

**Audits of Body Worn Camera Footage
Salt Lake City Police Department
Pursuant to City Code 2.10.200
July 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 July, 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 5,433 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 walking into a department store with another officer. The officers walk into a back office, and a store employee is speaking with the Subject female, who is sitting on a chair. The employee informs the Subject Officer that the Subject female and her mother worked as a “team” to take merchandise out of the store without payment. Subject Officer asks the Subject female for the location of her mother. The Subject female informs the officers that her mother is outside and that she can call her. Subject Officer asks Subject female’s name and age. She provides her name and states that she is 18 years old. Subject female calls her mother and tells her that she needs to come to the store office. Subject female informs the officers that the mother is coming back into the store.

Store employee informs Subject Officer that the Subject female and the mother have stolen items in the past. The Subject female states that she did not steal any merchandise. The employee states that the females have a pattern where they scan some items but do not scan other items and walk out of the store with all items. Subject Officer asks the employee if he wants to charge the Subject female, the mother, or both. The employee states that they would like to charge the person who walks out of the store without paying for the merchandise, which in this case is the Subject female. Subject Officer states that both the mother and the daughter can be charged in this case. Subject Officer asks if they have a video of the incident and the employee shows the Subject Officer the video.

Subject Officer walks outside and to his patrol car to conduct a warrant check on the Subject female and her mother. Subject Officer also searches for information on retail theft statute. Subject Officer returns to the store and approaches the other officer and states “muting for officer consult” and mutes the audio. The officers walk to the store office, and the Subject Officer unmutes his audio.

One of the officers asks the Subject female to walk out of the office with him. Subject Officer reads Miranda to the Subject female’s mother. Subject Officer then describes what he saw on the video and asks why she took the merchandise and what items were taken without payment. The mother states that she just doesn’t have much money and describes the items that she took without payment. Subject Officer informs the mother that both her and the Subject female will get citations for misdemeanor retail theft.

Subject Officer informs the mother that she can take the items she paid for and employee states that she will be trespassed from the department store for one year.

The employee then has the Subject female sign a document and then allows the two females to leave the store, while escorted by the officers. The officers walk back to the

patrol cars. Subject Officer has the Subject female and the mother fingerprinted and provides them the citations. Subject Officer describes the process to the Subject female and her mother on how to take care of the citation.

Subject Officer says, “Going off” and something inaudible and then turns off the BWC.

Finding

The officers appear to comply with State statute, City code, and Police Department policy. Subject Officer was respectful with both female suspects. Subject Officer worked well with the department store by allowing the security personnel to conduct their own store process before conducting their own investigation.

Case No. 2

Summary

Subject Officer is standing in front of a patrol car, speaking with two other officers and another male. Subject Officer asks the male if he works for Child Protective Services (CPS) and he confirms. The CPS worker describes the situation to the officers but some of the explanation is inaudible. The male, who is a CPS worker, explains that the mother’s parental rights were terminated for her first child. She recently had a second child that the court ordered removed from the home. The CPS worker has the warrant to remove the infant from the home. The CPS worker discusses the mother’s mental health conditions and explains that she has been violent in the past. He explained concerns from the attorney working on the case that the mother might harm herself and her infant. He explains that the mother has no knowledge of the removal order. Subject Officer explains to the CPS worker that the role of the officers will be to accompany him into the home to support him in case there is a safety issue. Subject Officer explains to the new recruit his potential role since he is still in his first observational week of work.

The CPS worker knocks on the door, but nobody answers the door. A male approaches from a hallway and the Subject Officer ask if he has seen the Subject female. The male states that he saw her the day before with the baby but not today. The male also states that he saw her boyfriend take out the trash today. The male then departs the scene. The Subject Officer indicates that she is not hearing anything inside the apartment – “no TV, no music, no movement.”

The CPS worker reads part of the warrant out loud to the officers, which authorizes any peace officer to search the premise to take the child into protective custody. The Subject Officer informs the CPS worker that the officers will call their supervisor to receive guidance. The CPS worker, two officers, and the building manager stay in the hallway and problem-solve the situation for some time while waiting for information from the third

officer who has gone outside to speak with a supervisor. The CPS worker and building manager discussed that the boyfriend lives at the apartment and is likely the father of the infant.

The officer who was speaking with his supervisor returns. The apartment manager then unlocks the door and says aloud that she is the manager. The officers walk in first and state they are police and conduct a brief search of the apartment. The officers do not find anybody in the apartment and walk out of the apartment.

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

Finding

The officers appeared to comply with State statute and City code. This incident is being referred for further evaluation of compliance with Police Department policy regarding assessing risk prior to the service of search warrants to ensure officer and subject safety.

Subject Officer provided good mentorship to the new officer, both verbally and through her actions. The officers displayed good problem-solving skills by collecting a lot of information about the case and seeking guidance from a supervisor.

