obtains his name, and inquires about any outstanding warrants. Two additional officers arrive on scene. The Subject Officer performs a warrant check on the Subject Male. Subject Officer then returns inside the coffee shop to ask the employee if she wishes to have the Subject Male formally trespassed; she confirms yes.

The Subject Officer informs the Subject Male that he is now officially trespassed from the property and explains the potential consequences of re-entry. Subject Officer confirms whether the Subject Male understands the instructions, and the Subject Male indicates understanding. Subject Officer notifies the individual that he has an active Class B warrant in another jurisdiction and advises him to address it accordingly.

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

#### ***Finding***

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

### **Case No. 2**

#### ***Summary***

Subject Officer exits the patrol vehicle and approaches three individuals—two females and one male. The Officer inquires whether they called regarding a hit-and-run incident. The individuals confirm and one of the females, Subject Female, explains that their vehicle was struck by another car which then fled the scene. The Subject Female presents video footage of the vehicle that hit their vehicle and then departed. The male provides additional details, indicating that the driver appeared intoxicated and had backed into their vehicle multiple times.

The Subject Officer returns to the patrol vehicle to utilize the laptop. Subsequently, the Officer photographs the damage to the vehicle. The Subject Female asks about the vehicle repair process; the Subject Officer advises her on consulting her insurance company. The Subject Officer then requests the Subject Female to complete a witness statement form.

The Subject Officer re-enters the patrol vehicle to continue working on the laptop. Attempts are made to contact the suspect driver; however, all phone numbers are out of service. The Subject Officer informs the Subject Female that they will attempt to visit the suspect's residence.

The Subject Female provides the Subject Officer with the completed witness statement. The Subject Officer provides the case number before the individuals depart the scene.

Subject Officer starts driving the patrol vehicle and picks up the mobile phone and dials a number and then says, "End contact. Going off." and turns off the BWC.

### ***Finding***

The Subject Officer appeared to comply with State and City Codes. Subject Officer may have violated Police Department policy by using his mobile phone while driving. Subject Officer conducted a good investigation while treating the persons respectfully.

### **Case No. 3**

### ***Summary***

Subject Officer appears to be in a hospital. The Subject Officer knocks on a door, enters a room, and introduces himself to a male individual who is lying on a bed, with a female seated nearby. The Subject Officer requests both individuals to describe the reported incident. The Subject Officer asks for a description of the suspect and the date of the incident. The officer also inquires whether the male individual is willing to complete a witness statement form, and the female indicates that the male has difficulty writing and offers to assist him in completing the form.

The Subject Officer states that he will visit the location where the reported incident occurred to review any available video footage relevant to the incident. The Subject Officer then exits the room and makes an inaudible remark before muting the BWC audio. During this time, the Subject Officer appears to be using his mobile device. After unmuting the audio, the officer re-enters the room and continues to interact with the individuals as they complete the witness statement. The individuals provide the completed statement to the officer, who informs them that he will contact the reported location and speak with their staff.

The officer concludes the encounter by stating, "Going off, end of contact," and deactivates the BWC.

### ***Finding***

Officers appeared to comply with State and City Codes and Police Department policy. Subject Officer was kind and patient with the individuals.

### **Case No. 4**

### ***Summary***

Subject Officer is seated in the patrol vehicle and calls a complainant, Subject Female, regarding a reported incident. The Subject Officer first requests Subject Female's name, date of birth, and address, followed by a description of the situation. The Subject Female reports receiving a phone call from an individual claiming that suspicious transactions appeared in her bank account. Subject Female states that upon hanging up the phone with the individual and reviewing her bank account, she discovered two ATM withdrawals of \$900 each. The Subject Female reported she contacted her parents to inquire whether they had made the withdrawals, and they denied involvement. Subject Female reported that she then called back the original caller, who provided her with instructions on how to address the situation including conducting certain computer activity. Subject Female reported that during the call that she overheard individuals in the background discussing their intention to steal her brother's money. She reported subsequently ending the call and discovered that an additional \$2,000 had been stolen from her parents' account. Subject Female reports she is concerned that her accounts have been compromised and worries that her phone may have been hacked as well.

The Subject Officer asks the Subject Female to provide the phone numbers associated with the caller and any relevant web links received. The Subject Female provides Subject Officer with this information. She also indicates that she previously spoke with a police officer from a different city, who advised her to contact SLCPD. Additionally, she reports that she has contacted her bank and has closed all bank accounts belonging to her and her family.

The Subject Officer clarifies the details of the incident by restating his understanding and requests contact information for her parents, who reside out of state and have also consulted with their local law enforcement.

The Subject Officer concludes the contact by stating, "End of contact. Going off," and deactivates the body-worn camera.

### ***Finding***

Subject Officer appeared to comply with State and City Codes and Police Department policy. Additionally, the officer displayed a high level of empathy and patience toward the female involved.

### **Case No. 5**

### ***Summary***

The Subject Officer spoke with a female, Subject Female via telephone. It was observed that the officer was seated at a desk with a body-worn camera (BWC) facing a cubicle wall. The Subject Female reported that after leaving her workplace and walking towards her vehicle, she noticed a dent and a white scrape and a dent on the driver's side door. Subject Female further mentioned that in the morning she observed a white car parked next to where she parked and speculated whether someone from the office might have struck her vehicle. The Subject Female stated that she took a photograph of the damage for documentation.

The Subject Officer inquired whether the office building is equipped with surveillance cameras. The Subject Female responded that she had asked her supervisor and was informed that there are no internal or external cameras on the property. The Subject Officer requested an estimate of the damages' cost and asked if she could describe the white vehicle parked next to hers. The Subject Female provided an approximate damage estimate but was unable to give a detailed description of the white car, noting that she might recognize it.

The Subject Officer then asked the Subject Female to hold briefly while he consulted with another individual regarding necessary documents. Upon returning, the Subject Officer requested her full name, email address, and physical mailing address so that she could be sent a witness statement. Subject Officer also provided her with a case number and explained the upcoming steps in the process.

The officer concluded the conversation by stating, "Going off. End of contact," and deactivated the BWC.

### ***Finding***

Subject Officer appeared to comply with State and City Codes and Police Department policy. Subject Officer asked the Subject female important questions regarding the case, such as photos taken, cost of damage, description of suspected car, and possibility of cameras. Subject Officer also consulted with colleagues regarding proper documentation needed in the case.

## **CONCLUSION**

In 4 of the 5 cases that were reviewed, the audit found that police officers appeared to materially comply with City Code, State law, and Police Department policies. There was one case that is being referred for a potential violation of Police Department policy.