Audits of Body Worn Camera Footage
Salt Lake City Police Department
Pursuant to City Code 2.10.200
September 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 September, 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 4,858 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 riding a bicycle next to another officer, who is also on a bicycle. The officers approach two males who are sitting between some fences in an alley. Subject Officer informs the males that they cannot be loitering in the alleyways. One of the males stands up and the Subject Officer tells him to sit down. This first male states that he cannot sit down because he had a bone marrow transplant. Subject Officer gets the basic information of the first male while the other officer speaks with the other male and asks for his information. The officers check for warrants on the two males. Two other officers on bicycles arrive on scene. Subject Officer asks who owns the bicycle that is leaning on the fence. The second male states that it is his bicycle. Subject Officer asks if the bicycle is registered. Second male states that he purchased the bicycle the day before. Subject Officer and another officer take the bicycle, turn it over and look for the registration and serial numbers.

Another officer asks the first male if he has any drugs on him and he says “no.” The officer then asks the first male if he can search his bag and he says “no.” The officers do not search the bag.

Subject Officer asks dispatch to “run a serial number on a bicycle.” The second male states that he has a pipe and one of the officers asks if it is a “smoking pipe” or a “meth pipe.” Second male states that it is a smoking pipe. The officer asks the second male if he can see it and the male gives it to the officer and the officer receives it and walks away from the scene.

Dispatch states that she does not get anything for the serial number given. Subject Officer and the other officer are still attempting to find the correct serial number of the bike. Subject Officer clarifies with dispatch that serial number is for a bicycle.

An officer asks the second male if he has already smoked all the meth and the male says, “something like that”. The officer asks the second male if he has any drugs on him and if he can check if he has any more drugs on him and the second male replies, “if you’d like.” The second male pours out a small bag and empties out his pockets placing the items in front of him on the ground. The officer looks at the items while speaking with the second male.

Dispatch informs the Subject Officer that the number “came up negative.”

Subject Officer informs the two males that they can leave and that they need to “quit hanging out in alleys.”

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

Finding

The officers appear to comply with State statute and City code. This case being referred for evaluation of compliance with Police Department Policy 311, Search and Seizure, regarding the inspection of the bike.

Case No. 2

Summary

Subject Officer is walking up an escalator following two fire personnel and walk into an entertainment center. Subject Officer is speaking with someone on the phone and appears to be trying to locate the person on the phone. Subject Officer states that they will meet the person at the fire truck. Subject Officer meets other officers and states that the person on the phone, the Complainant, stated that he was involved in a “hit and run”. The Complainant arrives at the fire truck and first speaks with the fire personnel and then returns to speak with the officers. The Complainant describes the incident where a motor vehicle hit another parked car, then “ran over me” and then “drove around and hit me again”. The Complainant states that a witness took pictures of the incident, including the suspect’s vehicle license plate.

Another officer arrives at the scene, who the Subject Officer introduces as the investigative officer. Subject Officer states that the suspect vehicle was located . The investigative officer states that he will speak with the crime lab. Complainant provides a description of the driver.

The investigative officer asks the Complainant to describe the situation and then asks him to fill out a witness statement. The Complainant’s wife arrives on scene and sits next to him on a bench.

Subject Officer informs the investigative officer that the suspect vehicle is registered to a female but the driver in the incident was male. Investigative officer also spoke with mall security to search for mall cameras to see if the incident was caught on video.

Subject Officer encourages the investigative officer to contact the sergeant to coordinate sending an officer to the registered owner’s address to attempt to continue the investigation.

Crime lab arrives and the Subject Officer informs him that the Complainant states that a car hit him and has injuries on the elbow, knee and the calf. Crime lab personnel inform the Complainant that he will be documenting the injuries and commences to take picture of the injuries (elbow, knee, calf and hands). Crime lab personnel depart the scene after

documenting the injuries. Investigative officer continues to ask Complainant to describe it in more detail.

Investigative officer informs the Complainant that he can leave.

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

Finding

The officers appeared to comply with State statute, City code, and Police Department policy. Subject Officer was respectful and patient with the Complainant.

