



Phil Green
Electoral Commissioner, ACT
North building, Civic Square, London Circuit, Canberra City ACT 2601

2nd Submission to Redistribution Committee ACT Electoral Commission

Dear Redistribution Committee members,

I make the following submission to the Redistribution Committee in response to the "Proposed Redistribution of the ACT into Electorates for the Legislative Assembly" and as the Secretary and Registered Officer of ACT Branch of the Australian Labor Party.

I would like to begin by stating my support for the Redistribution Committee's proposal as it has clearly considered all six initial public submissions and the redistribution criteria, before carefully concluding that a small change to the existing boundaries would provide the best available change to existing boundaries and ensure requirements of the Electoral Act are met. Until more substantial reform is possible in the future we believe that this is the most responsible outcome for the current electoral cycle.

I am writing now to raise issues and concerns regarding matters which have been aired in public debate since the redistribution was first announced. ACT Labor sympathises with the submissions which have argued for clearer "community of interest" identification within electorates. In particular the frustrations which have been articulately explained in the Gungahlin Community Council submission include valid concerns about the challenges and benefits of fulfilling community of interest objectives.

However, simply transplanting the existing community of interest frustrations from one part of the city to another will not resolve this problem in the long-term. We suspect that had it been in the Redistribution Committee's proposal, any plans to move Lyneham and Watson into Ginninderra (an electorate that is largely identified with the Belconnen region) would cause some concern within those suburban communities, as much as it has been of concern to residents in the suburb of Nicholls in past elections.

The GCC submission adds considerable weight to the argument for a significant evolution of the ACT electoral system and boundaries to better reflect the physical and demographic changes that Canberra has seen over the past 20 years. The only long-term resolution of the community of interest challenge is a larger number of electorates that better reflect local communities and natural geographic divisions. A new framework for future redistributions following the 2012 ACT Election would ensure orderly iterative electoral redistributions for several decades. Until that happens, we agree with the Redistribution Committee that the best interim measure is minimalist change, as represented in the current Proposed Redistribution.

Yours sincerely,

Elias Hallaj, Secretary, ALP (ACT Branch)

From: Alan Kerlin
Sent: Thursday, 2 June 2011 11:53 PM
To: Elections
Subject: Objection to proposed electoral boundary redistribution

Dear Mr Green

Thank you for considering our submission on the 2011 boundary redistribution.

We are disappointed that the committee dismissed our proposal and instead opted for a proposal of further incremental tinkering, rather than seeking to resolve the problem that is the Molonglo electorate. Instead, the committee proposes to pull more suburbs from the main Gungahlin electorate.

The effect of what the committee is proposing is that both the Woden and Gungahlin electorates would have multiple suburbs carved off into neighbouring electorates without any apparent regard to the requirements of the legislation that calls for common communities of interest. Gungahlin would have Nicholls, Crace and Palmerston in Ginninderra, and Woden already has Chifley, Pearce, Torrens and Farrer separated into Brindabella. The problem with Molonglo is that it is strung most of the length of Canberra. But instead of withdrawing from one end OR the other towards an eventually more compact electorate, the committee has over several redistributions actually made things worse rather than better

The legislation requires the committee to "duly consider —

1. the community of interests within each proposed electorate, including economic, social and regional interests;
2. the means of communication and travel within each proposed electorate;
3. the physical features and area of each proposed electorate;
4. the boundaries of existing electorates; and
5. the boundaries of divisions and sections fixed under the Districts Act 2002."

The legislation either intended the options to be in priority order as listed, or of equal importance. Our key point is that the second last criterion on the list seems to get most of the committee's consideration, disproportionately compared to the first criterion on the list. And by the way they are pursuing stability of the boundaries, the committee is instead ensuring precisely the opposite - ongoing need for continuous change.

We have proposed a major change that would have the effect of correcting the obvious problems that exist with the current Molonglo, and would set things up for the future growth areas to be incorporated into Molonglo and Ginninderra without constant future changes. Brindabella covering the southern band of the ACT across would cover all of Weston and Tuggeranong. With limited future growth Brindabella should be over quota. But by including Weston it provides a physical connection to the new development district of Molonglo (not the electorate), it can be expanded into that area if necessary at some stage in the future.

