



LEXINGTON POLICE DEPARTMENT
PERSONNEL ORDER
Lexington, Kentucky

DATE OF ISSUE
May 15, 2026

EFFECTIVE DATE
May 18, 2026

NUMBER
PO:26-215

TO:
RESIGNATION

INDEX AS:
OFFICER
MARCUS OLMSTEAD / 59396

AMENDS:

RESCINDS:

This is to advise on the resignation of Officer Marcus Olmstead to be effective, May 18, 2026.

Lawrence B. Weathers

Lawrence B. Weathers
Chief of Police

LBW/rmh



Lexington-Fayette Urban County
Division of Police
MEMORANDUM
Lexington, Kentucky

DATE OF ISSUE

May 26, 2026

EFFECTIVE DATE

NUMBER
REVISED
COP:
26-0145

TO:

Kenneth Armstrong, Commissioner
Department of Public Safety

SUBJECT:

Disciplinary Recommendation
PIU2026F-002
Officer Marcus Olmstead / 59396

FROM:

Lawrence B. Weathers
Chief of Police

I met with Officer Marcus Olmstead on April 2, 2026, and recommended this formal complaint go before the Disciplinary Review Board. The Disciplinary Review Board met on Wednesday, May 6, 2026, and determined this as "Improper Conduct" for violation of:

- General Order 1973-02L - Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers, Appendix B, Operational Rule 1.02 – Misconduct

The Disciplinary Review Board recommended termination.

I was scheduled to meet again with Officer Olmstead on May 20, 2026, prior to my meeting with Officer Olmstead, he submitted his resignation, to be effective May 18, 2026 (attached).

Lawrence B. Weathers

Lawrence B. Weathers
Chief of Police

LBW/rmh

Attachment

LEXINGTON POLICE DEPARTMENT
FORMAL COMPLAINT FORM
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FORM 111 (2/24)

File #: PIU2026F-002

Employee Involved: Officer Marcus Olmstead		Employee #: 59396	Hire Date: 05/23/2022
Present Assignment: Bureau of Patrol / West Sector / First Shift			
Complainant: Lieutenant Steven Wiggins		Complainant Address: 150 E. Main Street, Lexington, KY 40507	
Complainant Phone #: (859) 258-3600	Alternate Complainant Phone #: N/A	Complainant Email: N/A	
Date of Incident: 12/11/2025	Time of Incident: 1415	Location of Incident: Alexandria Drive / Enterprise Drive	Date and Time Reported: 01/05/2026
		How Reported: ☐ Letter ☐ Phone ☐ Person ☒ Email	

DESCRIPTION OF ALLEGATIONS:

On December 11th, 2025, Officer Marcus Olmstead was on-duty and driving his marked police vehicle in a normal, non-emergency manner on Alexandria Drive when he rear-ended a stopped passenger vehicle. At the scene, Officer Olmstead told investigating officers and a supervising officer that the passenger vehicle had stopped abruptly without warning. He also stated that just prior to the collision, he briefly glanced at his MDC and, upon looking back up, was unable to stop in time.

A subsequent review of Officer Olmstead's BWC footage revealed that the officer had been using his personal phone to text and speak in the seconds leading up to, and at the time of, the collision. The driver of the passenger vehicle informed Officer Olmstead that she did not stop abruptly, but instead slowed gradually with the flow of traffic.

When questioned about the discrepancy between his initial statement and the video evidence, the officer stated that he did not disclose his phone use at the scene because he believed he had been trained or instructed not to admit fault. He further stated that he later informed his supervisor of his phone use the same day. These actions and omissions by Officer Olmstead have raised serious concerns regarding his integrity, honesty, judgment, and character.

If the above allegation is true, Officer Olmstead has violated General Order 1973-02L Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers, Appendix B, Operational Rule 1.02 Misconduct - Officers shall conduct themselves at all times, both on and off duty, in such a manner as to reflect most favorably on the department and to not cast doubt on the officer's integrity, honesty, judgment, or character. Misconduct of an officer shall include that which tends to bring the department into disrepute or reflects discredit upon the officer as an employee of the department, or that which tends to impair the operation and efficiency of the department or officer.

