

**Audits of Body Worn Camera Footage
Salt Lake City Police Department
Pursuant to City Code 2.10.200
Aug 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 August, 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 5,306 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 present at a residence with multiple other officers. Several SLC Fire personnel are engaged in conversation with a male individual, referred to as Subject Male. At least two other officers are also present during this law enforcement activity.

Fire personnel and the Subject Male are discussing the death of an elderly individual located inside the residence. The Subject Officer mutes the body-worn camera (BWC) audio and enters a bedroom where a person, potentially deceased, is lying on the bed.

The Subject Officer proceeds to move throughout the residence while fire personnel continue their discussion with the Subject Male. Briefly, the officer reactivates the BWC to state, "Subject Officer says, 'Going off. End of contact,'" before deactivating the BWC while still within the residence.

Finding

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, 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.

Case No. 2

Summary

Subject officer communicates with a store employee, a male located adjacent to the gas pumps at a gas station and convenience store. The male describes an individual, identified as the suspect male, who has a history of illicitly taking merchandise from the store without payment and subsequently leaving the premises for a nearby location. The employee states that other officers have previously located the suspect male at a nearby makeshift dwelling and provides directions to that location. The employee offers a detailed physical description of the suspect male.

Both the officer and the employee enter the store, where the employee presents receipts documenting the stolen merchandise and provides the store manager's contact information.

The officer requests the employee to complete a witness statement. The employee does not respond to the request and continues discussing the incident. The officer provides the case number to the employee.

The employee suggests to the officer that he should visit the makeshift dwelling where the suspect male is known to go after shoplifting. The officer departs the store, enters his patrol vehicle, and proceeds to the location indicated. He walks along a driveway between two buildings toward the rear of the property in search of the suspect, but the individual is not located.

The officer states, “End contact. Going off,” and deactivates the body-worn camera.

Finding

The officers appeared to comply with State and City Codes and Police Department policy. Subject Officer was respectful with the Subject Male and positive and friendly with community members.

Case No. 3

Summary

Subject Officer arrives at a scene where several officers are on a driveway at what appears to be a funeral home. On scene are several adults and a juvenile female who is yelling and screaming. During the law enforcement encounter, Subject Officer places his hand in front of the BWC several times, which obstructs the recording. Subject Officer returns to his patrol vehicle and retrieves something from the vehicle. Subject Officer continues to place hand in front of the BWC. The juvenile continues to yell out loud while some persons are trying to comfort her. A female tells the Subject Officer that they are trying to leave but a police vehicle is blocking their car. Subject Officer speaks to another officer regarding moving the patrol vehicle.

Subject Officer speaks with another officer who states that “the kids can go” and “these

Subject Officer speaks with another officer, walks into the funeral home, and states “consulting officers” and along with something else which is inaudible and then mutes the BWC audio and unmutes it about a minute later.

A female approaches the officers, stating that the children are under state care and she wants DCFS to be called to address the children’s behavior. Subject Officer informs the female that the child’s father has just died and that they cannot be involved in influencing children’s behaviors unless it involved abuse. The Subject Officer informs the female that she can call the tip line. The female then leaves. Subject Officer leaves the building and speaks with another officer.

Subject Officer turns off BWC without stating why.

Finding

Officers appeared to comply with State law. Subject Officer appears to violate Police Department policy and City Code by muting his BWC audio without stating reason. 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.

Case No. 4

Summary

Subject Officer appears to be taking a report by telephone from a male, Subject Male. The Subject Male asks the Subject Officer if she has the protective order from his ex-wife and if she can clarify his communication restrictions with his ex-wife. The Subject Male states that his ex-wife sent him an email and he reads the contents out loud to the Subject Officer, which contains threatening statements on his life. Subject Male said he is in the hospital and under suicide watch. Subject Officer asks if he thinks that she would try to harm or kill him and he says “yes” and that she has continued to send him accusatory emails of wrongdoings.

