



## WESTMINSTER

### WESTMINSTER POLICE DEPARTMENT MEMORANDUM

To: Ivan Armendariz Chavez, Police Officer  
From: Norm Haubert, Chief of Police  
Date: March 26, 2026  
Subject: Disciplinary Action

---

On March 12, 2026, a pre-disciplinary meeting was held to address the topics specifically listed in your pre-disciplinary memo dated March 11, 2026. This memo summarizes your time spent in the field training program, specifically your shortcomings and you not responding to training. During the meeting, you were given an opportunity to respond to the concerns raised by the field training officers, the field training sergeant, and the field training commander.

During the pre-disciplinary meeting, you advised that you had received good training and that you were "over-thinking things and worried about doing things right" causing you to make errors. You indicated that, from your perspective, you had successfully completed the traffic portion of your field training and that you should go back to patrol to continue your training and that your training schedule should be extended to allow you to continue to work through your deficiencies.

#### **Background/Investigation**

You have been in the Field Training Officer (FTO) program for a total of 34 contact days. You spent 5 weeks in Phase I and 5 weeks in Phase II/Traffic of the training program. Phase I is scheduled for 4 weeks and Phase II/Traffic for 3 weeks. Deficiencies in several core competency areas were noted in Phase I: radio traffic, geography, multi-tasking, decision making and officer safety. While it is common for new officers to initially struggle in these areas, most demonstrate measurable improvement and progress over time. You did not show the expected level of development and Phase I was extended 1 week. At the conclusion of the fifth week, your Field Training Officer continued to express concerns regarding your readiness to advance. To provide additional evaluation and a different training perspective, you were moved to Phase II/Traffic and assigned a different Field Training Officer. While assigned to Traffic, you continued to exhibit the same deficiencies and did not meet the required standards to successfully complete the Traffic portion of Phase II. You were subsequently assigned to a third Field Training Officer for further training and evaluation. The same concerns and lack of progression were once again noted. After speaking with the FTO Commander you were reassigned back to your primary Traffic Field Training Officer for an additional week of training. You were also



## WESTMINSTER

assigned to a fourth Field Training Officer for an additional day of evaluation. During your time in the FTO program you have been assigned to four different Field Training Officers who all noted similar deficiencies related to officer safety, multi-tasking and decision making. Your Daily Observation Reports (DORs) reflect a consistent inability to internalize and apply training. A review of your DORs shows a clear and repeated pattern. You can perform tasks in slow-paced and controlled environments, but you are unable to perform consistently when confronted with changing circumstances, multiple simultaneous demands, and stressful or chaotic conditions. You have demonstrated poor multi-tasking abilities, poor situational awareness, difficulty retaining previously taught material, and poor officer safety.

The FTO program DOR software tracks 31 performance categories on a 1-5 scale (1 being unacceptable, 5 being excellent). Scores of 3.5 or below are flagged as poor performance. You currently have 14 out of 31 categories flagged as poor performance (3.5 or below), including: Officer Safety, Control of Conflict, Radio Usage & Procedure and Field Performance Under Stress. During your last week in training, you received several Not Responding to Training (NRT's) scores and other unacceptable scores in the areas of Location/Response to Calls (NRT), Field Performance Stress (NRT), Officer Safety (NRT) and Radio/MDC (1) and Problem Solving/Decision Making (1). Examples of this include:

- Officer Armendariz has a hard time knowing where he is at times. Today we were getting on US 36 WB from Federal Blvd. He initiated a traffic stop on a vehicle and was unsure where exactly we were causing dispatch to ask several questions to get the information they needed for the stop. DOR #29
- Officer Armendariz approached the vehicle less robotic than normal. He contacted the driver and when doing so, he was still too close to the car, and his feet were still underneath the vehicle. This has been a discussion that we have had within the past few days. DOR #29
- Office Armendariz conducted a traffic stop on the passenger side of the vehicle. When speaking to the driver he was still too close to the vehicle. DOR #29
- Officer Armendariz and I spoke about the importance of officer safety and standing on a raised median on the angle in the middle of a bunch of people. I advised him that the best practice for this would be to ask the driver to step over with him instead of putting himself in a position of disadvantage. DOR #30
- During a traffic stop Officer Armendariz was still too close to the vehicle when speaking with the driver. His foot was not completely underneath the vehicle as it has been in the past, but it was still underneath. Dor #30
- Office Armendariz was still too close to the vehicle and had his right foot under the vehicle while talking to the driver. I spoke to Armendariz again



