

ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSIONS: REPRESENTATION

1. Is 1 director for Area “D” sufficient? Why or why not?
2. If Area “D” was split into 2 electoral areas, each would have an electoral area director. Weighted voting strength would be divided as well, based on population. Would that be an improvement? Why or why not?
3. If Area “D” was to be divided into 2 electoral areas, how would you divide them and why?

Okanagan Falls (March 2)

- Director cannot respond to needs – Policing, road maintenance, repair
- Existing structure is OK
- Two Directors better
- More staff support (informed, responsive) would be helpful
- Confusion – no difference in outcome from more directors or different areas
- Why focus on splitting area and adding directors?
- Less directors, especially from urban areas would be better (smaller RDOS Board)
- Possible urban/rural split (urban area around Skaha Lake)
- East/West division – does not make any sense
- Most areas have nothing in common
- Change whole RDOS system – it’s just not working for us
- What is the Director’s view of splitting the area into 2 electoral areas?
- Okanagan Fall is well-served by the current Director, but other areas of the RDOS may feel differently

Kaleden (March 3)

- Existing Director handles everything ok now
- What is the Director’s opinion – is it too much work?
- Director does have an alternate and RD staff as a resource
- Urban/rural split – urban around Skaha Lake, one rural director one urban director
- Would this make any difference in service delivery?
- Weighted voting does not work
- Existing director serves us well now
- Area is diverse, no similar communities and is complex. Two directors might help
- Services are already on an area-by-area basis – bus service, water, parks, sewer
- What is the problem? Why do we need to split? Why do we need more directors?
- Separate OK Falls. One Director. Everything else one director.
- Existing system seems to work
- Any division should be based on watersheds
- Watershed planning needs to be strengthened.

- Technical planning needs to be strengthened. More research. Better information.

Apex (March 5)

- Apex needs a champion to represent the issues with the level of government that is responsible.
- property owners association is generally a good body to draw issues together
- concerned about losing the weight of the 5 votes on regional decisions if the Electoral Area was split
- Apex's issues are unique to the mountain. Their issues would get swallowed up by any boundary that would divide the EA into two areas
- Ties are to Penticton or south, not to Okanagan Falls
- Problem with so many government agencies/departments as well as RDOS having jurisdiction over Apex
- Apex has specific and unique needs not related to the rest of Area D and are "getting nothing."
- need one director specifically for Apex, a "local" representative who is invested in the community and who can bring the "consciousness of Apex" to the RDOS
- Need for a representative who is familiar with and can work with all the agencies that influence the community (forestry, aboriginal, environment)
- There is some antagonism between residents and Apex corporation.
- Frustration regarding bringing plans to reality eg trails.
- Concern that Apex development charges are not coming back to Apex.
- Perhaps a need for a Parks Commission; no identified parks in revised OCP. (where are cash-in-lieu of parks funds spent?)
- The Regional District has a role as an advocate for apex with other agencies
- The RDOS needs to help us make sense of the other levels of government, and they need to get back to us when we write letters or call staff
- Many landowners are not at apex to become political (they come to ski) and others are apathetic