Subject Male states that his sister also sends him similar types of emails and that he has told them to leave him alone because he has severe mental health problems. Subject Male states that he shares a daughter with his ex-wife.

Subject Officer asks if he would be able to send her pictures of the emails sent to him by his ex-wife. Subject Male says “yes”. Subject Male asks if he would get in trouble if he were to communicate with his ex-wife. Subject Officer states that she saw a clause in the protective order that communication about their daughter was permissible. Subject Officer states that if the Subject Male is communicating with his ex-wife only about their daughter that it should be fine. Subject Officer asks if ex-wife has done this before and the Subject Male says “yes” and describes other occurrences. Subject Male states that he has reported them in the past but “they’ve never really gone anywhere”. Subject Officer asks if his reports have been in Salt Lake City. Subject male responds by stating the reports had been made to several different agencies.

Subject Officer asks if he and his ex-wife had a consensual sexual relationship and he says “yes”. Subject Officer muted the audio without stating a reason for the muting.

Subject Officer unmutes audio. Subject Male states that he is worried for his safety and the safety of his daughter and that DCFS has been involved for the “last couple of years”. Subject Officer asks Subject Male if his daughter has made any statements that concern him about her safety and he says “yes” and describes an incident with his ex-wife, her

boyfriend and his daughter. Subject Male states that there have been “over a hundred police visits” in another city.

Subject Officer asks Subject Male for the name of the hospital where he is presently located. Subject Male asks if he is in trouble but Subject Officer informs him that she needs his location in case detectives need to speak to him. Subject Male tells Subject Officer his location. Subject Officer states that she can text him the “Blue Card” and describes the information that is in it, as well as contact information for department social workers and the case number.

Subject Officer states, “End contact. Going off.” and turns off the BWC.

Finding

Subject Officer appeared to comply with State law. Subject Officer appears to violate Police Department policy and City Code by muting the BWC audio without stating reason. Subject Officer did an extremely good job speaking with the Subject Male on a difficult and challenging case. Subject Officer was empathetic and professional while collecting evidence and explaining the protective order. Lastly, the Subject Officer provided the Subject Male with victim resources.

Case No. 5

Summary

Subject Officer is driving the patrol vehicle. Subject Officer arrives at the scene and starts speaking with two males that had just crossed the street and are walking on the sidewalk. Subject Officer informs the two males that they cannot cross in the middle of the street because it is a large street and dangerous. Subject Officer asks the males to sit on the street curb and collects their information. Subject Officer returns to his vehicle and conducts warrant check on the males. Another officer arrives and appears to speak with the Subject Officer from the passenger side window but it is inaudible. The Subject Officer replies “no. I don’t think just off that...unless we have reason to or the consent.”

Subject Officer returns to speak with the two males and informs them that they got a tip that they were out possibly buying drugs. The other officer states that the two males are acting erratic. Subject Officer asks them if he can search them to make sure they do not have any drugs. One male stands up and says “yeah”. As the Subject Officer begins to search the first male, he informs him “let me know if you...whenever you decide...” and then gets interrupted by the first male speaking. A pipe is found in the pocket of the first male. After the Subject Officer is done searching the first male, he asks the other male if he can search him and the male says “yeah” and stands up to be searched.

Subject Officer finds alcohol in a water bottle belonging to the first male and pours out the alcohol. Subject Officer informs the first male that he is not being charged with anything and that he is “gonna get rid of the pipe”. Subject Officer then allows the males to leave. Another officer arrives and is inspecting a plastic bottle that has a small plastic bag in it.

Subject Officer states “Going off. No further contact” and turns off BWC.

Finding

Subject Officer appeared to comply with State and City Codes and Police Department Policy. The Subject Officer did a great job in this case. Subject Officer explained to the two males the safety issue regarding crossing the busy street while still maintaining safety by requesting hands to be out of pockets. Subject Officer built rapport with the two males, and, therefore was able to gain their compliance with relative ease.

CONCLUSION

In 2 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 were three cases that are being referred for review of a potential violation of Police Department policy and/or City Code.