Molonglo would cover the central band of Woden, South Canberra and almost all of North Canberra. The new district of Molonglo would also be incorporated into it over the next few years, so this electorate should be somewhat under quota.

Ginninderra would cover the entire northern communities of Belconnen and Gungahlin and with the majority of the next few years' population growth, should be significantly under quota - at the very margin of the allowed variance.

Admittedly one or two suburbs of North Canberra would temporarily need to be in Ginninderra, but the off-set of this is that the fragmentation of both Woden and Gungahlin districts are corrected - in a lasting way - and the districts of

Tuggeranong, South Canberra, Belconnen and Weston Creek are maintained as wholes and in a manner that will last. There can be no question that the solution reduces current fragmentation and will prevent future fragmentation for far more of the ACT than the alternatives put forth by the committee.

We were disappointed to see the committee buried its very important observation that the proposals made by us could win through if there were significant community support back in page 20. We would have thought that such a significant concession warranted some mention in the summary of the report.

We wish to point out that, apart from any submissions the committee may receive, there has been a degree of discussion about our proposal on the online forums of GCC's Facebook site and the-riotact.com, with significant support for, and no dissent against, it.

With regard to the electorate names, we point to the difficulty experienced herein of discerning between the district and the electorate of the same name. It will only get worse. We suggest the committee consider the name of Griffin for the central electorate, in recognition that the central band of Canberra (in the GCC proposed redistribution) contains most of the core areas designed by Walter Burley Griffin.

We also wish to finish off by reminding the committee that our preferred position is for an expanded Assembly, with five five-member electorates. Through the committee, we urge all members of the Assembly, regardless of their political party, to do the right thing by the ACT's democratic representation, and seek Commonwealth support for amendments to the legislation to enact this larger Assembly.

Regards,

Alan Kerlin
Gungahlin Community Council
Spokesman - Planning, Transport and Environment

Woden Valley Community Council Inc.

PO Box 280 Woden ACT 2606; e-mail info@wvcc.org.au; ph. 0420529747

ACT Electoral Commission
Ground Floor, North Building
Civic Square
London Circuit
CANBERRA CITY ACT 2601

Email: elections@act.gov.au

Dear Augmented Electoral Commission

Objection to the Redistribution Committee's Proposed Redistribution

The Woden Valley Community Council (WVCC) would like to register its strong objection to the Redistribution Committee's proposed redistribution of the ACT electoral boundaries. The bifurcation of Woden, with the town split across the electorate of Molonglo and Brindabella has been a long-standing concern of the WVCC. We are very disappointed that this issue has not been resolved in the proposed redistribution.

Notwithstanding the primary criteria of quotas that must be met, it would appear that criterion (c)(iv) to consider 'the boundaries of existing electorates' has been the primary consideration, and that criteria (c)(i) to consider 'the community of interests within each proposed electorate, including economic, social and regional interests' and (c)(iii) 'the physical features and area of each proposed electorate' have not been adequately addressed, despite the Committee having stated in its report that it 'considered that these criteria were best met by avoiding, where possible, splitting suburbs and districts and by selecting boundaries which clearly separate communities'.

The current situation of representation with one part of Woden being on the periphery of the electorate of Brindabella, primarily comprising the Tuggeranong Valley, and the other part of Woden being on the periphery of the electorate of Molonglo that stretches all the way to the northern part of Gungahlin is most unsatisfactory. The WVCC has found that the bifurcation of Woden in this way has resulted in, with few exceptions, inadequate

representation by our elected members of the Legislative Assembly, and the issues facing our town being 'off the radar'.

The suburbs of Chifley, Farrer, Pearce and Torrens are part of the Woden Valley, not the Tuggeranong Valley, from both a geographic, demographic and community point of view. It is our view that the issues of concern in the Woden Valley are similar across all the suburbs in the Valley and would be best served by having local members responsible for an electorate that contains the Woden Valley as a whole.

