

Portland City Council Agenda
Written Testimony - Item 635

	Agenda Item	Name or Organization	Position	Comments	Attachment	Created
1	635	Anonymous	Support with changes	We need to bring back the Office of Neighborhood Involvement. Since Chloe Eudaly and Jo Ann Hardesty butchered that office and converted it into the Office of Civic Life we have seen the entire neighborhood system suffer. Senior staff with unrivaled institutional knowledge of the neighborhood system left city service due to bullying by the Office of Civic Life director Chloe Eudaly installed. Today neighborhood associations have less support and ONI standards are no longer enforced. Also city agencies are no longer transparent with the neighborhood system.	No	07/08/24 1:03 PM
2	635	Terry Harris	Support with changes	I have concerns, generally, with this significant change to the District Coalition model, and I would have hoped that the Council could have considered it more deeply with some work session(s). Regardless, the "Exhibit A" provided with this agenda item is, at best, a mistake and should be corrected before Council consideration. If the council is giving authorization to enter these agreements, they should be seeing more than a mere template. (See also Agenda item 634).	No	07/08/24 1:27 PM
3	635	Marie Tyvoll	Oppose	See PDF for written testimony.	Yes	07/09/24 7:52 PM
4	635	Marie Tyvoll	Oppose	See PDF for additional written testimony.	Yes	07/09/24 8:02 PM



Marie Tyvoll <mtyvoll@gmail.com>

Serious Concerns, Tomorrow's July 10 Ordinance, City Council

Marie Tyvoll <mtyvoll@gmail.com>
Draft

Tue, Jul 9, 2024 at 7:47 PM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Marie Tyvoll <mtyvoll@gmail.com>

Date: Tue, Jul 9, 2024 at 9:19AM

Subject: Serious Concerns, Tomorrow's July 10 Ordinance, City Council

To: <annie.vonburg@portlandoregon.gov>

Cc: Shannon Hiller-Webb <shannonh@prosparus.com>, Courtney Vaughn <cvaughn@portlandmercury.com>, Alex Zielinski <azielinski@opb.org>, <opbnews@opb.org>, Sophie Peel <speel@wwweek.com>, <njaquiss@wwweek.com>, K. Rambo <k.rambo@streetroots.org>, <kaia@streetroots.org>, Betsy Hammond <betsyhammond@oregonian.com>, Shane Kavanaugh <skavanaugh@oregonian.com>, <gbutler@oregonian.com>, <kgabrielson@oregonian.com>, <amesh@wwweek.com>, <auditorsoffice@portlandoregon.gov>, <Contact@sarahsilkie.com>, Jeremy Smith <jeremy4PDX@gmail.com>, <mitch@mitch4portland.com>, <info@lykinsforportland.com>, Lisa Freeman <lisafreemanforportland@gmail.com>, Andra Vltavin <andraforpdx@gmail.com>, <christian@steph4eastportland.com>, Stephanie Routh <hello@steph4eastportland.com>, Marie Tyvoll <mtyvoll@gmail.com>, <daniel.mcardle-jaimes@portlandoregon.gov>, <OEHR@portlandoregon.gov>, <michael.jordan@portlandoregon.gov>

Dear Ms. Von Burg,

I am writing in regards to the Ordinance scheduled to go before City Council tomorrow, July 10, 2024 regarding District Coalition funding: <https://www.portland.gov/council/documents/ordinance/grant-agreements-four-nonprofit-neighborhood-district-coalitions>

I've reviewed the materials provided and there are several concerns that should be raised, including with the NWNW District Coalition. In regards to last year's NWNW grant, it is very troubling to see their funding was doubled through an amendment and that there appears to be no public accountability for how those funds were spent.

The Amended NWNW Grant agreement for 2023-24 was doubled to \$708,215. We have never seen an amended grant agreement that doubles the approved budget for a District Coalition. In the amended agreement there are considerable activities, deliverables and results promised, but where is the report that captures the true impact for how those taxpayer funds were spent to ensure transparency and accountability for the public? Does the NWNW Board and Neighborhood Association Boards reflect greater diversity as a result of \$708,215 in funding as stated they would? I've attended several NWNW Board and Committee meetings recently and I see a vast majority of white-identifying individuals. Did the other District Coalitions also receive amended grant funding for DEI work?

