

**Audits of Body Worn Camera Footage
Pursuant to City Code 2.10.200
January 2024**

SUMMARY

This memorandum constitutes a random audit, pursuant to City Code 2.10.200.E, of body worn camera recordings for the month of January 2024. 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 recording based on a particular timeframe. Because of that limitation, a random number generator was used to identify 5 case numbers (out of 4,762 case numbers) from the month. If a case number had multiple recordings for that case number, a recording was randomly selected for review.

Of the five matters that were reviewed, the audit found that officers appeared to materially comply with City Code, State law, and Department policies.

BODY WORN CAMERA REVIEWS

Case No. 1

Summary

Officers enter a homeless resource center to speak with an employee about gathering available security footage of an alleged assault. The subject officer shows the other officer what he had previously gathered. The other officer walks away to find the employee and the subject officer ends the call.

Findings

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

Case No. 2

Summary

Officers pull up to a convenience store and encounter a scene where items are strewn about the floor. Officers encounter a store clerk and a person who allegedly tried to steal items but instead threw them on the floor. Store clerk informs officers that he doesn't want a citation to be issued, and would prefer that the person is trespassed from the store. The officers trespass the person and the call concludes.

Findings

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

Case No. 3

Summary

Officer and a crime lab technician are walking into the ER of a hospital and meet up with a victim of a domestic violence assault. The crime lab tech takes photographs of the person's injuries. The officer provides victim resources to the victim and the call concludes.

Finding

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

Case No. 4

Summary

Officers are speaking to a person on the street who was involved in an altercation at a bar. The person is inebriated and not making much sense. Another officer arrives and indicates that she spoke with bar security who informed her that they want the person trespassed from the bar. Officers trespass the person from the bar and conclude the call.

Finding

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

Case No. 5

Summary

Officers respond to a call of an assault at a warehouse. Warehouse employee indicates that he was assaulted by a truck driver making deliveries. Officers watch a security video recording of the incident and confer whether an assault or self-defense by the driver occurred. Warehouse employee indicates that he does not want to press charges, but only wants the driver trespassed from the property. Officers speak to the employee's manager and he confirms that the driver should be trespassed. Officers speak to the driver and inform him that he's been trespassed and conclude the call.

Findings

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

CONCLUSION

Of the five matters that were reviewed, the audit found that officers appeared to materially comply with City Code, State law, and Department policies.