While we understand the constraints of the current electoral legislation and criteria that the Commission must adhere to, we would suggest that the starting point of the redistribution process be that as far as possible, none of the towns of Canberra should be split across electorates. While there may be some initial (and we believe relatively minor) disruption to members and the electorates that they serve, this would provide better long-term outcomes for the residents of the Woden Valley, and we would suggest, for all residents of Canberra.

We request that the Augmented Electoral Commission consider this objection and restore the integrity of Woden's suburbs into the one electorate under the 'Second Proposed Redistribution'.

The WVCC appreciates the opportunity to again put forward its views and looks forward to a positive response.

Yours sincerely



Shirley Lithgow
Secretary
WVCC

2 June 2011

From: bogey musidlak
Sent: Thursday, 2 June 2011 2:08 PM
To: Elections
Subject: objection to proposed redistribution
Attachments: ACT redistribution objection.doc

Hello

Please find attached a submission from the ACT Branch of the Proportional Representation Society of Australia objecting to the proposal to alter a boundary in the Mollnglo Valley.

Bogey Musidlak
Convenor

**PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION SOCIETY OF AUSTRALIA
(AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY BRANCH)**

LEAVE MOLONGLO VALLEY BOUNDARIES UNCHANGED

The Proportional Representation Society of Australia (Australian Capital Territory Branch) warmly applauds the Redistribution Committee's recommendation that Palmerston and Crace be transferred from Molonglo to Ginninderra, as such a decision would cause the minimum possible disruption to voters while ensuring compliance with the mandatory legislative framework that is in operation.

We object though to the premature proposed boundary change in the Molonglo Valley that would include those areas north of the Molonglo River within Molonglo rather than in Ginninderra where they have been to date.

Even though, as the Redistribution Committee has indicated, only four current electors would be affected, a sudden change along these lines solves does not solve any additional problems, as there are none further that must be tackled. By proposing the immediate placement of all these anticipated future growth areas exclusively within Molonglo, the Committee appears to be slanting the discussion necessary in around four years' time, as this change would result in the bulk of predictable population growth occurring in Molonglo, and continue to skew future elector-to-MLA ratios that are published at the start of each redistribution process.

In the Society's view, the best time to deal thoroughly with these specific matters is when the salient conditions in the lead-up to the 2016 general election are clearer. At the time of the next redistribution process, there will be far better information on current and projected enrolments in all the suburbs where significant development activity is occurring or anticipated, and the outcome of any concerted attempt to change the size of the Legislative Assembly will also be known.

The Society notes that there has not been any public agitation for an immediate change of the nature being proposed.

A change in Molonglo Valley boundaries should therefore not be made currently in accordance with some subsidiary principle of redistribution practice, but await a full and informed public discussion during the term of the next Assembly when far more of the key relevant facts will be known or can be estimated or projected much more confidently.

Abandonment of this premature proposal would best uphold the accepted and welcome past practice of causing minimum disruption to voters within the stipulations of the legislation covering redistributions.

The Proportional Representation Society of Australia (Australian Capital Territory Branch) has consistently pointed to stability of electoral boundaries as an anticipated and appreciated feature of the Hare-Clark system. When detailed consideration is given to our boundaries during the term of the next Assembly, if there is to be no change in its size, the starting point should be the current longstanding layout of boundaries in the Molonglo Valley.

We trust that this matter can be resolved quickly without unnecessary excessive diversion of ACT government resources.

From: Harvey Bromwich
Sent: Friday, 20 May 2011 9:25 AM
To: Elections
Subject: Electoral Boundary changes

Dear Sir/Madam,

I wish to support the Gungahlin Community Council proposal for the redistribution of boundary changes. As a recent resident of Amaroo (relocated from Sydney) I strongly appose the proposal to 'split' the Gungahlin region across two electorates. As a fast growing region we already have inadequate narrow roads, a lack recreational and sporting facilities, poor access to hospital facilities and government services, the most expensive petrol outlets in Canberra (WHY?) and limited shopping outlets.

Gungahlin needs STRONG representation by elected members, not a split vote which weakens our voice. Gungahlin should be a showcase for the new Canberra, NOT a neglected northern region.

