



**Is there really a need for a Metropolitan Park District to support the Friends Of The Pool's over \$20 million dollar Methow Aquatics Complex???**

<https://nopooltaxes.com>

### **Fund a pool facility with a Sales Tax Option via a Public Facilities District (PFD)**

The FOTP looked at four possible funding methods... Three park districts and a public facility district (PFD). They excluded the PFD option because they thought it had to be county wide to generate enough revenue for operations, maintenance, and partial building of the pool. A PFD sales tax option would work if it was for operations and maintenance ONLY! Build the pool with grants and donations... Don't build it on the back of all local property taxpayers. Don't create a toxic Metropolitan Park District.

**A 0.2% Sales Tax Funding Option:**

**Year/Qtr Total Taxable Sales**

#### **Twisp**

2023 Quarter 1 \$9,064,861

2022 Quarter 4 \$12,132,721

2022 Quarter 3 \$13,333,064

2022 Quarter 2 \$12,176,874

Total Sales \$46,707,520

Add 0.2% pool sales tax \$93,415 revenue

#### **Winthrop**

2023 Quarter 1 \$13,161,226

2022 Quarter 4 \$16,394,175

2022 Quarter 3 \$24,148,852

2022 Quarter 2 \$19,262,811

Total Sales \$72,967,064

Add 0.2% pool sales tax \$145,934 revenue

Total Pool Sales Tax Revenue per year \$239,349

**My original list of options/questions for this scenario to happen:**

**1. Could Winthrop and Twisp each create their own PFD and combine the funds to support a joint pool?**

This could be a solution! Needs legal verification. RCW 36.100 for PFD's implies county boundaries, but Pasco has a local PFD... <https://www.pasco-wa.gov/225/Public-Facilities-District>

**Overview**

Any city or group of contiguous cities in a county of less than one million population may create a public facilities district (PFD) under chapter 35.57 RCW to develop, improve, and operate "regional centers" (defined in RCW 35.57.020) costing at least \$10 million and serving a regional population.

In addition, any county may create a public facilities district under chapter 36.100 RCW to develop and operate sports, entertainment, convention, or recreational facilities, as well as "regional centers" as defined above.

Public facilities districts are municipal corporations with independent taxing authority and are taxing districts under the state constitution. PFDs must be coextensive with the boundaries of the jurisdictions that created them.

So... The local PFD would be created under RCW 35.57, not RCW 36.100... Not sure how the \$10mil cost factor comes into play. More lawyer stuff... 🤔

**2. Could a school district boundary be used for a PFD?**

**No**

**3. Could two cities and a small portion of unincorporated county between them form a PFD?**

**No**

**4. Maybe Winthrop and Twisp could extend their boundaries to become contiguous?**

**Not likely**

So we are left with option 1. With a reasonably sized pool, this could be a viable option.

Total Pool Sales Tax Revenue per year of \$239,349 should be adequate with some possibly left over for debt service or other expenses.

I would not mind a local 0.2% sales tax “add on” to support a reasonable cost pool for the Valley. Much better than a Metropolitan Park District and a permanent property tax. In addition, tourists would also be helping to pay for the operations of the pool, not just the local tax payers. Food exemptions still exist so as to not to unreasonably burden the fixed/low income folks.

**Think outside the box! Vote NO on Proposition 1!**