

File a Formal Complaint - Arvilla Ohlde

Arvilla reported 21 hours ago (Wed, 5 Oct at 10:44 AM) via Portal Meta

In Mason County signs are posted stating "No on Prop 1. I don't think that they have a registered PAC. The only marks on the sign is that they were printed by Thompson Sign in Tumwater. Attached below is a photo of the sign.

1 Attachment

DOCX [No to prop 1...](#)
(475 KB)



Prop. 1 - The Rest of the Story

Not just a levy - a new government agency!

Type Keyword

Search

Home	Taxes	Bureaucracy	Existing Parks	Unanswered Questions	Local Control	About/Contact	1-page Handout
------	-------	-------------	----------------	----------------------	---------------	---------------	----------------

Who will control existing parks?

Type Keyword

Search

By admin | September 22, 2016 | Comments Off |



The County currently has 20 parks, comprising hundreds of acres worth millions of dollars. Will they stay with the County or be "given" to the new Metropolitan Park District? *If Prop. 1 passes taxpayers will lose, no matter what decisions are made about existing parks.*

At the Commissioners' briefing on July 18, Tim Sheldon asked the organizers of the Metropolitan Park District what would happen to existing parks. Their answer? *"We were hoping the County would give them to us."* Let that sink in for a minute. Do any of the candidates have experience managing parks?

Or perhaps the County will keep their parks. In the July 19 County Commissioners Board meeting, Commissioner Neatherlin said "(Prop. 1) has nothing to do with our land. It doesn't... We haven't decided we're giving anything away. There's land that we cannot give away. People have donated lands to the county with restrictions on it... These are things that a (MPD) if formed, will have to

RECENT POSTS

- 5 Reasons to Vote NO on Prop. 1
- Broad powers to tax and spend
- A Metro Park District is forever.
- The annual levy will never expire
- Do we need two County Park authorities?
- Five "at-large" representatives?
- Who will control existing parks?
- Prop. 1 is not the answer to budget problems
- What's the rush?
- Prop. 1 is a blank check

CATEGORIES

5 Reasons to Vote NO on Prop. 1

Everyone supports parks, but Prop. 1 comes with a lot of issues.

1. A new “forever” tax.

Prop. 1 creates a new property tax on every home in unincorporated Mason County. This levy is \$20 per \$100,000 assessed value and will repeat every year. There is no expiration date. It will collect \$1.27 million in 2017 and it will grow as property values grow.

2. Prop. 1 creates new bureaucracy.

Prop. 1 creates a new “Metropolitan Parks District” (MPD) - a political entity which has all the power of a city. Created under RCW Chapter 35.61, the new Park District would raise money for recreation projects through a property tax, and would be overseen by a five-member commission.

The County would not have oversight over the Metropolitan Park District. Park commissioners would operate independently during their six year term. And under State law the new District would have the power to *levy up to 75 cents per \$1,000 of assessed valuation*; to take homes or land through *eminent domain*; to pay Park Commissioners a stipend of up to \$10,944 per year; and to issue *general obligation bonds*.

The MPD can hire an expensive executive director and other staff, spend on a new headquarters, equipment, and land, adding a *new level of bureaucracy* which will not benefit voters.

3. There’s no plan; no budget. But if Prop. 1 passes, we’re stuck with it.

If citizens create a Metropolitan Park District and then decide that it was a mistake, it will be too late. Once we create the MPD, we citizens cannot “uncreate” it. *Only the MPD board members/commissioners have the power to dissolve the MPD.* (RCW 35.61.310)

4. We don’t need TWO County Parks authorities.

Mason County already has a Parks and Trails Department. That’s *not* going away.

The proposed Metropolitan Park District will add another layer of expensive, redundant bureaucracy. *If we approve Prop. 1, we’ll be paying twice for services we already have.*

5. Loss of local control.

Parks are inherently a local issue. But under Prop. 1, your region may not be represented on the Board of Park Commissioners. It is possible all five commissioners could be from the same neighborhood.

In a highly unusual move, the organizers of Prop. 1 ignored the 3 existing County districts and designated all 5 positions on the Parks Board to be “at large.” The ballot only lists candidate names, so it is difficult to keep track of who you are voting for, where they live, or whether they will have any interest in your local concerns. *Instead of strengthening local control, Prop. 1 would create another County-wide taxing authority, putting local areas in competition for where our tax dollars are spent.*

Let’s work to support Parks through our existing County structure. Its a better solution.

\$1.27 million new taxes. A new bureaucracy. Please vote NO on Prop. 1.

To learn more: **NOprop1.info** or type in 216.104.189.151