Harvey Bromwich
Amaroo

From: marina.costelloe
Sent: Monday, 16 May 2011 8:00 PM
To: Elections
Subject: nicholls needs to be with gungahlin we are a community

Consider Belconnen and Gungahlin combined into one seven-member electorate. The electorates would then essentially be Ginninderra with seven members across the north, Molonglo with five members across the central areas, and Brindabella with five members covering the south and Weston Creek. This would also set the electorates up to cater for future growth with minimal further changes

From: Kevin Cox
Sent: Monday, 16 May 2011 6:49 PM
To: Elections
Subject: Boundaries

As a resident of Gungahlin I would like to make a plea for all suburbs in Gungahlin to be included in the one electorate. This could be done by making Ginninderra a 7 member electorate by including all gungahlin in Gininiderra.

The end result would be to put all of Woden into Molonglo. The only suburb outside its natural boundaries would be Watson and that is unlikely to remain that way for long.

Kevin

From: Paul Crowley
Sent: Monday, 16 May 2011 9:38 PM
To: Elections
Cc: Gungahlin Community Council
Subject: electoral boundaries

To whom it may concern at the Electoral Commission.

I have read with horror that you might be further splitting up the Gungahlin Community, politically even more. I would like to express my objection to this possibility. Whatever technical reasons you might have to do this please consider qualitative reasons in this relatively small Community. Gungahlin is a growing community with a strong need for consultation, thinking and planning and the community having a strong voice to have its views taken notice of.

Please keep all of Gungahlin in the one Electorate. It does nothing for the democratic process to split us up

Yours sincerely
Paul Crowley
12 Yarrowonga Street Ngunnawal ACT

From: Elizabeth (Betsy) Dixon
Sent: Tuesday, 24 May 2011 8:39 PM
To: Elections
Subject: Support for Gungahlin Community Council proposal re electoral boundaries

Hello,
I support the proposal by the Gungahlin Community Council to have all of the Gungahlin communities in one electorate. I do not support the Electoral Commission proposal to move Palmerston and Crace into another electorate.

Gungahlin is a fast-growing area--I have lived here since 2002 and have seen the incredible growth and numerous changes. It seems to me that it would be more sensible to have all the Gungahlin communities in one electorate, where the needs and interests of Gungahlin residents can be fairly and accurately represented.

Regards

Elizabeth Dixon

From: Taz De Silva
Sent: Thursday, 19 May 2011 8:47 PM
To: Elections
Subject: Electoral Boundary redistribution

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to you about the proposed boundary changes, in particular the decision to separate Crace & Palmerston from the broader Gungahlin suburbs.

Having recently moved into the Gungahlin area I feel that the needs of the broader Gungahlin area is not being addressed as it is.

I believe any further division would not be in the interests of Gungahlin residents.

I feel that the residents would be better served with either
a electorate over Gungahlin to account for future growth or a electorate tied with Belconnen

Given the lack of employment prospects in the region, especially the lack of government departments given that practically all other town centres have some form of government department.

The need of residents to have the ability to vote on these matters as a region is important.

Also, with the future growth of new suburbs in the Gungahlin area I think it would be wise for residents to be properly represented so that we might have the ability to influence government policy and stop useless/wasteful government policy like the construction of Gungahlin Drive.

Some of the current MLA's for the region also appear to be very limited in consulting with residents unless facing an election campaign.

Thank you

Taz De Silva

From: Dan Fearn
Sent: Tuesday, 17 May 2011 9:56 AM
To: Elections
Subject: Electoral Boundary Redistribution

I wish to record my view that the whole of Gungahlin be included in one electorate.

This could be done if all of Gungahlin were included in the electorate of Ginninderra as proposed by the Gungahlin Community Council. Ginninderra should then be a 7 - member electorate, with Molonglo a 5 - member electorate and Brindabella a 5 - member electorate given the present size of the Legislative Assembly.

I have lived in Nicholls for 16 years and watched Gungahlin grow in size and develop a community of interest that is coherent and meaningful. This should be reflected in the ACT electoral structure.