I swear/affirm that the facts set out in the allegations herein are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Complainant Signature: [Signature]

Date: 1-21-26

Subscribed and sworn before me this date: 1-21-2026

(Date)

Melanie R. Votaw KYNP20919

(Notary)

My Commission Expires: 2-3-2029

Witness:

Name: _____ Address: _____ Phone: _____

Recorded By: Bureau of Investigation, Public Integrity Unit



LEXINGTON POLICE
DEPARTMENT
MEMORANDUM
Lexington, Kentucky

DATE OF ISSUE
May 6, 2026

EFFECTIVE DATE

NUMBER
PIU26-049

TO:	Lawrence Weathers Chief of Police	SUBJECT: Disciplinary Review Board Findings & Recommendation - PIU 2026F-002 Officer Marcus Olmstead 59396
FROM:	Commander David Biroschik Bureau of Investigation Public Integrity Unit	

On Wednesday May 6, 2026, the Disciplinary Review Board convened to review the formal complaint filed by Lieutenant Steven Wiggins against Officer Marcus Olmstead, for violation of General Order 1973-02L, Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers, Appendix B, Operational Rule 1.02 Misconduct.

Below is a list of the Disciplinary Board Members:

- Assistant Chief Chris Dearing
- Assistant Chief Sam Murdock
- Commander Matt Brotherton
- Commander Darin Salyer
- Commander Matt Greathouse
- Sergeant Brad Hawkins (FOP Representative)
- Sergeant William Powers (FOP Representative)
- Mr. Daniel Murphy (Citizen Member)
- Ms. Allison Connelly (Citizen Member)

The Board reviewed and discussed information compiled during the administrative investigation conducted by Lieutenant Dillan Taylor. The Disciplinary Review Board found Officer Olmstead's conduct to be improper and made a recommendation of Termination. This matter is being forwarded to you for consideration.

Officer Olmstead was advised of the findings of the Disciplinary Review Board and their recommended discipline. He was also advised he would be contacted by the Office of the Chief to set a date for you to confer with him.

Per the current Collective Bargaining Agreement Article 15, Section 5/I; a copy of this memorandum was provided to Officer Olmstead.

_____(e-mailed)
Commander David Biroschik
Bureau of Investigation
Public Integrity Unit



Lexington-Fayette Urban County
Division of Police
MEMORANDUM
Lexington, Kentucky

DATE OF ISSUE
April 8, 2026

EFFECTIVE DATE

NUMBER
COP:
26-0060

TO: Commander David Biroschik Public Integrity Unit	SUBJECT: Disciplinary Review Board - Formal Complaint PIU2026F-002 Officer Marcus Olmstead / 59396
FROM: Lawrence B. Weathers Chief of Police	

I met with Officer Marcus Olmstead on Thursday, April 2, 2026, in regards to his formal complaint. I have recommended this complaint to be presented before the Disciplinary Review Board.

Please convene the Disciplinary Review Board.

Lawrence B. Weathers

Lawrence B. Weathers
Chief of Police

LBW/rmh

Attachment



LEXINGTON POLICE
DEPARTMENT
MEMORANDUM
Lexington, Kentucky

DATE OF ISSUE
March 16, 2026

EFFECTIVE DATE

NUMBER
PIU 26-036

TO:
Lawrence Weathers
Chief of Police

SUBJECT:
Summary of Formal Complaint on Officer
Olmstead PIU 2026F-002

FROM:
Lieutenant Dillan Taylor
Bureau of Investigation
Public Integrity Unit

Sir,

This memorandum will provide a synopsis of the investigation; however, other supporting documents may be viewed in conjunction with this memorandum.

On January 21st, 2026 a Formal Complaint was filed against Officer Marcus Olmstead #59396 by Lieutenant Steven Wiggins for violation of General Order 1973-02L Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers, Appendix B, Operational Rule 1.02 Misconduct. Lieutenant Wiggins alleged the following:

On December 11th, 2025, Officer Marcus Olmstead was on-duty and driving his marked police vehicle in a normal, non-emergency manner on Alexandria Drive when he rear-ended a stopped passenger vehicle. At the scene, Officer Olmstead told investigating officers and a supervising officer that the passenger vehicle had stopped abruptly without warning. He also stated that just prior to the collision, he briefly glanced at his MDC and, upon looking back up, was unable to stop in time.

A subsequent review of Officer Olmstead's BWC footage revealed that the officer had been using his personal phone to text and speak in the seconds leading up to, and at the time of, the collision. The driver of the passenger vehicle informed Officer Olmstead that she did not stop abruptly, but instead slowed gradually with the flow of traffic.

