City Operations
Tracy Warren, Deputy City Administrator

Tracy.warren@portlandoregon.gov
1221 SW 4th Ave. #330
Portland, OR 97204
503-865-6586

Date: June 25, 2026

To: Mayor Keith Wilson
From: Tracy Warren, Deputy City Administrator, City Operations Service Area

Subject: Case # 2022-B-0022 - Findings and Recommendation – IPR Investigation of Crowd Control and Management Training

Background:

This investigation focused on the Settlement Agreement requirement that Independent Police Review (IPR) determine whether PPB officers at the rank of lieutenant or above provided training which incorrectly indicated force could be used against community members without meeting the requirements of Directive 1010.00 – Use of Force.

During the 2020 protests, DOJ staff raised concerns that some Rapid Response Team (RRT) members indicated they were trained to use force in ways that potentially violated Directive 1010.00. IPR crafted allegations concerning then-Commander[1] Craig Dobson and then-Captain[2] Franz Schoening after determining that they played substantial roles in developing and providing crowd control training to other PPB members.

Allegations and Proposed Findings:

1. Commander Craig Dobson #35609, provided inadequate crowd management and crowd control training, which incorrectly indicated force could be used against community members without meeting the requirements of Directive 1010.00 (CONDUCT) (Directive 1500.00 – Training; Directive 635.10 – Crowd Management/Crowd Control; Directive 1010.00 – Use of Force)
2. Captain Franz Schoening #41832, provided inadequate crowd management and crowd control training, which incorrectly indicated force could be used against community members without meeting the requirements of Directive 1010.00 (CONDUCT) (Directive 1500.00 – Training; Directive 635.10 – Crowd Management/Crowd Control; Directive 1010.00 – Use of Force)

IPR recommended finding Allegations 1 and 2 not sustained. For the reasons outlined in the Investigative Report, and listed below, I concur with IPR's recommended finding. Therefore, because the evidence was insufficient to prove that Commander Dobson or Captain Schoening provided inadequate training, I propose Allegations 1 and 2 be **not sustained**.

IPR reviewed crowd management and crowd control training material that was presented between 2017 and 2020 and did not find any concerning or incorrect information regarding Directive 1010.00. IPR also

interviewed multiple experienced RRT officers and some PPB members who had force allegations sustained against them during that period. These officers did not report receiving any training that indicated they could use force without complying with the requirements of Directive 1010.00. To the extent that members developed a mistaken understanding regarding the circumstances under which they were authorized to use force, IPR concluded this likely occurred during scenario-based trainings where incorrect performance was not corrected in the moment, but later during a debrief.

For these reasons, I recommend that Allegations 1 and 2 be not sustained.

6/25/26

TRACY WARREN
Deputy City Administrator
City Operations Service Area

Date

Mayor's Findings:
I agree with these recommendations.

6/25/26

KEITH WILSON
Mayor

Date

City Operations
Tracy Warren, Deputy City Administrator

Tracy.warren@portlandoregon.gov
1221 SW 4th Ave. #330
Portland, OR 97204
503-865-6586

Date: June 25, 2026

To: Mayor Keith Wilson
From: Tracy Warren, Deputy City Administrator, City Operations Service Area

Subject: Case # 2022-B-0024 - Findings and Recommendation – IPR Investigation of Use of Force

Background:

Both the Settlement Agreement and Bureau Directives require the Bureau to perform a detailed review when an officer uses force. The officer completes a Force Data Collection Report (FDCR) to document the force used and the officer's chain of command uses a process referred to as an After-Action Report (AAR) to review the use of force and the completeness of the FDCR. Supervisors may be held accountable if the AARs they complete or review are not complete and accurate. The Bureau's FDCR and AAR processes are data intensive, even when reviewing low-level force.

Multiple witnesses credibly testified that the force-review processes were developed with discrete uses of force in mind, as opposed to sustained, volatile crowd control events. As the 2020 protests continued, with frequent civil disturbances and riots, the Bureau documented over 6,000 uses of force, triggering multiple AARs after each evening's events. IPR described, "Each night of police operations created another set of FDCRs and AARs the Bureau was required by the Settlement Agreement and Directive to investigate, review, and analyze. As protests continued for days, then weeks, then months at a time, the Police Bureau's FDCR and AAR processes broke down." (Report, 10).