Dan Fearn
6 Anne Clark Avenue
Nicholls ACT 2913

From: Janice hodgson
Sent: Monday, 16 May 2011 8:44 PM
To: Elections
Subject: electoral boundaries

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

As a long-time resident of Nicholls, I find it ridiculous that our area of Gunghalin is split into two electorates. I shop in Gunghalin and Belconnen, my library is in Gunghalin, one day my swimming pool will be in Gunghalin and meanwhile I swim in Belconnen, my grandchildren attend school in Gunghalin, I use the parks in Gunghalin, I walk the walkways in Gunghalin,

and yet all these Gunghalin facilities come under the care of the electorate of Molonglo, while I am in Ginninderra! Molonglo is VAST, spread from one end of Canberra to the other, taking in areas I have no connection with.

Would you please consider combining all Belconnen and Gunghalin in the one electorate - Ginninderra? This would provide a consolidated physical area, one which most people in this area would appreciate, an area that is linked through amenities provided, an area where we would have interface with our elected members - members who would have a better overall understanding of the needs of the area as a whole and provide a much clearer picture for future development.

Thank you for your consideration,
Janice Hodgson
Candlebark CI
Nicholls

From: Gus Pauza
Sent: Monday, 16 May 2011 5:10 PM
To: Elections
Subject: Objections to the Proposed Redistribution

I am a long standing resident of Palmerston, having moved there in 1993. I find it inconceivable that you would consider carving off Palmerston and Crace from the Molonglo electorate and incorporating us into Ginninderra. As a Gungahlin resident I have absolutely no affinity with the Ginninderra electorate, their problems are not ours and their issues would be quite different to ours. It would appear that there is a desire to split the Gungahlin community, initially by carving off Nicholls and now Palmerston and Crace.

I find the idea of this proposal to be an insult to the Palmerston and Crace community and one that totally disregards community standards and affiliations. I request that this proposal be reconsidered.

Gus Pauza

From: Robert Mair
Sent: Thursday, 5 May 2011 5:10 PM
To: Elections
Subject: ACT Electoral Boundaries

Dear Sirs,

I wish to lodge an objection to the proposed new electoral boundaries involving the exorcism of the suburbs of Palmerston and Crace from the Molonglo Electorate to the Ginninderra Electorate.

The basis of my objection is that these suburbs including Nicholls are an integral part of the Gungahlin district in the Molonglo Electorate and as such do not fit into the Ginninderra Electorate. It would be necessary for Ginninderra members to give different emphasis to these suburbs as any problems are ostensibly Gungahlin based and as such unique to Gungahlin. These suburbs are physically separate from Ginninderra by both a green belt and the Barton highway, a main thoroughfare. The focus of these suburbs is also towards the central district of the Gungahlin Town Centre and in no way can be linked to any happenings in the Ginninderra Electorate.

I regard this proposal as another piecemeal attempt to artificially adjust boundaries to try to maintain the strange tripartite electoral system of five, five and seven member electorates. This original electoral system is unfortunately restricted by the inability of the ACT to increase the total number of members in the Assembly when the number of ACT voters is rapidly rising. Surely one sure answer is to increase both the total number of electoral members and the number of ACT electorates. If this cannot occur due to Federal restrictions, then why not increase the number of ACT electorates within the existing total member level and have four electorates of three members and one electorate of five members. I feel sure that smaller electorates could be adequately catered for by three members. This is of course still better than the single member federal electorate model.

Yours faithfully

Robert Mair

=====
Robert J S Mair
6 Arid Place
Palmerston, ACT 2913, Australia
=====

From: Ian Ruecroft
Sent: Monday, 16 May 2011 8:58 PM
To: Elections
Subject: Redistribution of Electoral Boundries submission from Ian Ruecroft
Attachments: Electoral boundries 15.5.11.doc

Theodore Ian Ruecroft
42 Brinkley Cct
Palmerston
ACT 2913

As a Gungahlin resident I would like to express my concern at the recommendation that the suburbs of Palmerston and Crace be transferred from the electorate of Molonglo to the electorate of Ginninderra. This proposal would further disadvantage the Gungahlin community and compound the electoral disadvantage of Gungahlin voters.