- "1. The Grant Agreement not-to-exceed amount of \$325,552 is increased by \$382,663 for a new total not to-exceed amount of \$708,215. FY 23-24, funding consists of \$317,450 for core program operations, \$30,000 for district coalition partners support, and \$35,213 for the Neighborhood Small Grants and Event Sponsorships Program." Page 1, AMENDMENT No. 1 to GRANT AGREEMENT

In reference to the July 10, 2024 Ordinance I would expect there to be a report on the results of NWNW's \$708,215 in funds tied to the amendment in order to gauge the effectiveness of taxpayer funding.

Let's look at the language of the [Ordinance](#):

1. B. "Amendments and renewals to the grant agreements may be agreed to and executed by the Director of the Office of Community & Civic Life or their designee, including but not limited to scope of work and budget for FY 2024-25, and for FY 2025-26 provided Civic Life's 2025-26 budget has been approved by City Council, provided such amendments and renewals have been approved as to form by the City Attorney."

When the new form of government was voted on by the majority of Portland voters they approved the creation of four Districts and Civic Life subsequently specified four District Coalitions in lieu of the current seven. At this time Civic Life planned to issue an RFP for organizations to apply for one of the four District Coalitions. However, that process never took place and instead the City selected which District Coalition's would represent the four districts, bypassing the competitive process by which all other City contracts are awarded. **When Civic Life did so, they stated that the RFP process would resume in 2025 but based on the language in the Ordinance it appears that Civic Life intends to thwart the RFP process until 2026 and thereby take the decision-making power away from the newly seated City Commissioners who would likely want a say in how \$2 million will be spent in support of their districts.** This appears to be an end run around democratic principles and should be omitted as the new City Council members should weigh in on financial decisions that pertain to their districts. An RFP process should also be provided as with ALL other city-awarded contracts - there should be no exceptions or carve outs.

2. In regards to Section C in the [Ordinance](#), we know that the current NWNW Bylaws are not compliant with ONI Standards and therefore do not qualify to receive grant funds. The June 20, 2024 NWNW Bylaws do not provide a "grievance procedure" as required, see attached redline NWNW Bylaws. Instead the language for the section on grievances references a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA). When Ms. Urban-Garrett, Executive Director of NWNW, received a public records request for the MOA, she confirmed in an email that it is currently under legal review. Why would City Council approve funding for an organization that is not in compliance with ONI Standards and who has sought legal counsel in a document that City of Portland attorneys presumably have not yet reviewed? Why would City Council approve funding for an organization who has not made a document, the MOA, available to the public? Why would compliance not be required for all District Coalitions in regards to the grievance process?

- "C. These grant agreements shall comply with City Code Chapter 3.96 Office of Community & Civic Life and with the Standards for Neighborhood Associations, District Coalitions, Business District Associations, and the Office of Neighborhood Involvement." See [Ordinance](#).
- **"Section XII - Grievance Procedure**
[District 4 Coalition](#) shall enter into a Memorandum of Agreement that shall include procedures for addressing grievances with a District Coalition and appeals from Neighborhood Associations or individuals." Page 10, redline NWNW Bylaws.

3. Even more troubling is that the [Ordinance](#) does not provide actual contracts for City Council to approve. It is worth noting that these District Coalition contracts have been handed out by the City for over 40 years in a no-bid process so it is alarming to see that [Exhibit A](#) in the Ordinance is not an actual contract but a generic template. **Civic Life has presumably known for months that contracts are required, so why are they not available for public access and transparency, so the City Council can make an informed decision about substantive contracts valued at nearly \$2 million in taxpayer funds?**

- “4. A total of \$1,959,999 in both General Fund on-going and one-time in the Office of Community & Civic Life’s FY 2024-25 approved budget are allocated to support the four (4) District Coalitions as part of the Neighborhood Outreach & Support Program.” See [Ordinance](#).
- In [Exhibit A](#), you can see this is not a contract, but a template (this is the standard template used by Civic Life for grants and is therefore a placeholder). When will the actual contracts be available for public viewing prior to authorization by City Council? Why is a template being used in the first place? The use of a “fill in the blank” template rather than an actual contract seems to be an attempt to bypass transparency and accountability on behalf of taxpayers who fund the District Coalition and Neighborhood Association system.