When questioned about the discrepancy between his initial statement and the video evidence, the officer stated that he did not disclose his phone use at the scene because he believed he had been trained or instructed not to admit fault. He further stated that he later informed his supervisor of his phone use the same day. These actions and omissions by Officer Olmstead have raised serious concerns regarding his integrity, honesty, judgment, and character.

If the above allegation is true, Officer Olmstead has violated General Order 1973-02L Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers, Appendix B, Operational Rule 1.02 Misconduct - Officers shall conduct themselves at all times, both on and off duty, in such a manner as to reflect most favorably on the department and to not cast doubt on the officer's integrity, honesty, judgment, or character. Misconduct of an officer shall include that which tends to bring the department into disrepute or reflects discredit upon the officer as an employee of the department, or that which tends to impair the operation and efficiency of the department or officer.

Interview of Det. T. Hurlburt

On 2/6/26 at 1045 I interviewed Det. Hurlburt at the PIU office. Commander Biroschik was also present for this interview. This interview was in reference to Ofc. Olmstead's comments in his memorandum which stated, "I remember being told either in the academy or FTO that if an Officer was involved in a collision, it was advised not to make any statements of fault on camera". Det. Hurlburt was one of Ofc. Olmstead's Field Training Officers (FTO).

Det. Hurlburt did confirm he was one of Ofc. Olmstead's FTOs. He confirmed he was a FTO for two years before being transferred to Bureau of Investigation. Det. Hurlburt denied ever teaching any probationary officer riding with him and specifically Ofc. Olmstead to not admit fault on camera in reference to involvement in a collision. Det. Hurlburt did agree that this quote from Ofc. Olmstead was counterintuitive to what the Lexington Police Department stands for when it comes to integrity and honesty.

The interview concluded at 1046.

Interview of Ofc. R. McCullough

On 2/6/26 at 1158 I interviewed Ofc. McCullough at the PIU office. Lt. Anderson was also present for this interview. This interview was in reference to Ofc. Olmstead's comments in his memorandum which stated, "I remember being told either in the academy or FTO that if an Officer was involved in a collision, it was advised not to make any statements of fault on camera". Ofc. McCullough was one of Ofc. Olmstead's Field Training Officers (FTO).

Ofc. McCullough did confirm he was one of Ofc. Olmstead's FTOs. He confirmed he has been a FTO for seven years. Ofc. McCullough denied ever teaching any probationary officer riding with him and specifically Ofc. Olmstead to not admit fault on camera in reference to involvement in a collision. Ofc. McCullough did agree that this quote from Ofc. Olmstead goes against everything the Lexington Police Department stands for when it comes to integrity and honesty.

The interview concluded at 1159.

Interview of Ofc. N. Owings

On 2/9/26 at 1000 I interviewed Ofc. Owings at the PIU office. Lt. Anderson was also present for this interview. This interview was in reference to Ofc. Olmstead's comments in his memorandum which stated, "I remember being told either in the academy or FTO that if an Officer was involved in a collision, it was advised not to make any statements of fault on camera". Ofc. Owings was one of Ofc. Olmstead's Field Training Officers (FTO).

Ofc. Owings did confirm she was one of Ofc. Olmstead's FTOs. She confirmed she has been a FTO for eleven years. Ofc. Owings denied ever teaching any probationary officer riding with her and specifically Ofc. Olmstead to not admit fault on camera in reference to involvement in a collision. Ofc. Owings did agree that this quote from Ofc. Olmstead goes against everything the Lexington Police Department stands for when it comes to integrity and honesty.

The interview concluded at 1001.

Sgt. Kidd interview

On 2/9/26 at 1000 I interviewed Sgt. Kidd at the PIU office. Lt. Anderson was also present for this interview. This interview was in reference to Ofc. Olmstead's comments in his memorandum which stated, "I remember being told either in the academy or FTO that if an Officer was involved in a collision, it was advised not to make any statements of fault on camera". Sgt. Kidd is currently one of the sergeants in the Bureau of Training and was the sergeant in Training when Ofc. Olmstead came through the police academy.

Sgt. Kidd confirmed he has been assigned to the Bureau of Training and Wellness as an officer and sergeant for a combined 16 years which included 12 years as a sergeant. Sgt. Kidd denied the Training Unit would ever teach any recruit in the Lexington Police Academy to not admit fault on camera in reference to involvement in a collision. That no one in the Training Unit has ever instructed recruits this action. Sgt. Kidd did advise that this quote from Ofc. Olmstead is "Total counterintuitive for what we teach in the academy as it pertains to honesty and integrity. Okay. It's against everything we preach."