The Gungahlin community is a "community of common interests" just the same as Belconnen, Weston Creek, Tuggeranong and other clearly identified communities. The needs of any community experiencing sustained growth must be an important factor when determining electoral boundaries. Gungahlin has been a community since 1992 and now has a substantial population. Because our voting power is split over two electorates, MLAs do not focus on Gungahlin issues and this is reflected in the level of community infrastructure. I note that legislation requires the Electoral Commission to duly consider the community of interests within each proposed electorate, including economic, social and regional interests.

The proposed distribution will maintain the existing Gungahlin status, where we are a minor community within two electorates. This has resulted in our under representation within the ACT Legislative Assembly and an associated lack of provision of services for the Gungahlin community. Politicians from both electorates have difficulty in recognising that Gungahlin even belongs in their electorate. As an example - following the outcome of the 2008 ACT election, Jon Stanhope (speaking in front of TV cameras) thanked the voters of "Belconnen" for electing him to office. If the most-senior politician can't remember that Nicholls was also in his electorate, how well is Gungahlin represented in the ACT Legislative Assembly?

In April 2012 Gungahlin will celebrate the 20th anniversary of our community. Facilities and services provided of other ACT communities, during their development stages, have not been available to Gungahlin; although the financial contributions made from land sales, stamp duty and rates from the Gungahlin district have made significant contributions to the ACT's finances. Every audit comparing services and/ or facilities, within the ACT community, confirms that Gungahlin is a disadvantaged community and this situation has continued to deteriorate over recent years. Successive ACT Governments have failed to respond to community representation or to deliver reasonable levels of infrastructure. They have also failed to create incentives to attract employment to the Gungahlin/ Mitchell district and failed to provide public transport initiatives or road networks that are adequate for the growing population.

There are many options that would bring all the Gungahlin suburbs into one electorate. I believe that the Electoral Commission has a responsibility to work with the Gungahlin community to explore every possible solution to the current situation and implement changes that will ensure that Gungahlin is contained within one electorate for the 2012 ACT election and for future elections. Gungahlin will be a major community within one electorate or two minor communities within two electorates.

If it is not possible to develop a suitable option that contains all communities of common interests within the same electorate, then there is a need to develop a process that rotates the disadvantage. Gungahlin can be wholly contained within either the Molonglo or Ginninderra electorate, however this may impact on other parts of these electorate. Without major changes to electoral boundaries it may not be possible to structure electoral boundaries unless one or more communities of common interests are disadvantaged. If this is the case it is time that other districts are disadvantaged.

Gungahlin has been split into two electorates for too long. In the 2012 ACT election, all Gungahlin suburbs must be contained within one electorate. This should be a non-negotiable consideration, as it is required to resolve the current issues and to provide the ACT community with a transparent and socially equitable model for electing members of the ACT Legislative Assembly.

Yours sincerely
T.I. Ruecroft

From: Paul and Sandy
Sent: Wednesday, 18 May 2011 10:25 PM
To: Elections
Subject: Electoral boundaies of divisions and sections ACT

I support the Gungahlin Community Council's proposal for all of suburbs of Belconnen and Gungahlin regions to be combined into one seven-member electorate.

The ACT electorates would then essentially be Ginninderra with seven members across the north, Molonglo with five members across the central areas, and Brindabella with five members covering the south and Weston Creek.

This would also set the electorates up to cater for future growth with minimal further changes.

Sandy Sherd
1 Gamburra Street
Ngunnawal

From: Karl Schaffarczyk
Sent: Tuesday, 17 May 2011 1:28 PM
To: Elections
Subject: Objection to proposed redistributions

Dear Elections,

I object to the proposed redistribution which will see Crace and Palmerston moved into Ginninderra.

As an elector, I wish to be grouped with electors with similar interests and issues, and while Molonglo has issues insofar as access to elected MLAs, breaking my suburb into a Belconnen electorate will make it harder for MLAs to care about issues relevant to me.

