



April 16, 2025

**Clackamas County Board of Commissioners  
Policy Position  
Relating to Urban Renewal Amendments**

**Clackamas County opposes HB 3499 unless amended:** As proposed, this bill requires a new, countywide vote any time an urban renewal plan undergoes a major amendment. Although well intended, this extra step creates unintentional consequences for Clackamas County where best practices are already incorporated into urban renewal planning.

Clackamas County currently administers three urban renewal areas. A fourth urban renewal area, Government Camp, was retired in 2015 after all projects were completed and funds were expended. Each urban renewal plan was developed with extensive involvement from the residents within the boundary of the proposed urban renewal area. Notably, Clackamas County also requires a countywide vote on any new urban renewal plan since 2013.

Although Clackamas County made a local choice to send all new plans to a countywide vote, it would be cumbersome and expensive to send the same plan back to voters for every major amendment, such as refining a planning-level project to include state or federal requirements. Repeated countywide votes also diminish the voice of residents of the affected community, as well as the county's ability to adjust plans to meet a neighborhood's changing priorities.

In pursuit of a solution, we urge the state to consider making countywide votes optional, recognizing that each community may have different needs.

**We urge a "NO" vote on HB 3499 unless amended.**

Please contact Trent Wilson ([twilson2@clackamas.us](mailto:twilson2@clackamas.us)) for more information.