4. As per the [Ordinance](#), each District Coalition is to receive a one time budget bump to fund education regarding Charter Reform. This funding is critical and the public has no understanding of how each District Coalition intends to spend taxpayer dollars. There is also a GF (Grant Funding) One-Time Redistrict line item for each District Coalition with no reference to the related expenses it is being allocated to? Again, where is the transparency and access? See [Ordinance](#).

5. Civic Life stated in a newsletter on January 3, 2024 that there would be public meetings held in early 2024 regarding the new four District plans and an RFP process in 2026 (see screenshot below). Did those public meetings occur? [Section B in the Ordinance](#) allows for contract continuation through to 2026. Given that a new City Council of 12 Commissioners will be seated as of Jan. 1, 2025, it is appropriate for the Commissioners to have a voice in this decision. **This provision should be removed so 12 Commissioners can make an informed decision on when and if renewals are appropriate for 2025-26.**

- “B. Amendments and renewals to the grant agreements may be agreed to and executed by the Director of the Office of Community & Civic Life or their designee, including but not limited to scope of work and budget for FY 2024-25, and for FY 2025-26 provided Civic Life’s 2025-26 budget has been approved by City Council, provided such amendments and renewals have been approved as to form by the City Attorney.” See [Ordinance](#).

District Coalition Offices Model Changing

In 2024, Civic Life will change the DCO model to move from 7 to 4 service areas which will all be supported by nonprofit-run district offices. We are aligning the DCO boundaries with Portland's new voting districts to ensure the offices serve roughly equal populations with shared characteristics and interests. Neighborhoods will continue to have representation at the City and receive support from Civic Life. **The new model will take effect on July 1, 2024.**

Civic Life's Neighborhood Program will support the DCOs and fund them equitably by population to allow the offices to provide similar levels of staffing and services. This will increase DCOs' ability to advocate for Portlanders, coordinate with the City, and ensure the new city councilors can work with DCOs to engage their constituents.

Civic Life will work with the existing nonprofit DCOs - [Southeast Uplift](#), [Northeast Coalition of Neighborhoods](#), [Central Northeast Neighbors](#), and [Neighbors West-Northwest](#) - to serve the new districts for the immediate future, with plans to begin an RFP process for long-term service in 2026.

Civic Life will hold public meetings in early 2024 to earn input on this plan from community. This will be a recurring section to provide updates.

6. Section C in the [Ordinance](#) clearly states that grant agreements must comply with City Code 3.96, ONI Standards, and we know as of today that the NWNW Bylaws do not. In addition, the contracts for the other City-managed District Coalitions are not available to the public so we have no way to check if they are out of compliance as well.

- "C. These grant agreements shall comply with City Code Chapter 3.96 Office of Community & Civic Life and with the Standards for Neighborhood Associations, District Coalitions, Business District Associations, and the Office of Neighborhood Involvement." See [Ordinance](#).

7. Section E in the [Ordinance](#) should only be waived as it applies to this grant cycle and future cycles MUST require an RFP process.

- "E. The competitive solicitation requirements in City Policy FIN-2.04 are waived as applied to the grant agreements authorized by this ordinance." See [Ordinance](#).

8. Finally, how is it possible that there are no District Coalitions contracts to review? Contracts have been handed out on a silver platter to District Coalitions with almost no oversight for over 40 years - how is this timeline now a surprise? Why are these contracts not drafted for public access and review?

- "2. There has never been a competitive or open bidding process for these contracts since the inception of the Neighborhood Outreach & Support program in 1974. These nonprofit District Coalitions have been the sole recipients from this program since 1974, the past 50 years." See [Ordinance](#).

It appears that the District Coalition/Neighborhood Association system, formed and funded to support two-way feedback between the City and taxpayers, is opaque and shrouded in secrecy. This is the people's process created over 40 years ago for public engagement with their government. Voters have now demanded even more participation and representation with Charter Reform, yet Civic Life and District Coalitions continue to operate without public scrutiny and accountability. Do Better and Do It Now.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best,

MARIE TYVOLL (she/her)

503-998-6338 mtyvoll@gmail.com www.linkedin.com/in/marietyvoll



2024.06.20 redline compare between current adopted Bylaws and changes for vote (1).docx
282K



Marie Tyvoll <mtyvoll@gmail.com>

Serious Concerns, Tomorrow's July 10 Ordinance, City Council

Marie Tyvoll <mtyvoll@gmail.com>
Draft

Tue, Jul 9, 2024 at 7:57 PM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Marie Tyvoll <mtyvoll@gmail.com>

Date: Tue, Jul 9, 2024 at 2:47 PM

Subject: Re: FW: Serious Concerns, Tomorrow's July 10 Ordinance, City Council

To: <annie.vonburg@portlandoregon.gov>, Ratbi, Mourad <mourad.ratbi@portlandoregon.gov>

Cc: Courtney Vaughn <cvaughn@portlandmercury.com>, Alex Zielinski <azielinski@opb.org>, <opbnews@opb.org>, K.

