



Australian Electoral Commission

2009 Redistribution of Tasmania into Electoral Divisions

Commonwealth Electoral Act 1918
Section 75

© Commonwealth of Australia 2009

ISBN 978-1-921427-09-1

This work is copyright. Apart from any use as permitted under the *Copyright Act 1968*, no part may be reproduced by any process without prior written permission from the Commonwealth. Requests and inquiries concerning reproduction and rights should be addressed to the Commonwealth Copyright Administration, Attorney-General's Department, Robert Garran Offices, National Circuit, Canberra, ACT 2600 or posted at <http://www.ag.gov.au/cca>

Published by the Australian Electoral Commission
Printed by Union Offset Printers, Fyshwick, ACT

Contents

Part 1 Redistribution of Tasmania into Electoral Divisions

| | | |
|------------|---|----|
| 1.1 | Determination made by the augmented Electoral Commission for Tasmania. | 2 |
| 1.2 | Reasons for the determination made by the augmented Electoral Commission for Tasmania. | 3 |
| 1.3 | Statistical summary. | 13 |
| 1.4 | Description of the method used to calculate the areas of electoral divisions. | 14 |
| 1.5 | General description of each electoral division. | 15 |
| Appendix A | Composition of the augmented Electoral Commission for Tasmania and the Redistribution Committee for Tasmania. | 21 |
| Appendix B | List of objections lodged with the Australian Electoral Commission pursuant to section 69(1) of the <i>Commonwealth Electoral Act 1918</i> . | 22 |
| Appendix C | List of comments on objections lodged with the Australian Electoral Commission pursuant to section 69(3) of the <i>Commonwealth Electoral Act 1918</i> . | 23 |
| Appendix D | List of persons who appeared at the public inquiry into objections held by the augmented Electoral Commission for Tasmania in Hobart on 8 October 2008. | 24 |
| Appendix E | List of persons who appeared at the public inquiry into objections held by the augmented Electoral Commission for Tasmania in Devonport on 27 October 2008. | 25 |
| Appendix F | Guidelines for the naming of electoral divisions. | 26 |
| Appendix G | Redistribution timetable. | 28 |

Part 2

Enclosures

Redistribution statistics; public suggestions to the Redistribution Committee; comments on public suggestions; report – 2008 Proposed Redistribution of Tasmania into Electoral Divisions; public objections to the proposed redistribution; comments on public objections to the proposed redistribution; transcripts of the inquiries into public objections; PDF maps of electoral divisions.

CD

Composite map showing the boundaries of the electoral divisions for Tasmania as determined by the augmented Electoral Commission for Tasmania.

Paper map
(1 sheet)

PART 1

Redistribution of Tasmania into Electoral Divisions

16 February 2009

Commonwealth Electoral Act 1918
Sections 73 and 74

1.1 DETERMINATION MADE BY THE AUGMENTED ELECTORAL COMMISSION FOR TASMANIA

Pursuant to section 73 of the *Commonwealth Electoral Act 1918*, the augmented Electoral Commission for Tasmania hereby determines that the names and boundaries of the electoral divisions into which Tasmania is to be distributed are as shown on the maps certified by the members of the augmented Electoral Commission for Tasmania and lodged in file number 08/1150 at the National Office of the Australian Electoral Commission in Canberra. These maps are numbered in the following sequence:

| | |
|------------|----------|
| TAS01/2009 | Bass |
| TAS02/2009 | Braddon |
| TAS03/2009 | Denison |
| TAS04/2009 | Franklin |
| TAS05/2009 | Lyons |

The augmented Electoral Commission for Tasmania reached this determination on the basis that it determined the names and boundaries of the electoral divisions in Tasmania should be as proposed by the Redistribution Committee for Tasmania in its report published on 22 August 2008, subject to the following changes:

- (i) the Kentish local government area (LGA) shall be located in the Division of Lyons;
- (ii) the western part of the Latrobe LGA shall be located in the Division of Braddon in the manner shown on the relevant maps;
- (iii) the whole of the Clarence LGA shall be located in the Division of Franklin; and
- (iv) the whole of the locality of Gagebrook shall be located in the Division of Lyons.

