Newsletter
Number 7
8/15/2023

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

Voter Pamphlet Proposition 1 For and Against Statements

Post by pasayten » Wed Aug 16, 2023 5:26 pm

Steve Oulman and I (Ray Peterson) are on the "Against" committee for Proposition 1 in the Voters Pamphlet. These are the 150 word maximum submitted statements that will be published in the Voters Pamphlet. The 75 word rebuttals will not be known until the pamphlet is published.

For statement:

Proposi□on 1 will establish a recreation district, which will provide leadership and funding for a new pool. The Wagner Pool needs to be replaced due to major structural problems, and lacks sustainable funds.

Public pools build community and protect public health. They support play, health, well-being, and safety for everyone.

Approving this measure will ensure our community has a safe and supervised place for children, adults and seniors to learn to swim, play and exercise.

Voting yes is an investment in our community, public health, safety, and well-being. These are values that build a vibrant community.

Vote YES on Proposition 1.

Against Statement:

Proposition 1 is not about simply replacing a community pool. It is about creating a powerful permanent taxing authority (a metropolitan park district) with an unelected governing Board requiring no input from the taxpayers.

Proposition 1 empowers the Board to levy up to $67 million in debt and $2 million in annual taxes.

Proposition 1 proponents advocate a $25+ million indoor aquatic center costing $1 million per year to operate. No comparable rural community in the country has such an indoor aquatic center.

Proposition 1 is not a fiscally responsible approach for replacing a pool. It will significantly increase your taxes

and rents. It will burden fixed income seniors and families of limited income.

Proposition 1 will divert community resources to a swim facility benefiting a few at the expense of community priorities like schools, affordable housing or health care.

Vote NO on Proposition 1
https://nopooltaxes.com

Rebuttal Against For Statement:

Proposition 1 is not about simply replacing the aging Twisp pool.

Proposition 1 proponents advocate a $25+ million indoor aquatic center costing $1 million per year to operate.

Rural communities like the Methow Valley don't have indoor aquatic centers. They are a poor investment.

A metropolitan recreation district and governing Board not directly elected by taxpayers is the least fiscally responsible approach for replacing our current public pool asset.

Vote NO on Proposition 1
https://nopooltaxes.com

29025

Local NonPartisan Offices
Vote for One

Methow Valley School District No. 350

Methow Valley School District 350
Director District 1

- [ ] Judith Hardmeyer-Wright
- [ ] Austin Lott
- [ ]

Methow Valley School District 350
Director District 3

- [ ] Scott Larson
- [ ] Jennifer Zbyszewski
- [ ]

Methow Valley School District 350
Director District 5 (At Large)

- [ ] Frank Kline
- [ ] Michael Liu
- [ ]

Local Measures

Proposed Methow Aquatics District

Proposed Methow Aquatics District

Proposition 1

A petition of the voters has been submitted concerning formation of a metropolitan park district. If approved, this proposition would create a district under chapter 35.61 RCW, to be known as the Methow Aquatics District, to provide ongoing funding to develop, construct, operate, and maintain the Methow Aquatics Center and related existing and future facilities. The District would have the powers provided under chapter 35.61 RCW, excluding eminent domain, but including, among others, to levy regular property taxes up to 75 cents per $1,000 assessed value, and its boundaries would be coterminous with the boundaries of Methow Valley School District 350. The District would be governed by a five member board appointed by the Okanogan County Commission and the Twisp and Winthrop Town Councils as provided by interlocal agreement approved by the three jurisdictions.

- [ ] For the formation of a metropolitan park district to be governed as provided in interlocal agreement
- [ ] Against the formation of a metropolitan park district

Read Both Sides of the Ballot