The interview concluded at 1107.

Lt. Wiggins interview

On 2/3/26 at 1321 I interviewed Lt. Wiggins at the PIU officer. Lt. Anderson was also present for this interview. This interview was in reference to a formal complaint filed against Ofc. Olmstead by Lt. Wiggins and who is Ofc. Olmstead's assigned lieutenant on West Sector 1st shift.

Lt. Wiggins advised he was notified through email that a Health and Safety report was completed for a collision that involved Ofc. Olmstead. When Lt. Wiggins returned to work on 12/15/25 Lt. Wiggins advised he watched the Body Worn Camera (BWC) footage of the incident. From watching this footage, he found it did not align with what he was told and what he read in the Health and Safety report. Lt. Wiggins advised as soon as the BWC footage begins you can observe Ofc. Olmstead actively texting on his phone while operating his vehicle for around 13 seconds. Ofc. Olmstead is seen colliding with the vehicle that was in front of him, who had stopped for a traffic hazard in the roadway. Lt. Wiggins advised once the collision happened Ofc. Olmstead approached the female in the vehicle he struck and made it sound like she had stopped abruptly but the BWC footage appears to show Ofc. Olmstead did not even notice that traffic had stopped and no accident avoidance was taken prior to the collision. Lt. Wiggins stated that once Ofc. Olmstead returned to his vehicle he noticed that not only was he texting while driving but he was also on speaker phone with his wife. Lt. Wiggins advised when Sgt. White showed up to the scene Ofc. Olmstead on BWC advised Sgt. White he collided with the vehicle in front of him because the vehicle abruptly stopped and he looked at his Mobile Data Computer (MDC). After reviewing the BWC footage it didn't appear any of those things happened.

Lt. Wiggins advised he was familiar with the statement that Ofc. Olmstead wrote in his memorandum that stated, "I remember being told either in the academy or FTO that if an Officer was involved in a collision, it was advised not to make any statements of fault on camera". Lt. Wiggins did agree that statement does not align with anything we stand for at the Lexington Police Department.

Lt. Anderson asked Lt. Wiggins is there a scenario where an officer can make a lying statement to him then make an honest statement to somebody else and that is ok in Lt. Wiggins' eyes? Lt. Wiggins responded "No. No I don't think that's ok."

The interview concluded at 1329.

Interview of Lt. Sharapov

On 2/2/26 at 1225 I interviewed Lt. Sharapov at the PIU office. Lt. Anderson was also present for this interview. Lt. Sharapov was Ofc. Olmstead's sergeant during this incident.

Lt. Sharapov stated that he received an email from Sgt. White in reference to the collision that stated that Officer Olmstead was involved in an at-fault collision. Lt. Sharapov stated he reviewed the BWC footage of Ofc. Olmstead and noticed that the officer was actively texting while operating his vehicle which was contrary to what was reported on the Health and Safety and collision report. In these two reports it was reported Ofc. Olmstead stated that prior to collision he was looking at his MDC.

Lt. Sharapov questioned Ofc. Olmstead about this discrepancy in the reporting and what actually happened. Ofc. Olmstead stated that at some point in his training he was told to never admit fault in the collision on BWC. That we have as the police the same rights as the general public so nobody can make us admit fault. That is when Lt. Sharapov requested a memorandum from Ofc. Olmstead.

Lt. Sharapov stated Ofc. Olmstead advised he did tell Sgt. White once at West Roll Call that he was actually texting while driving and not looking at his MDC. That Sgt. White responded back to the effect of, "it's all right that it happens."

I then asked Lt. Sharapov about the statement from Ofc. Olmstead in reference to being trained to not admit fault on camera Lt. Sharapov advised he thought he remembered that the FOP sent something out many years ago about no one can make you make a statement on camera that you don't want to make. But Lt. Sharapov added, the biggest issue was he made a false statement about the cause of the collision and that false statement was on an official collision report.

The interview was concluded at 1233.

Interview of Sgt. White

On 2/12/26 at 1132 I interviewed Sgt. White at the PIU office. Lt. Anderson was also present for this interview. Sgt. White was the supervisor that reported to the scene of the collision.