J C S Burchett QC
Chairperson
augmented Electoral Commission
for Tasmania

1.2 REASONS FOR THE DETERMINATION MADE BY THE AUGMENTED ELECTORAL COMMISSION FOR TASMANIA

Representation of Tasmania in the House of Representatives

1. On 17 November 2005 the Electoral Commissioner made a determination of State and Territory entitlements to representation under section 48(1) of the *Commonwealth Electoral Act 1918* (the Electoral Act). Under the determination, and by virtue of section 24 of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia, Tasmania is entitled to five members of the House of Representatives.

Direction for a redistribution of Tasmanian electoral divisions

2. Section 59(1) of the Electoral Act provides that a redistribution shall commence whenever the Australian Electoral Commission (the Electoral Commission) so directs by notice published in the Commonwealth Government Gazette (the Gazette).
3. Section 59(2) of the Electoral Act provides that a direction to commence a redistribution shall be made if a period of seven years after the day on which the State or Territory was last distributed into electoral divisions has expired. If that expiry occurs within one year before the date of expiry of a House of Representatives by effluxion of time, section 59(4) provides that the direction shall be made within 30 days after the day of the first meeting of the next following House of Representatives.
4. The last distribution of Tasmania into electoral divisions was determined under section 73(1) of the Electoral Act on 11 February 2000. The Electoral Commission directed on 13 February 2008, by notice published in the Gazette, that a redistribution was to commence in Tasmania.
5. At the end of 13 February 2008, the day determined by the Electoral Commission for the redistribution to begin, the number of electors enrolled in Tasmania was 352 203.
6. Redistribution statistics which include the electoral enrolment figures as at 13 February 2008 were made available on the Australian Electoral Commission website. In addition, copies were available upon request at the Hobart office of the Australian Electoral Commission. The statistics were given at the following levels:
 - Census Collection District (CCD)
 - Statistical Local Area (SLA)
 - Electoral Division
 - State.

Quota

7. Under section 65(2) of the Electoral Act, the Electoral Commissioner determined that the quota of electors for Tasmania was 70 441 (352 203 divided by five members). The permitted range of the margin of allowance of 10% below and above the quota was 63 397 to 77 485 accordingly (Table 1). The Electoral Act does not permit any greater variation from the quota to be provided for in a redistribution.

Appointment of the Redistribution Committee for Tasmania

8. In accordance with section 60 of the Electoral Act, the Electoral Commission appointed the Redistribution Committee for Tasmania on 9 April 2008. The Redistribution Committee (the Committee) comprised the following members:

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Electoral Commissioner | Mr Ian Campbell |
| Australian Electoral Officer for Tasmania | Ms Marie Neilson |
| Surveyor-General, Tasmania | Mr Peter Murphy |
| Auditor-General, Tasmania | Mr Mike Blake |

Redistribution Committee's proposed redistribution

9. All preconditions having been met, the Committee made a proposed redistribution of Tasmania under section 66 of the Electoral Act, stating its reasons in writing; caused the notice required by section 68(1)(c) of the Electoral Act to be published in the Gazette on 22 August 2008; and took the other steps required by section 68.

Projected enrolment

10. In making its proposed redistribution, the Redistribution Committee was required by section 66(3) of the Electoral Act, as far as practicable, to endeavour to ensure that, if a redistribution proceeded in accordance with its proposal, the number of electors enrolled in each electoral division in Tasmania would not, at the projection time determined under section 63A, be less than 96.5% or more than 103.5% of the average divisional enrolment of the State at that time. Correspondingly, the augmented Electoral Commission is required by section 73(4), in making its determination by notice published in the Gazette under section 73(1), as far as practicable, to endeavour to ensure that the number of electors enrolled in each electoral division in Tasmania will not, at the projection time determined under section 63A, fall outside the same parameters. Section 63A, both for the purposes of the Redistribution Committee and for the purposes of the augmented Electoral Commission, fixes the projection time by reference to the time of making the determination which the augmented Electoral Commission is to make by notice published in the Gazette, that is to say, the date of gazettal; the projection time is the end of the period of 3 years and 6 months after that date.