Rambo <k.rambo@streetroots.org>, <kaia@streetroots.org>, Sophie Peel <speer@wweek.com>,

<njaquiss@wweek.com>, <amesh@wweek.com>, Betsy Hammond <betsyhammond@oregonian.com>, Shane

Kavanaugh <skavanaugh@oregonian.com>, <gbutler@oregonian.com>, <kgabrielson@oregonian.com>,

<auditorsoffice@portlandoregon.gov>, Shannon Hiller-Webb <shannonh@prosparus.com>, <michael.jordan@

portlandoregon.org>, <daniel.mcardle-jaimes@portlandoregon.gov>, Marie Tyvoll <mtyvoll@gmail.com>

Dear Ms. Von Burg and Director Ratbi,

Thank you for your message and invitation.

The concerns we raised include solutions for each. Can you share how a meeting would be helpful and a good use of everyone's time? We believe time spent focused on implementing solutions would be preferred.

To summarize, here are the priority action items that warrant immediate attention from Civic Life to ensure taxpayer trust:

1. Pull the Ordinance from tomorrow's City Council meeting agenda since clearly the Ordinance lacks transparency and accountability. There is no other solution that would satisfy the utter lack of transparency and accountability around the grants process.
2. Transfer decision-making power from Civic Life to the newly seated 12 City Commissioners who will likely want a say in how \$2 million will be spent in support of their districts, by removing the provision granting authorization to Civic Life to make decisions regarding the 2025-26 District Coalition contracts.
3. Any future Ordinance should include all District Coalition *contracts* with ample advance notice and a feedback process for public input and review.
4. Require all District Coalition bylaws to comply with ONI Standards (we recognize they are hopelessly outdated) and undergo review by city attorney's before Civic Life finalizes grant contracts and provides funding.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best,

MARIE TYVOLL (she/her)

On Tue, Jul 9, 2024 at 11:31 AM Von Burg, Annie <Annie.VonBurg@portlandoregon.gov> wrote:

Hello Marie,

Thanks again for reaching out. Do you have time today to meet with Civic Life Director, Mourad Ratbi and myself to discuss your concerns?

Thanks,

Annie

From: Marie Tyvoll <mtyvoll@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, July 9, 2024 9:20 AM

To: Von Burg, Annie <Annie.VonBurg@portlandoregon.gov>

Cc: Shannon Hiller-Webb <shannonh@prosparus.com>; Courtney Vaughn <cvaughn@portlandmercury.com>; Alex Zielinski <azielinski@opb.org>; opbnews@opb.org; speel@wwweek.com; njaquiss@wwweek.com;

k.rambo@streetroots.org; Sand, Kaia <kaia@streetroots.org>; Betsy Hammond <betsyhammond@oregonian.com>; Shane Kavanaugh <skavanaugh@oregonian.com>; gbutler@oregonian.com; kgabrielson@oregonian.com; Mesh.

Aaron <amesh@wwweek.com>; Auditors Office External Use <auditorsoffice@portlandoregon.gov>;

Contact@sarahsilkie.com; Jeremy Smith <jeremy4PDX@gmail.com>; mitch@mitch4portland.com;

info@lykinsforportland.com; Lisa Freeman <lisafreemanforportland@gmail.com>; Andra Vltavín

<andraforpdx@gmail.com>; christian@steph4eastportland.com; Stephanie Routh <hello@steph4eastportland.com>;

Marie Tyvoll <mtyvoll@gmail.com>; McArdle-Jaimes, Daniel <Daniel.McArdle-Jaimes@portlandoregon.gov>; Office of Equity and Human Rights <oehr@portlandoregon.gov>; Jordan, Michael <Michael.Jordan@portlandoregon.gov>

Subject: Serious Concerns, Tomorrow's July 10 Ordinance, City Council

Dear Ms. Von Burg,

I am writing in regards to the Ordinance scheduled to go before City Council tomorrow, July 10, 2024 regarding District Coalition funding: <https://www.portland.gov/council/documents/ordinance/grant-agreements-four-nonprofit-neighborhood-district-coalitions>

I've reviewed the materials provided and there are several concerns that should be raised, including with the NWNW District Coalition. In regards to last year's NWNW grant, it is very troubling to see their funding was doubled through an amendment and that there appears to be no public accountability for how those funds were spent.