Sgt. White advised he was notified via radio that a collision had occurred involving Ofc. Olmstead. Once on scene Sgt. White stated he could immediately observe Ofc. Olmstead rear ended a vehicle. He advised he made contact with the other party of the collision who was bleeding from the mouth area but refused medical attention. The driver advised him that traffic had slowed for large metal plates in the roadway and that is when the officer struck the rear of her vehicle. Sgt. White confirmed while on scene that indeed large metal plates were in the roadway covering a hole in the roadway. Sgt. White then made contact with Ofc. Olmstead

Sgt. White acknowledged that vast majority of collisions the driver that rear ends a vehicle will be the at-fault vehicle so who was at-fault during this collision was not in question.

Sgt. White questioned Ofc. Olmstead at the scene about the cause of the collision and Ofc. Olmstead advised that he was travelling behind the vehicle at typical speeds, that he looked down at his MDC, and when he did, the car in front of him stopped abruptly.

Sgt. White advised no other conversation happened with Ofc. Olmstead about the collision. That Ofc. Olmstead did not approach him while at West Roll Call to clarify that he was texting while driving and not looking at his MDC. Sgt. White acknowledged that he does not recall at any point Ofc. Olmstead coming to him to clarify and ensure that Sgt. White was clear that the on-scene statement was not accurate.

I then asked Sgt. White about the comment from Ofc. Olmstead's memorandum which stated, "I remember being told either in the academy or FTO that if an Officer was involved in a collision, it was advised not to make any statements of fault on camera". Sgt. White advised he has never advised any of his officers to do that, and as an officer, never been advised of this directive. Sgt. White did agree that this quote from Ofc. Olmstead goes against everything the Lexington Police Department stands for when it comes to integrity and honesty. That it is a complete violation of integrity to lie on camera.

Sgt. White did agree with the statement that even if the above statement from Ofc. Olmstead was correct and he was trained to not admit fault on camera that it does not give the officer the right to lie about the reasoning and then later clarify by telling the truth about really happened.

The interview concluded at 1140.

Interview of Ofc. Olmstead

On 2/26/26 at 1027 I interviewed Ofc. Olmstead at the PIU office. Lt. Anderson and Nick Oleson were also present during this interview. This interview was in reference to the formal complaint that had been filed against Ofc. Olmstead by Lt. Wiggins.

Ofc. Olmstead acknowledged he was currently on duty; he was given more than 48 hours' notice in reference to this interview and had received the formal complaint and Bill of Rights.

I asked Ofc. Olmstead in reference to his interactions on scene after that collision where he rear ended a vehicle that was stopped in the roadway for traffic. I read a part of the collision report narrative that stated, "Unit #1 advised he (Ofc. Olmstead) was following behind Unit #2 and glanced towards his computer and as he looked back towards the roadway, Unit #2 had started to break in the roadway. Unit #1 advised he attempted to brake but did not expect Unit #2 to stop where she did". When Sgt. White arrived on scene, he asked Ofc. Olmstead what happened in reference to any factors that caused this collision. While on body worn camera (BWC) Ofc. Olmstead advised Sgt. White that he looked down at his MDC and that she (Unit #2) stopped suddenly. I then referenced his memorandum which Ofc. Olmstead wrote, "On scene Sergeant White asked me what happened. I replied that I didn't expect her to stop there and I looked down at my computer. This statement clearly contradicts what was captured on my body camera." The contradiction Ofc. Olmstead is speaking about is from the moment his BWC is activated to the point of collision Ofc. Olmstead is actively texting. I asked Ofc. Olmstead to address the contradiction.

Ofc. Olmstead wanted to start from the beginning. Ofc. Olmstead stated he was driving down Alexandria Drive when he started to text Ofc. Hack. Ofc. Olmstead stated he then looked at his computer for a second like he does all the time throughout the day. When he looked up from his

computer, he noticed traffic had stopped and slammed on the brakes but could not stop in time. Ofc. Olmstead stated he never gave a statement to the responding officers about the factors of the collision. In which I agreed and based on BWC Ofc. Olmstead never advised the reporting officers of the circumstances of the collision. By watching BWC it appears one of the responding officers was close enough to Ofc. Olmstead and Sgt. White's conversation where he could hear Ofc. Olmstead advise Sgt. White he looked down at his computer.