Case No. 3

Summary

Subject Officer gets out of his patrol car and approaches officers who are next to a patrol vehicle and are detaining the Subject male on the ground. The Subject male is cursing at the officers while being held down. The Subject Officer brings a restraining device called a “wrap” to the scene to further retrain the Subject male. Subject Officer places one strap on the foot of the Subject male and then another officer assists to strap both legs. The Subject male continues to yell and curse, especially towards the female officer. The officers place the “body strap” on the Subject male’s torso and then place a “spit hood” over his head. The officers inform the Subject male that they will place a safely helmet on his head for his safety. The officers place the safety helmet on the Subject male and then sit him up. The officers then place Subject male in the patrol car. The Subject male continues to curse at the officers while they buckle the seat belt on him.

Subject Officer mutes the audio without stating reason. Several officers are standing around a sergeant and appear to be speaking about the case.

The officers begin to disperse, and the Subject Officer turns off BWC without stating reason.

Finding

Officers appeared to comply with State statute and City code. Subject Officer appears to violate Police Department policy by muting his BWC audio without stating the reason. The case is being referred for evaluation of compliance with Police Department Policy 302.5, Handcuffing and Restraints, which requires continual monitoring after the placement of a spit hood.

The officers involved in securing the Subject male were extremely calm during the entire time that they were placing the wrap on him and into the patrol vehicle. This was especially

notable for the female officer who was receiving most of the verbal aggression from a very irate suspect.

Case No. 4

Summary

Subject Officer is driving the patrol car. Subject Officer appears to be speaking with someone in the patrol car, possibly a suspect in the backseat. Subject Officer asks the person how much they had to drink because of the strong smell of alcohol.

Subject Officer appears to arrive at his destination, possibly the county jail. Subject Officer states through a speaker, "I got a male on charges. I don't need assistance." Subject Officer says, "Going off" and turns off the BWC.

Finding

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

Case No. 5

Summary

Subject Officer is sitting in the patrol vehicle and is speaking with a female on the phone. Subject Officer collects the Complainant female's information. The Complainant female lives in a city south of Salt Lake City. Complainant female describes the reason for the call, which is a violent act towards her by another person. Subject Officer asks if she knows the name of the "individual that hit you?" The Complainant female states that the individual is her daughter's female friend.

Complainant female states that her daughter and the female friend were with her at a party in a bar the night before. The Complainant female states that her daughter's friend, the Suspect female, hit her on the eye and head and pushed her down. The Subject female states that she now has double vision, a "huge bump" on her head and it "hurts really bad." Additionally, the Complainant female states that she has a swollen ankle and scratches and bruises on her body. Complainant female states that she did take pictures of her injuries. Complainant female states that medical visited her, evaluated her injuries, took her vitals then informed her to go to the emergency room. Complainant female states that she was thinking of going to the ER but instead took a nap and felt a little better but now she still feels "foggy" and still doesn't feel good and has "double vision."

The Complainant female provides the Subject Officer the first name and a description of the Suspect female. The Complainant female states that the Suspect female lives with her daughter. The Complainant female states the she has been estranged from her daughter.

The Complainant female provides the Subject Officer a more detailed description of the incident. The Complainant female states that her daughter started to say mean things to her in the bar and when the Complainant female reached out and touched her daughter on the shoulder to tell her that she should not speak to her like that as a mother, the Suspect female became involved. The Complainant female states that the Suspect female came from behind and began hitting her. Complainant female states that security at the bar removed the daughter and Suspect female. Subject female states that the two females were waiting for her outside the bar "to continue the fight," and she called the police. The two females left the premises once they saw the police arrive. Complainant female's friends spoke to the police officer because she was crying and "shook" by the incident.

Subject Officer states that he will call her daughter to hear her side of the story and then will call her back. Complainant female informs the Subject Officer that the bar should have videos of the incident and that she has her friends as witnesses too in case he wants to talk to them too.

Subject Officer calls the Subject female's daughter, but she does not answer the phone.

Subject Officer calls dispatch and asks if the police department from the city where the Complainant female resides can go by her house to document her injuries. Subject Officer then informs Complainant female that officers from another police department will come by her house to take pictures of her injuries.

Subject Officer again calls the Complainant female's daughter, but she does not answer the phone.

Subject Officer states, "End of contact for now" and turns off BWC.

Finding

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

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. One case is being referred for further evaluation of compliance with departmental policies.