11. By virtue of these provisions, it is necessary for the projection time (commonly referred to as “the projection date”) to be fixed early in the redistribution procedures, so that the appropriate calculations may be made, and when notices are given under section 64, persons wishing to make suggestions or comments may be able to take account of projected enrolments at the relevant time. For the redistribution of Tasmania, the Redistribution Committee and the augmented Commission have taken the projection time as being 15 August 2012 when, it has been calculated, the projected average divisional enrolment of Tasmania will be 73 007, yielding a permissible range for projected divisional enrolments of 70 452 to 75 562 (Table 1). But the augmented Commission has decided to make its determination, by notice published in the *Gazette*, on 16 February 2009, and the projection time, being the end of the period of 3 years and 6 months after the time of making the determination, is therefore 16 August 2012, not 15 August 2012. Nor could the augmented Commission have brought its determination forward to 15 February 2009, since that was a Sunday, when the *Gazette* is not published. However, the augmented Commission is satisfied that one day, or even two days, makes no material difference to the calculation of the projected enrolment figures in question, and its determination under section 73(1) is unaffected, except that it is made on the basis of the application of section 73(4) of the Electoral Act to the correct projection time calculated from the gazettal on 16 February 2009.

Objections and comments

12. A total of 49 objections and 9 comments on objections was received.

Augmented Electoral Commission

13. By section 70(1) of the Electoral Act there is established for the purposes of any such redistribution an augmented Electoral Commission for the relevant State or Territory. By virtue of section 70(2) the members of the augmented Electoral Commission for Tasmania (augmented Commission) were the Chairperson of the Electoral Commission (Hon James Burchett QC); the member of the Electoral Commission other than the Electoral Commissioner and the Chairperson (Mr Brian Pink, Australian Statistician); and the occupants of the positions previously mentioned who (or in the case of the acting Electoral Commissioner, Mr Paul Dacey until 4 January 2009, whose predecessor in office) were members of the Committee; except that from 5 January 2009 Mr Dacey upon ceasing to be a member of the augmented Electoral Commission, was replaced from that date by the Electoral Commissioner, Mr Edward Killesteyn, and except that from 5 January 2009 Ms Marie Neilson ceased to be a member of the augmented Electoral Commission, being replaced from that date by the acting Australian Electoral Officer for Tasmania, Mr Peter Weldon.

Public inquiry

14. The augmented Commission held a public inquiry into the objections in Hobart on 8 October 2008 and in Devonport on 27 October 2008. Arguments were presented on those occasions by six persons (at Hobart), and a further seven persons (at Devonport), and have been carefully considered by the augmented Commission, together with all the objections and comments. For further details, see Appendices D and E.

The statutory mandate of the augmented Electoral Commission

15. By section 73 of the Electoral Act, it is the augmented Electoral Commission for Tasmania which must determine, by notice published in the Gazette, the names and boundaries of the electoral divisions into which Tasmania is to be distributed. But that task must be performed in accordance with the requirements of section 73(4) and (4A), which provide:

“(4) In making the determination, the augmented Electoral Commission:

- (a) shall, as far as practicable, endeavour to ensure that the number of electors enrolled in each Electoral Division in the State or Territory will not, at the projection time determined under section 63A, be less than 96.5% or more than 103.5% of the average divisional enrolment of that State or Territory at that time; and*
- (b) subject to paragraph (a), shall give due consideration, in relation to each Electoral Division, to:*
 - (i) community of interests within the Electoral Division, including economic, social and regional interests;*
 - (ii) means of communication and travel within the Electoral Division;*
 - (iv) the physical features and area of the Electoral Division; and*
 - (v) the boundaries of existing Divisions in the State or Territory;*

and subject thereto the quota of electors for the State or Territory shall be the basis for the redistribution, and the augmented Electoral Commission may adopt a margin of allowance, to be used whenever necessary, but in no case shall the quota be departed from to a greater extent than one-tenth more or one-tenth less.