I asked Ofc. Olmstead to go into his conversation with Sgt. White. Ofc. Olmstead stated at that time he was under the impression that a collision was a critical incident and that nobody was going to ask him anything. Ofc. Olmstead acknowledged that after reviewing the policy that it says for serious physical injury or death and not physical injury. So that was where his confusion was. Ofc. Olmstead stated when he told Sgt. White his initial statement, he never knew it would end up in the report. He then advised he did tell Sgt. White at roll call after the BWC was off that he was also on his phone. It is important to point out, when Sgt. White was interviewed by me and asked about this statement that Sgt. White did not recall having this conversation with Ofc. Olmstead or hearing this statement.

Based on Ofc. Olmstead admitting, he was texting too I asked him did he now recognize that he was not looking at his MDC but that he was texting while driving. He stated no. Ofc. Olmstead stated he had his phone in his hand and that he was texting but he looked over at his computer. That the last thing he did was look at was his computer. I then offered both Ofc. Olmstead and Mr. Oleson to watch the BWC again (*which will happen a few minutes later*) because I wanted a better opportunity and understanding of what he was talking about. I advised Ofc. Olmstead that to me when I watch the BWC I see a person who is actively texting from the moment the camera comes on to the moment that the collision occurred and that does not mean he was not looking or glancing at his MDC but the entire time he was actively texting and his response was "I can text without looking at my phone. It's not hard." Ofc. Olmstead agreed that he was texting, looking at his MDC and talking to his wife on the phone and never denied he was not at-fault.

When asked why he excluded that he was texting prior to the collision to Sgt. White. Ofc. Olmstead advised he just wanted to give a quick summary of the last thing he looked at which he stated was his computer. He stated he was thrown off that a supervisor would ask him questions about a collision he was involved in. It is important to point out and Lt. Anderson points this out later in the interview that during this interaction with Sgt. White that Ofc. Olmstead did not stop the conversation or ask to talk off camera about it and his response would not give anyone the impression he was caught off guard. He answered immediately and without hesitation. Ofc. Olmstead never seemed worried or confused by the basic question by a supervisor of "What happened?" If Ofc. Olmstead had the impression he should not be asked questions about this incident with BWC on he never indicated that to the supervisor on scene.

Ofc. Olmstead advised again he told Sgt. White in a conversation at roll call that he was also texting while driving. I asked Ofc. Olmstead if Sgt. White acknowledged him in anyway when he said this because this statement was very important for the investigation and would be important to ensure the supervisor heard this. Ofc. Olmstead stated he was sitting close to Sgt. White and assumed Sgt. White was capable of hearing him. No follow up was made by Ofc. Olmstead to ensure that Sgt. White heard him and that this information would be added to the documentation. When asked again by Lt. Anderson later in the interview about the alleged statement Ofc. Olmstead made to Sgt. White that he was also texting and, on the phone, Ofc. Olmstead stated he could not remember what Sgt. White's response was to this statement because it was two and a half months ago. A few moments later after I read Sgt. Sharapov's memorandum where Sgt. Sharapov details a meeting on 12/16/25 with Ofc. Olmstead. In

this memorandum Sgt. Sharapov advised that Ofc. Olmstead said he told Sgt. White about the texting while at roll call. Ofc. Olmstead advised Sgt. White said "its alright, it happens" Note that Sgt. White does not recall this conversation when interviewed and Ofc. Olmstead did not recall this statement from Sgt. White until I read Sgt. Sharapov's memorandum.

When asked again why he omitted telling Sgt. White at the scene he was texting he stated he wanted to give a minimal statement and figured he would tell the full story later at roll call. Ofc. Olmstead acknowledged he should have asked Sgt. White if he wanted to talk about the collision right then with BWC on.

When asked about the comment in Ofc. Olmstead's memorandum that he was told either by his Field Training Officers (FTO) or the Training Academy "that when involved in a collision it was advised not to make any statements of fault on camera" Lt. Anderson pointed out that based on the nature of the collision he was clearly at fault. Lt. Anderson followed up with why leave out the full story? Why leave out details and give the supervisor the quick version when it really does not really matter as Ofc. Olmstead was at-fault. To give one reason or all reasons he would still be at-fault. Ofc. Olmstead stated to Lt. Anderson he felt he already answered this question but continued by saying that he felt he was going to be asked when the body cameras off at a later time.

