
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

—
Jonathon Reynolds