## WESTMINSTER

about having his foot/feet under the vehicle when talking to the driver. DOR #30

- Officer Armendariz demonstrates solid geographical knowledge; however, his performance remains inconsistent during high-stress encounters. He tends to over-rely on external resources during critical incidents leading to lapses in officer safety. It is imperative that he prioritizes officer safety fundamentals, as these critical deficiencies currently overshadow his navigational strengths. DOR #31
- During a hit and run accident call when contacting the suspect vehicle Officer Armendariz did not know his location as well as if the vehicle was occupied. As Officer Armendariz got to the rear of the vehicle, he turned his back to the car to air that the vehicle was unoccupied without being able to see the back seat of the car. Officer Armendariz then moved to the front of the car and building which restricted his movement and eliminated any viable path of retreat or access to cover, creating a significant tactical disadvantage if the situation was to escalate. This also created a crossfire situation as Officer Armendariz was directly in front of me as he approached from the front of the vehicle. These continued mistakes in officer safety are particularly concerning as they have been the subject of extensive prior feedback. Officer Armendariz has received detailed debriefs, verbal counseling and scenario based remedial training from multiple FTO's and sergeants regarding these specific tactical errors. Officer Armendariz has made little to no corrections and the action is unacceptable. These recurring safety concerns pose a direct risk to his safety and the safety of fellow officers. DOR #31 (NRT)
- Officer Armendariz assisted another officer on a felony arrest call. While completing the search incident to arrest he failed to remove the suspects' gold neck chain and earrings. Officer Armendariz has done several prisoner transports prior to this and knows this needs to be done. DOR #32

All the areas of concern in the DORs are officer safety or officer safety related issues.

The FTO program is not designed to be indefinite. You have been provided multiple opportunities, extended training (12 contact days), reassignment to different FTOs, remedial instruction (5.7 hours), and direct counseling. The DORs reflect a consistent inability to internalize and apply training. While some limited progress has been made in report writing, the ongoing officer safety concerns cannot be overlooked. These deficiencies present a substantial risk to you, fellow officers, and the public.

During the pre-disciplinary meeting on March 12, 2026, you stated you received great training from your FTO's, and they taught you a lot. Although, there were several discrepancies in how your FTO's wanted you to perform certain tasks like handcuffing, contacts on traffic stops and the use of your patrol vehicles lights. You



## WESTMINSTER

admitted that you overthink and over analyze situations and along with your desire to do right with each of your FTO's caused you not to perform up to standards in certain instances. You added, you just should have followed your training. The over thinking, over analyzing and indecision resulted in you receiving low scores in certain areas on your DORs. You admitted to making mistakes, but added you learned something from each instance. You did not feel that during Phase II/Traffic you were set up to succeed, but you are very confident you have it down referring to handling traffic-related calls/accidents and should be passed through this phase. You believe that being extended in training and returning to the patrol phase of the FTO program is where you need to be, training on a busier shift like swing shift. You concluded by saying that you have it in you to be a successful officer and pass the FTO training program.

### **Findings**

I find that your actions are in violation of the following rules of employee conduct as enumerated in Section X, Employee Conduct (J) Reasons for Dismissal or Disciplinary Action of the City of Westminster's Personnel Policies and Rules:

City of Westminster Policies and Rules

#### X EMPLOYEE CONDUCT

(J) Reasons for Dismissal or Disciplinary Action: Non-Exempt and exempt employees are subject to disciplinary action up to and including immediate termination for any of, but not limited to, the following reasons:

- Substandard Job Performance

Westminster Police Department Policies

102.11 Standards of Professional Conduct/ Ethics and Standards of Conduct.

#### SPECIFIC RULES OF CONDUCT:

- **UNSATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE:** Department employees shall maintain sufficient competency to properly perform their duties and assume the responsibilities of their positions. They shall perform their duties in a manner which will maintain the highest standards of efficiency in carrying out the functions and objectives of the department. Unsatisfactory performance may include, but is not limited to, a lack of knowledge of the application of laws required to be enforced; an unwillingness or inability to perform assigned tasks; the failure to conform to department work standards or performance standards established for the employee's rank, grade or position; the failure to take appropriate action on the occasion of a crime, disorder or other condition deserving police attention; or absence without leave. In addition to other



## WESTMINSTER

indicia of unsatisfactory performance, the following will be considered “prima facie” evidence of unsatisfactory performance: repeated poor evaluations or written record of repeated infractions of rules, regulations, directives or orders of the Department.

### **Disciplinary Decision**

After reviewing your statements during the pre-disciplinary meeting, as well as related documentation/facts/information/etc., I have determined that you failed to meet the City’s expectations of all employees, and in particular, the City’s expectations of a Westminster Police Department Police Officer.

In determining the appropriate discipline in this matter, I considered all relevant factors, including the statements you provided during the pre-disciplinary meeting. I have determined the appropriate disposition in this matter is to terminate your employment with the City of Westminster as a Police Officer.

### **Authority to Discipline**

Chapter X, Section (J), (M), and (N) of the City of Westminster Personnel Policies and Rules.

cc: David Lester, Deputy Police Chief  
Jim Buckner, Commander  
Janay Hall, Commander  
Davy Godfrey, Human Resources Director  
Martee Erichson, Human Resources Manager  
Caitlin Sosta, Human Resources Administrator  
Jodi Cohen, Senior Human Resources Business Partner  
Ron Arguello, Assistant City Attorney II  
Chuck Piekarski, Assistant City Attorney II  
Personnel File  
PSS File  
Employee Performance Log