Mr. Oleson wanted to clarify that Ofc. Olmstead never told the reporting officer about the details of the collision and that it appears the reporting officer overheard the statement Ofc. Olmstead provided to the supervisor. We acknowledged that seemed to be case. We then clarified that our expectation at the Lexington Police Department is that your statement should be the same no matter who the officer tells it to. Regardless if it's to the Chief or the reporting officer. That the officer's statement is expected to be truthful and consistent to what happened. It appears Mr. Oleson attempted to compare this minor injury collision to an officer involved shooting (OIS). That an officer that is involved in a OIS makes a brief statement to a supervisor and that this conversation that Ofc. Olmstead had with Sgt. White equates to the same type of incident. That a full statement should be made later in reference to the collision details as far as a written report.

The interview concluded at 1056.

Investigation

After watching the BWC footage Ofc. Olmstead is seen operating his police vehicle while texting. Ofc. Olmstead was texting another officer about a work-related issue. It is important to point out the Kentucky Revised Statue for Texting while Driving has an exception for police officers. The exception is for essential functions of the operator's official duties and based on this investigation it appears Ofc. Olmstead's texting was not about "official duties".

Also, watching the BWC footage it appears Ofc. Olmstead did not notice the vehicle had stopped because he was distracted by texting and talking on the phone. It does not appear that braking was attempted or any kind of accident avoidance was attempted.

Conclusion

After completing this Formal Investigation and based on the above investigative information and interviews it does appear that Ofc. Olmstead violated department policy, specifically General Orders 1973-02L Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers, Appendix B, Operational Rule 1.02 Misconduct.

Officers shall conduct themselves at all times, both on and off duty, in such a manner as to reflect most favorably on the department and to not cast doubt on the officer's integrity, honesty, judgment, or character. Misconduct of an officer shall include that which tends to bring the department into disrepute or reflects discredit upon the officer as an employee of the department, or that which tends to impair the operation and efficiency of the department or officer.



Lexington Police Department
MEMORANDUM
Lexington, Kentucky

DATE OF ISSUE

January 21, 2026

EFFECTIVE DATE

NUMBER

PIU: 26-008

TO: Assistant Chief Jackie Newman Bureau of Patrol	SUBJECT: FORMAL COMPLAINT
FROM: Lieutenant Dillan Taylor Bureau of Investigation Public Integrity Unit	

COMPLAINANT: Lieutenant Steven Wiggins

ACCUSED OFC.: Officer Marcus Olmstead

ALLEGATION: Violating General Order 1973-02L Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers, Appendix B, Operational Rule 1.02 - Misconduct.

ALLEGED CIRCUMSTANCES: On December 11th, 2025, Officer Marcus Olmstead was on-duty and driving his marked police vehicle in a normal, non-emergency manner on Alexandria Drive when he rear-ended a stopped passenger vehicle. At the scene, Officer Olmstead told investigating officers and a supervising officer that the passenger vehicle had stopped abruptly without warning. He also stated that just prior to the collision, he briefly glanced at his MDC and, upon looking back up, was unable to stop in time.

A subsequent review of Officer Olmstead's BWC footage revealed that the officer had been using his personal phone to text and speak in the seconds leading up to, and at the time of, the collision. The driver of the passenger vehicle informed Officer Olmstead that she did not stop abruptly, but instead slowed gradually with the flow of traffic.

When questioned about the discrepancy between his initial statement and the video evidence, the officer stated that he did not disclose his phone use at the scene because he believed he had been trained or instructed not to admit fault. He further stated that he later informed his supervisor of his phone use the same day. These actions and omissions by Officer Olmstead have raised serious concerns regarding his integrity, honesty, judgment, and character.

ACTION REQUESTED:

- The Bureau Commander and Officer Olmstead should sign the Acknowledgment Sheet and process this complaint.
- The Commanding Officer should provide the attached copy of the Form 111 and the Officer's Rights Packet to Officer Olmstead.
- Officer Olmstead should contact the Public Integrity Unit to arrange for a time to provide a formal statement.

DATE 1/22/26 TIME 1055

Bureau Commander D-1 B-4 44366

Supervisor Lt. S. Wiggins #52640

Officer [Signature] 59396

Accused officer would like the Public Integrity Unit to notify the FOP President or their designee that a formal complaint is filed against them. (Circle One) YES or NO

Returned to the Public Integrity Unit [Signature] 1/22/26 1312

[Signature]

Lieutenant Dillan Taylor
Bureau of Investigation
Public Integrity Unit

mrv

enclosures

cc: Chief Lawrence Weathers
file - PIU2026F-002

**LEXINGTON POLICE DEPARTMENT
FORMAL COMPLAINT FORM**

FORM 111 (2/24)