Witnesses described that this breakdown was due to the sheer volume of FDCRs generated and the lack of capacity of the Bureau's supervisors to complete the associated AARs. It is important to note that the AAR process requires supervisors to review not only the FDCR, but also any witness statements, video, photos, and any supplemental reports. Compared to the Bureau's usual operation of around a dozen uses of force a week,[1] the Bureau was faced with dozens of uses of force an evening for a sustained period.

This investigation focused on the Settlement Agreement requirement that Independent Police Review (IPR) determine whether PPB incident commanders and designees with the rank of lieutenant and above appropriately ensured the completion of FDCRs and AARs arising during the 2020 protests.

Allegations and Proposed Findings:

1. Former Assistant Chief Jami Resch #37142 failed to ensure that FDCRs and After-Action Reports arising from crowd control events starting on May 29, 2020, and ending on November 16, 2020, were completed as required by applicable Directive (PROCEDURE)

(Directive 315.30 – Satisfactory Performance; Directive 635.10 – Crowd Management/Crowd Control; Directive 1010.00 – Use of Force)

IPR recommended a finding of sustained. For the reasons outlined below, I disagree with IPR's recommended finding. Because I conclude that the evidence was insufficient to prove former Assistant Chief (AC) Resch violated a policy or procedure, I propose a finding of **not sustained.**

IPR explained their finding: "Information IPR obtained during this investigation demonstrates that former AC Resch took the initiative in leading the Bureau's attempts to fix problems with the FDCR and AAR processes. Ultimately however, these attempts were not successful, and the Bureau did not complete all AARs as required. "

Ultimately, I am persuaded by the multiple, proactive steps taken by former AC Resch to remediate the delayed completion of FDCRs and AARs. Indeed, "[m]ultiple witnesses IPR interviewed indicated that after the FDCR and AAR processes broke down, AC Resch played an important role in trying to ensure FDCRs and AARs were completed as required."[2] The evidence shows that former AC Resch directed additional sergeants and lieutenants, including individuals who had not worked the protests and so were not experiencing the exhaustion of those long hours, be dedicated to completing incoming protest-related AARs. This successfully enabled the Bureau to complete all incoming AARs moving forward.

Former AC Resch also directed then-Force Inspector Rob Simon[3], to conduct additional training on the proper completion of FDCRs to avoid additional barriers to timely completion. In his interview, Commander Simon explained that former AC Resch directed the Bureau to focus on completing the AARs with as much detail as possible, instead of rushing incomplete or inaccurate AARs through the process simply to relieve the backlog. This was a reasonable leadership decision in a difficult situation, and one that ensured a complete record of uses of force as opposed to prioritizing superficial compliance.

As the evidence shows, former AC Resch took multiple reasonable actions to attempt to address the systemic overload that the Bureau's force-review processes encountered during the unprecedented and sustained 2020 protests. I find the evidence is insufficient to prove that former AC Resch's conduct was a violation of policy or procedure. Therefore, I propose a finding of not sustained.

2. Assistant Chief[4] Charles Lovell #41706 failed to ensure that FDCRs and After-Action Reports arising from crowd control events starting on May 29, 2020, and ending on November 16, 2020, were completed as required by applicable Directive (PROCEDURE) (Directive 315.30 – Satisfactory Performance; Directive 635.10 – Crowd Management/Crowd Control; Directive 1010.00 – Use of Force)

IPR recommended a finding of sustained. For the reasons outlined below, I disagree with IPR's recommended finding. Because I conclude that the evidence was insufficient to prove former AC Lovell violated a policy or procedure, I propose a finding of **not sustained.**

IPR summarizes their finding by stating: "Information IPR obtained during this investigation demonstrates that AC Lovell delegated management of problems with the FDCR and AAR

processes to AC Resch. Ultimately however, AC Lovell was Chief of the Police Bureau at the time, and responsible for overseeing AC Resch."