I ask Elections ACT to rethink the proposed distribution, and where possible keep town centres in their own groups (eg all of Gungahlin in one electorate, all of belconnen in another, etc etc) This is not to say that multiple town centres cant share an electorate.

Karl Schaffarczyk
77 Chance Street
Crace ACT 2911

From: Bill Reid
Sent: Wednesday, 1 June 2011 3:44 PM
To: Elections
Subject: Electoral boundary redistribution

Dear Madam/Sir

I wish to submit the following comments on the proposed ACT electoral redistribution. I do so as a voter in the Molonglo electorate of some 14 years.

If an elected representative departs too far from the wishes of the electorate, the term representative democracy loses all content. A representative, while not necessarily being the typical, or the average, citizen of his or her electorate, should not be so far out of touch with the feelings and wishes of the ordinary citizens as not to be able to listen to their problems with sympathy or express their needs with vigour and conviction. (See Graham Maddox, *Australian Democracy in Theory and Practice*)

Within the present boundaries of the Molonglo electorate there is a real schism between the feelings, interests and needs of the demographically young, developing area of Gungahlin (including the Ginninderra electorate suburb of Nichols), and the mature, almost moribund, central areas. Subsequently, most candidates base their electoral appeal, and performance if elected, on party affiliation and interaction with non broadly-representative networks of interest and pressure groups. Neither area seems to be satisfactorily represented in this situation.

It is in the best interests of representative democracy for both areas, and for the fostering of democratic dialogue, that the electorate boundaries encourage a more genuine representation than exists now. Given the realities of current electoral laws, this is better achieved by joining all of Belconnen and Gungahlin in a 7 member electorate, reducing the Molonglo electorate to 5 members across the central areas.

Such a redistribution will also cater for future growth with minimal future changes.

The opportunity to make these changes should be taken now.

Yours sincerely,

W.A. Reid

16 Bullala Court
Ngunnawal 2913

From: Bori
Sent: Wednesday, 18 May 2011 4:29 PM
To: Elections
Subject: Opposition to Electoral boundary redistributions Gungahlin

Electoral boundary redistributions is something that as a Gungahlin resident I would like to express my opposition to help stop further splitting of Gungahlin suburbs into a second ACT electorate.

Currently all of Gungahlin is in the Molonglo electorate except Nicholls, which is in Ginninderra. The ACT Electoral Commission is proposing that Palmerston and Crace are also carved off into Ginninderra. They've also failed to address the long-standing problem of the Molonglo electorate sprawling from almost Tuggeranong to the northern ACT border, leaving us in the north represented by MLAs some of whom we seldom ever see.

The legislation requires the Electoral Commission to "duly consider:

- the community of interests within each proposed electorate, including economic, social and regional interests
- the means of communication and travel within each proposed electorate
- the physical features and area of each proposed electorate
- the boundaries of existing electorates, and
- the boundaries of divisions and sections fixed under the Districts Act 2002."

Our argument is that for too long, they've paid attention to the last two of these points, to the exclusion of the first three points – to the detriment of good representation for the Gungahlin community.

GCC has proposed that all of Belconnen and Gungahlin are combined into one seven-member electorate. The electorates would then essentially be Ginninderra with seven members across the north, Molonglo with five members across the central areas, and Brindabella with five members covering the south and Weston Creek. This would also set the electorates up to cater for future growth with minimal further changes.

We fully support the Gungahlin Community Councils view above on this matter opposing any further splitting of the Gungahlin electorate.

Regards

Robert Dale Wright & Valda June Wright

24 Penfold Street

Gungahlin

From: Nola & Geoff Shoring
Sent: Wednesday, 18 May 2011 3:36 PM
To: Elections
Subject: Redistribution

I fully support the Gungahlin Community Council's submission on redistribution, to have all of Gungahlin in the one electorate, so that the Assembly would be comprised of 7 members for Ginninderra, 5 for Molongo and 5 for Brindabella.