File #: PIU2026F-002

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Employee Involved: Officer Marcus Olmstead			Employee #: 59396	Hire Date: 05/23/2022
Present Assignment: Bureau of Patrol / West Sector / First Shift				
Complainant: Lieutenant Steven Wiggins		Complainant Address: 150 E. Main Street, Lexington, KY 40507		
Complainant Phone #: (859) 258-3600	Alternate Complainant Phone #: N/A	Complainant Email: N/A		
Date of Incident: 12/11/2025	Time of Incident: 1415	Location of Incident: Alexandria Drive / Enterprise Drive	Date and Time Reported: 01/05/2026	How Reported: ☐ Letter ☐ Phone ☐ Person ☒ Email

DESCRIPTION OF ALLEGATIONS:

On December 11th, 2025, Officer Marcus Olmstead was on-duty and driving his marked police vehicle in a normal, non-emergency manner on Alexandria Drive when he rear-ended a stopped passenger vehicle. At the scene, Officer Olmstead told investigating officers and a supervising officer that the passenger vehicle had stopped abruptly without warning. He also stated that just prior to the collision, he briefly glanced at his MDC and, upon looking back up, was unable to stop in time.

A subsequent review of Officer Olmstead's BWC footage revealed that the officer had been using his personal phone to text and speak in the seconds leading up to, and at the time of, the collision. The driver of the passenger vehicle informed Officer Olmstead that she did not stop abruptly, but instead slowed gradually with the flow of traffic.

When questioned about the discrepancy between his initial statement and the video evidence, the officer stated that he did not disclose his phone use at the scene because he believed he had been trained or instructed not to admit fault. He further stated that he later informed his supervisor of his phone use the same day. These actions and omissions by Officer Olmstead have raised serious concerns regarding his integrity, honesty, judgment, and character.

If the above allegation is true, Officer Olmstead has violated General Order 1973-02L Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers, Appendix B, Operational Rule 1.02 Misconduct - Officers shall conduct themselves at all times, both on and off duty, in such a manner as to reflect most favorably on the department and to not cast doubt on the officer's integrity, honesty, judgment, or character. Misconduct of an officer shall include that which tends to bring the department into disrepute or reflects discredit upon the officer as an employee of the department, or that which tends to impair the operation and efficiency of the department or officer.

I swear/affirm that the facts set out in the allegations herein are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Complainant Signature: _____

Date: 1-21-26

Subscribed and sworn before me this date: 1-21-2026
(Date)

Melanie R. Votaw KYNP20919
(Notary)

My Commission Expires: 2-3-2029

Witness:

Name: _____ Address: _____ Phone: _____

Recorded By: Bureau of Investigation, Public Integrity Unit

File #: PIU2026F-002Employee: Officer Marcus Olmstead**CHIEF OF POLICE**

[Finding: PC=Proper Conduct, IC=Improper Conduct, IE=Insufficient Evidence, PF=Policy Failure, UC=Unfounded Complaint]

Finding

Policy Violation

IC	General Order 1973-02L Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers, Appendix B, Operational Rule 1.02 Misconduct

Chief of Police Determination: ☐ Case Be Closed ☐ Corrective Training ☒ Recommend Disciplinary Action (see below)

Materials Reviewed:

I reviewed the PIU synopsis and an associated video

Comments:

Referred to the Disciplinary Review Board

Signature: Lawrence B. Weathers Digitally signed by Lawrence B. Weathers
Date: 2026.05.22 15:43:31 -04'00'Date: April 8, 2026**DISCIPLINARY REVIEW BOARD**

Finding

Policy Violation

IC	General Order 1973-02L Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers, Appendix B, Operational Rule 1.02 Misconduct

Disciplinary Review Board Recommendation: ☐ Case Be Closed ☐ Corrective Training ☒ Disciplinary Action (see below)

Comments:

Disciplinary Review Board made a recommendation of Termination
--

Signature: David Biroshik Digitally signed by David Biroshik
Date: 2026.05.22 15:44:24 -04'00'Date: May 6, 2026**CHIEF OF POLICE FINAL DETERMINATION**☒ Case Be Closed ☐ Corrective Training ☐ Recommend Disciplinary Action (see below)

Comments:

Officer Marcus Olmstead resigned, effective May 18, 2026 prior to meeting with the Chief for final recommendation.
--

Signature: Lawrence B. Weathers Digitally signed by Lawrence B. Weathers
Date: 2026.05.22 15:47:19 -04'00'Date: May 20, 2026**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**