The Amended NWNW Grant agreement for 2023-24 was doubled to \$708,215. We have never seen an amended grant agreement that doubles the approved budget for a District Coalition. In the amended agreement there are considerable activities, deliverables and results promised, but where is the report that captures the true impact for how those taxpayer funds were spent to ensure transparency and accountability for the public? Does the NWNW Board and Neighborhood Association Boards reflect greater diversity as a result of \$708,215 in funding as stated they would? I've attended several NWNW Board and Committee meetings recently and I see a vast majority of white-identifying individuals. Did the other District Coalitions also receive amended grant funding for DEI work?

- "1. The Grant Agreement not-to-exceed amount of \$325,552 is increased by \$382,663 for a **new total not to-exceed amount of \$708,215**. FY 23-24, funding consists of \$317,450 for core program operations, \$30,000 for district coalition partners support, and \$35,213 for the Neighborhood Small Grants and Event Sponsorships Program." Page 1, AMENDMENT No. 1 to GRANT AGREEMENT

In reference to the July 10, 2024 Ordinance I would expect there to be a report on the results of NWNW's \$708,215 in funds tied to the amendment in order to gauge the effectiveness of taxpayer funding.

Let's look at the language of the Ordinance:

1. B. "Amendments and renewals to the grant agreements may be agreed to and executed by the Director of the Office of Community & Civic Life or their designee, including but not limited to scope of work and budget for FY 2024-25, and for FY 2025-26 provided Civic Life's 2025-26 budget has been approved by City Council, provided such amendments and renewals have been approved as to form by the City Attorney."

When the new form of government was voted on by the majority of Portland voters they approved the creation of four Districts and Civic Life subsequently specified four District Coalitions in lieu of the current seven. At this time Civic Life planned to issue an RFP for organizations to apply for one of the four District Coalitions. However, that process never took place and instead the City selected which District Coalition's would represent the four districts, bypassing the competitive process by which all other City contracts are awarded. **When Civic Life did so, they stated that the RFP process would resume in 2025 but based on the language in the Ordinance it appears that Civic Life intends to thwart the RFP process until 2026 and thereby take the decision-making power away from the newly seated City Commissioners who would likely want a say in how \$2 million will be spent in support of their districts.** This appears to be an end run around democratic principles and should be omitted as the new City Council members should weigh in on financial decisions that pertain to their districts. An RFP process should also be provided as with ALL other city-awarded contracts - there should be no exceptions or carve outs.

2. In regards to Section C in the Ordinance, we know that the current NWNW Bylaws are not compliant with ONI Standards and therefore do not qualify to receive grant funds. The June 20, 2024 NWNW Bylaws do not provide a "grievance procedure" as required, see attached redline NWNW Bylaws. Instead the language for the section on grievances references a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA). When Ms. Urban-Garrett, Executive Director of NWNW, received a public records request for the MOA, she confirmed in an email that it is currently under legal review. Why would City Council approve funding for an organization that is not in compliance with ONI Standards and who has sought legal counsel in a document that City of Portland attorneys presumably have not yet reviewed? Why would City Council approve funding for an organization who has not made a document, the MOA, available to the public? Why would compliance not be required for all District Coalitions in regards to the grievance process?

- "C. These grant agreements shall comply with City Code Chapter 3.96 Office of Community & Civic Life and with the Standards for Neighborhood Associations, District Coalitions, Business District Associations, and the Office of Neighborhood Involvement." See Ordinance.
- **"Section XII - Grievance Procedure**

District 4 Coalition shall enter into a Memorandum of Agreement that shall include procedures for addressing grievances with a District Coalition and appeals from Neighborhood Associations or individuals." Page 10, redline NWNW Bylaws.