Yours faithfully

Geoff C Shoring
22 Whatmore Court
NICHOLLS ACT 2913

From: Carolyn Sullivan
Sent: Thursday, 19 May 2011 5:08 PM
To: Elections
Subject: don't split Gungahlin

If Gungahlin, including Nicholls, was all in one electorate, the fact that there is such a huge problem leaving in the mornings would have been addressed as every suburb in the district is affected. It is a nonsense thinking that we in Nicholls have anything in common re electoral concerns with the rest of our current electorate. It also makes it very difficult to seek redress for what is a problem for me re Broadband, roads, etc

From: Jonathon Reynolds
Sent: Thursday, 2 June 2011 3:37 PM
To: Elections
Subject: Written objection relating to the proposed redistribution of the ACT Legislative Assembly electorates 2011

Augmented Electoral Commission
ACT Electoral Commission
Ground Floor, North Building
Civic Square, London Circuit
CANBERRA CITY 2601

Dear Sir/Madam,

I wish to lodge a formal objection with regard to the proposed redistribution as recommended by the Redistribution Committee.

As you are aware any redistribution must take into consideration the following criteria:

- ensure that the number of electors in an electorate immediately after the redistribution is within the range of not greater than 110%, or less than 90% of the quota;
- endeavour to ensure, as far as practicable, that the number of electors in an electorate at the time of the next general election of members of the Legislative Assembly will not be greater than 105%, or less than 95%, of the expected quota for the electorate at that time; and
- duly consider -
 1. the community of interests within each proposed electorate, including economic, social and regional interests;
 2. the means of communication and travel within each proposed electorate;
 3. the physical features and area of each proposed electorate;
 4. the boundaries of existing electorates; and
 5. the boundaries of divisions and sections fixed under the *Districts Act 2002*.

I believe that it been previously established at previous redistributions that none of the criterion as outlined above should have a higher rating or emphasis than any other. However I would argue that in this instance the

Redistribution Committee has placed undue emphasis on sub-criterion 4 in the bottom criterion bullet point to arrive at their preferred outcome.

The first two major bullet points can always easily be met, even if necessary, using an arbitrary redistribution methodology, to ensure full compliance.

With respect to the third bullet point, each sub-criteria must also be met.

Given that no criterion should have an emphasis or weighting greater than any other, the only way to correctly evaluate a preferred redistribution outcome in these circumstances is to analyze which options will accurately meet the MAJORITY of these sub-criteria and choose the redistribution outcome on that basis, irrespective of circumstances where a single criterion cannot be fully compliant or met.

On the page 21 Conclusion of the "Proposed Redistribution of the ACT into Electorates for the Legislative Assembly", I believe that the Redistribution Committee has incorrectly:

- Omitted to properly assess and consider the ongoing inequities for "communities of interest" for the electors in the Woden Valley suburbs who remain split across two electorates,
- Incorrectly arrived at a preferred outcome using a concept of minimizing "public confusion" as a justification for the proposed boundary change, despite this not being one of the criteria it has been tasked to consider as part of a redistribution process,
- Incorrectly assessed the communication and travel means within each of the current and proposed electorates. The Redistribution Committee also fails to consider the similar on-going impact on electors in suburbs split across two electorates in the Woden Valley.
- And finally placed undue emphasis on maintaining continuity of existing boundaries as far as practicable where it can be demonstrated the majority of the other four sub-criteria could possibly be better met with alternative distribution models.

Whilst there is no "perfect" outcome possible, the Redistribution Committee has failed to take the opportunity to make the appropriate changes that could lead to potentially a better outcome for this iteration and the longer term.

In my previous submission (specifically in my third model as previously submitted) I proposed changes that could potentially lead to better longer-term outcomes. Whilst my model has its own deficiencies and inadequacies, it attempted to demonstrate how a significant change to the boundaries could be made that could improve (better matching the redistribution criteria) immediately and over time as various areas grew and developed. Unfortunately the Redistribution Committee appears more intent on taking a path of least resistance and minimal change, which ultimately will exacerbate the current problems and issues with this and each subsequent redistribution.

Ongoing work commitments permitting, I would be prepared to present in person to the Augmented Redistribution Committee if desired.

Yours faithfully

Jonathon Reynolds