Case No. 3

Summary

Subject Officer is walking towards a hotel, and a hotel employee escorts the Subject Officer into the hotel to speak with another hotel staff member. That staff member then walks the Subject Officer to the hotel manager, who states that the hotel's garage door was damaged and that all he needs is a police report.

After a brief discussion, it appears that the call to the police was made because there was a collision between a van and the overhead garage door. The hotel staff member, the van driver (Subject male), and the Subject Officer walk to view the hotel garage door. The Subject male states that his vehicle was damaged by the garage door when he drove into the hotel parking garage.

Subject Officer takes pictures of the damaged garage door. Subject Officer then takes pictures of the damaged vehicle. The Subject male had also taken photographs of the damaged vehicle, and the Subject Officer provides the Subject male with a link to upload those pictures. Subject Officer asked the Subject male to describe what had occurred and then asks if he wants to fill out a written statement. Subject Officer states that his BWC camera is recording and has captured the information. The Subject male declines to

provide a written statement. Subject Officer informs the Subject male to wait in his vehicle while he completes the required paperwork.

Subject Officer then goes into the hotel to speak with hotel staff and collects information about the hotel. Subject Officer informs the hotel staff that he will first go to the restroom before completing the required paperwork.

Subject Officer states something inaudible and turns off BWC. BWC does not appear to be reactivated after the officer's restroom break.

Finding

Officers appeared to comply with State statute and City code. The officer appears to have committed a technical violation of the body-worn camera policy by failing to reactivate his camera after using the restroom. The incident is being referred for further evaluation of compliance with Police Department policy requiring the completion of a DI-9 and driver exchange information.

Subject Officer is personable and helpful with both the hotel staff and the Subject male. Subject Officer documented damage to both the hotel garage door and the Subject male's vehicle.

Case No. 4

Summary

A police officer knocks on the door of an apartment while the Subject Officer stands next to him. The officer then turns around and goes up the stairs to another floor, and the Subject Officer follows. The officer knocks on another apartment door, and the Subject female answers the door. The officer asks a male (the Subject female's father), that is inside the apartment to step out of the apartment and go with another officer.

The officer asks the Subject female about the situation. Subject female states that both her and the father "got triggered". The Subject female states she does not know what triggered them but after the officer asked again, she stated possibly a slamming door and yelling triggered them both.

The officer leaves, possibly to speak with the father. Subject Officer asks the Subject female if she is "ok" and if anybody "put hands on each other" and she states that she is ok and they were just yelling at each other. Subject Officer asks if anything is broken inside and the Subject female says "no".

Subject Officer has a casual conversation with the Subject female while the other officers speak with her father. The Subject female seems more relaxed.

The other officer returns to speak with the Subject female and asks her if her father is allowed to return to the apartment and she says “absolutely”. The officers then inform the Subject female that she can go back into her apartment while he and the Subject Officer speak. The officers walk down the hall, and the Subject Officer says something inaudible and mutes his audio. The officers can be seen speaking with each other in the hallway. Subject Officer unmutes his audio and walks down the hall with the other officer.

The officers meet another officer and the Subject female’s father, who is sitting on the stairs. The officer informs the father that they know he has warrants but the officer is not going to serve the warrants because he believes that serving the warrants would not be helpful or the best interest of the father. Another officer reminds the father how to take care of the warrants, and the officers allow the father to leave. The father thanks the officers and departs the scene.

Subject Officer states something inaudible and he reaches up to the BWC and turns off BWC.

Finding

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

Subject Officer did a good job of speaking with the Subject female to de-escalate the situation through active listening and validating her feelings.

Case No. 5

Summary

Subject Officer is driving the patrol car and arrives at the scene where three officers are speaking with a male and female, both of whom are sitting on a sidewalk. One of the officers is speaking with the Subject female and another officer is speaking with the Subject male.

An officer asks the Subject male if he has any “dope” on him and he says that he has “a piece” on him and hands a pipe to the officer. The officer again asks the Subject male if he has dope on him, and the Subject male says he doesn’t. The officer then searches the Subject male and the Subject Officer assists.

One of the officers tells the subject female that “they are not going to give her a citation the first time for this.” The Subject female then walks to speak with a female officer behind a patrol vehicle. It is not clear if the Subject female is being searched by the female officer. Two officers are speaking with the Subject female. These two officers search her backpack.

The Subject male and Subject female are both released without a citation and they depart the scene.

One of the officers uses profanity repeatedly during the call. That same officer does not appear to be in a regulation uniform.

Subject Officer states, “Going off” and something inaudible and turns off BWC.

Finding

This incident is being referred for further evaluation of compliance with State law and Police Department policy regarding the search of the Subject male and the search of the Subject female’s backpack. The incident is being referred for further evaluation of compliance with Police Department policies regarding profanity and uniforms.

CONCLUSION

In two of the five cases that were reviewed, the audit found that police officers appeared to materially comply with City code, State law, and Police Department policies. There were three cases that are being referred for further evaluation of compliance with Police Department policies.