

04/20/26 City Council - Scull Past Meetings

Apr 11 – Attended the Rotary Heart of Gold Dinner

Apr 14 – Attended the Charbonneau Disaster Preparedness Captains Team Meeting

Apr 15 – Introductory conference call with State Senator Courtney Neron-Misslin

Apr 16 – Attended introductory meeting w/Sue Riekie Smith

Apr 17 – Meeting w/City Manager

04/20/26 City Council - Scull Forward Meetings

Apr 22 – Volunteer Appreciation Event

Apr 24 – Meeting w/City Manager

Apr 27 – Water Intake Facility (WIF) Board Meeting

4/20/26 Scull Public Comments

Opposition Statement: Urban Renewal Charter Amendment 3-362

Wilsonville has built its reputation as one of Oregon's most livable and economically stable communities through thoughtful, long-range planning and disciplined financial management. This proposed charter amendment, with marketed intention of promoting voter oversight, would significantly slow development, reduce economic competitiveness, and weaken the City's long-term financial health.

Urban renewal is not speculative spending—it is a structured economic development tool that allows cities to invest in infrastructure that enables private investment, job creation, and increased property values. Roads, utilities, stormwater systems, and redevelopment of underutilized land do not happen organically; they require coordinated planning and timely execution. By requiring voter approval for every new plan or major change/adjustment, this amendment introduces election-cycle delays of 6 to 18 months or more, during which project costs continue to rise due to inflation, labor shortages, and material cost escalation.

The reality is straightforward: delay equals higher cost and lost opportunity. Construction costs have increased dramatically in recent years, and postponing infrastructure investments only compounds those increases. In

addition, developers and business investors require predictability and timing. If Wilsonville cannot respond efficiently to opportunities, those investments will shift to neighboring communities that can. This amendment risks placing Wilsonville at a competitive disadvantage within the region, reducing job growth, slowing housing production, and limiting expansion of both commercial and industrial tax base.

Equally important is the impact on the City's long-term financial health. Urban renewal works by leveraging future growth in property values to fund today's infrastructure. When used responsibly, it expands the overall tax base, ultimately generating more revenue for core services like police, fire, and parks. Slowing or preventing these investments does not preserve financial stability—it does just the opposite. It constrains growth, limits future revenues, and increases the likelihood that the city will need to rely more heavily on fees, rate increases, or other funding mechanisms to maintain service levels.

This amendment also shifts complex, technical financing decisions into the political arena. Urban renewal financing involves detailed feasibility modeling, debt structuring, and long-term economic forecasting. Tying these decisions to campaign cycles introduces uncertainty and increases the risk that decisions will be driven by short-term messaging (as is happening now) rather than long-term community benefit. Over time, this can lead to fragmented planning, underinvestment in infrastructure, and missed opportunities that are difficult—and costly—to recover from.

Wilsonville's success has never been accidental. It is the result of consistent planning, strategic investment, and the ability to adapt over time. This amendment would limit that flexibility, slow progress, and introduce unnecessary financial risk (increased taxes). While voter engagement is critical, this proposal goes too far by creating fundamental process barriers that undermine the very tools that have helped make Wilsonville strong.

For these reasons, I oppose this amendment.