3. Even more troubling is that the Ordinance does not provide actual contracts for City Council to approve. It is worth noting that these District Coalition contracts have been handed out by the City for over 40 years in a no-bid process so it is alarming to see that Exhibit A in the Ordinance is not an actual contract but a generic template. **Civic Life has presumably known for months that contracts are required, so why are they not available for public access and transparency, so the City Council can make an informed decision about substantive contracts valued at nearly \$2 million in taxpayer funds?**

- "4. A total of \$1,959,999 in both General Fund on-going and one-time in the Office of Community & Civic Life's FY 2024-25 approved budget are allocated to support the four (4) District Coalitions as part of the Neighborhood Outreach & Support Program." See Ordinance.
- In Exhibit A, you can see this is not a contract, but a template (this is the standard template used by Civic Life for grants and is therefore a placeholder). When will the actual contracts be available for public viewing prior to authorization by City Council? Why is a template being used in the first place? The use of a "fill in the blank" template rather than an actual contract seems to be an attempt to bypass transparency and accountability on behalf of taxpayers who fund the District Coalition and Neighborhood Association system.

4. As per the Ordinance, each District Coalition is to receive a one time budget bump to fund education regarding Charter Reform. This funding is critical and the public has no understanding of how each District Coalition intends to spend taxpayer dollars. There is also a GF (Grant Funding) One-Time Redistrict line item for each District Coalition with no reference to the related expenses it is being allocated to? Again, where is the transparency and access? See Ordinance.

5. Civic Life stated in a newsletter on January 3, 2024 that there would be public meetings held in early 2024 regarding the new four District plans and an RFP process in 2026 (see screenshot below). Did those public meetings occur? Section B in the Ordinance allows for contract continuation through to 2026. Given that a new City Council of 12 Commissioners will be seated as of Jan. 1, 2025, it is appropriate for the Commissioners to have a voice in this decision. **This provision should be removed so 12 Commissioners can make an informed decision on when and if renewals are appropriate for 2025-26.**

- “B. Amendments and renewals to the grant agreements may be agreed to and executed by the Director of the Office of Community & Civic Life or their designee, including but not limited to scope of work and budget for FY 2024-25, and for FY 2025-26 provided Civic Life’s 2025-26 budget has been approved by City Council, provided such amendments and renewals have been approved as to form by the City Attorney.” See [Ordinance](#).

6. Section C in the [Ordinance](#) clearly states that grant agreements must comply with City Code 3.96, ONI Standards, and we know as of today that the NWNW Bylaws do not. In addition, the contracts for the other City-managed District Coalitions are not available to the public so we have no way to check if they are out of compliance as well.

- “C. These grant agreements shall comply with City Code Chapter 3.96 Office of Community & Civic Life and with the Standards for Neighborhood Associations, District Coalitions, Business District Associations, and the Office of Neighborhood Involvement.” See [Ordinance](#).

7. Section E in the [Ordinance](#) should only be waived as it applies to this grant cycle and future cycles **MUST** require an RFP process.

- “E. The competitive solicitation requirements in City Policy FIN-2.04 are waived as applied to the grant agreements authorized by this ordinance.” See [Ordinance](#).

8. Finally, how is it possible that there are no District Coalitions contracts to review? Contracts have been handed out on a silver platter to District Coalitions with almost no oversight for over 40 years - how is this timeline now a surprise? Why are these contracts not drafted for public access and review?

- “2. There has never been a competitive or open bidding process for these contracts since the inception of the Neighborhood Outreach & Support program in 1974. These nonprofit District Coalitions have been the sole recipients from this program since 1974, the past 50 years.” See [Ordinance](#).

It appears that the District Coalition/Neighborhood Association system, formed and funded to support two-way feedback between the City and taxpayers, is opaque and shrouded in secrecy. This is the people's process created over 40 years ago for public engagement with their government. Voters have now demanded even more participation and representation with Charter Reform, yet Civic Life and District Coalitions continue to operate without public scrutiny and accountability. Do Better and Do It Now.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best,

MARIE TYVOLL (she/her)

503-998-6338 mtyvoll@gmail.com www.linkedin.com/in/marietyvoll

Portland City Council Meeting
Wednesday, July 10, 2024 - 9:30 a.m.
Verbal Testimony

	Agenda Item	Name
1	635	DARLENE GARRETT
2	635	Jona Davis
3	635	Nanci Champlin
4	635	Alison Stoll