AC Lovell was fulfilling the duties of Chief during an unprecedented situation, when the Bureau's staff and resources were overwhelmed, and at a time when the political requirements of the Chief of Police were at an all-time high. AC Lovell recalls, and the evidence shows that the Bureau reassigned staff to focus on the backlog. AC Lovell explained that he was not involved at the level of deciding how many or which staff to reassign, but it is reasonable that a Bureau Director would delegate this task to a subordinate while he addressed other critical matters. He stated that he was aware that former AC Resch was working on the issue. Despite these efforts, AC Lovell credibly described how the force-review system, which was not built to review the circumstances at hand, broke under demand.
IPR notes, "It very well may not have been possible for PPB to complete the FDCR and AAR processes on time when these processes were so poorly suited to sustained mass protest events."

I agree that that the Chief of Police is ultimately responsible for the Bureau's actions, however, the evidence supports that it was highly likely not possible to complete the force-review process within the pre-existing deadlines given the staffing and resources the Bureau had available during these unprecedented circumstances. There is strong evidence suggesting the timeliness issues were due to systemic or resource failures, not leadership failures.

Based on this, I find the evidence is insufficient to prove that former-AC Lovell's conduct was a violation of policy or procedure. Therefore, I propose a finding of not sustained.

6/25/26

TRACY WARREN
Deputy City Administrator
City Operations Service Area

Date

Mayor's Findings:
I agree with these recommendations.

6/25/26

KEITH WILSON
Mayor

Date

City Operations
Tracy Warren, Deputy City Administrator

Tracy.warren@portlandoregon.gov
1221 SW 4th Ave. #330
Portland, OR 97204
503-865-6586

Date: June 25, 2026

To: Mayor Keith Wilson
From: Tracy Warren, Deputy City Administrator, City Operations Service Area

Subject: Case # 2023-B-0069 - Findings and Recommendation – IPR Investigation of Assistant Chief Dobson Use of Force Orders

Background:

This investigation, along with IPR investigation 2022-B-0070, focused on the Settlement Agreement requirement that Independent Police Review (IPR) investigate the PPB incident commander(s) (ICs) and designee(s) with the rank of Lieutenant or above who directed or authorized any officer to use force in violation of PPB Directive 1010.00 – Use of Force. IPR conducted an initial review of the ICs on the evenings of the 2020 protests that resulted in the most uses of force.

IPR identified seven dates when then-Commander[1] Dobson may have inappropriately directed PPB officers to use force in violation of Directive 1010.00. This investigation reviewed whether Commander Dobson's actions as IC on those dates were in violation of Bureau policy.

Allegation and Proposed Findings:

1. Assistant Chief Craig Dobson, #35609 inappropriately directed or authorized PPB officers to use force in violation of Directive 1010.00. (CONDUCT) (Directive 315.00 – Laws, Rules, and Orders; Directive 635.10 – Crowd Management/Crowd Control; Directive 1010.00 – Use of Force)

IPR recommended a finding of not sustained. For the reasons outlined in the Investigative Report, I concur with IPR's recommended finding. Because the evidence was insufficient to prove a violation of policy or procedure, I propose a finding of **not sustained.**

IPR interviewed squad leaders and RRT field commanders to inquire if any were directed by AC Dobson to use force in violation of Directive 1010.00. None of the members interviewed indicated they were given such direction, and, notably, witnesses reported that AC Dobson was receptive to feedback from members working directly with protesters. On five of the seven evenings, the evidence suggests that AC Dobson did not give any orders related to the use of the dynamic tactic or use of force. For the other two evenings, IPR reviewed video of protest activity and documentary evidence, and it appears that AC Dobson met the required policy and legal thresholds to authorize the use of CS gas.

For these reasons, I propose a finding of not sustained.

The City of Portland is committed to providing meaningful access. To request translation, interpretation, modifications, accommodations, or other auxiliary aids or services contact 311 (503-823-4000), for Relay Service & TTY: 711

6/25/26

TRACY WARREN
Deputy City Administrator
City Operations Service Area

Date

Mayor's Findings:
I agree with these recommendations.

6/25/26

KEITH WILSON
Mayor

Date