- (4A) When applying subsection (4), the augmented Electoral Commission must treat the matter in subparagraph (4)(b)(v) as subordinate to the matters in subparagraphs (4)(b)(i), (ii) and (iv).”*

16. These statutory requirements are expressed in an hierarchical order which puts, “as far as practicable”, the “endeavour to ensure” a division will fall within the projected enrolment range first; the considerations of “community of interests within [a division] including economic, social and regional interests”, “means of communication and travel within [a division]”, and “the physical features and area of [a division]” second; and “the boundaries of existing divisions” third – while stating that, subject to these matters, “the quota of electors for the State ... shall be the basis for the redistribution” and that “the augmented Electoral Commission may adopt a margin of allowance” not departing from the quota further than by one-tenth more or less.
17. The purpose of paragraph 4(a) is suggested by its history, over the period of which it has undergone some transformation since the *Commonwealth Electoral Legislation Amendment Act 1983* stipulated that boundaries were to be drawn, as far as practicable, to achieve equal numbers of electors in each of a State’s electorates three-and-a-half years after a redistribution. By 1984 “it was observed that the three-and-a-half year rule had in some areas forced the adoption, on purely numerical grounds, of boundaries which took little account of perceived community of interest”¹. Therefore, in 1987, the rule was relaxed, in order to permit a measure of tolerance, to plus or minus two percent from average projected enrolment. Subsequently, the Joint Standing Committee on Electoral Matters (JSCEM) concluded that “the numerical criteria do not allow ‘due consideration’, in the words of the Act, to be given to the qualitative factors. Rather, the political parties and others attempting to frame electoral boundaries essentially find themselves engaged in a mathematical modelling exercise. In order to relax the enrolment requirements to that extent necessary to allow a realistic degree of flexibility the Committee [JSCEM] recommends ... that subsections 66(3)(a) and 73(4)(a) of the Electoral Act be amended, so as to extend the variation from average divisional enrolment allowed three-and-a-half years after a redistribution from two to 3.5 percent.”² The JSCEM also, in the same report, refers to its recommended amendment as one that “would maintain substantial restrictions on malapportionment [and] would allow other legitimate policy objectives to be more effectively met”.
18. It was pursuant to this recommendation that the amendment was made by which paragraph 4(a) came to take its present form. The terms of the recommendation, and the discussion which preceded it, make clear the purpose of paragraph 4(a), as it now stands, and how it was intended to interact with the other criteria (ie the “other legitimate policy objectives”, as the JSCEM calls them) set out in the sub-paragraphs of paragraph 4(b), to which “due consideration” must be given. The augmented Commission has made its redistribution on this basis.

¹ Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Electoral Matters on *The Effectiveness and Appropriateness of the Redistribution Provisions of Parts III and IV of the Commonwealth Electoral Act 1918* (December 1995) Section 4.3

² Ibid. Section 4.11

Consideration of the Redistribution Committee's proposal and of objections, comments and arguments presented at the inquiry in Hobart and Devonport

The name of the Division of Denison

19. A number of objections and submissions argued that the augmented Commission should change the name of the Division of Denison to Clark or Inglis Clark. There is no doubt that, quite apart from his other services to Tasmania, Inglis Clark (Mr Justice Clark as he later became), along with the Tasmanian premier after whom the Division of Braddon was named, played an important role in the development of the Australian Constitution. Recognition of that role does not require the valuable services in the mid 19th century of Sir William Denison, as governor of Tasmania and later governor of New South Wales and governor-general of the Australian colonies, to be depreciated, especially not by judging them according to anachronistic standards of the 21st century.
20. The primary difficulty confronted by the argument for a change to the name of the division is that the augmented Commission is contemplating no substantial change to the boundaries of the division. It was otherwise when the matter was initially under consideration in the Committee. Major changes to Denison were then mooted. But, ultimately, the Committee rejected them, and the augmented Commission agrees with the Committee's decision in that respect.
21. So the question is whether the unusual step should be taken of changing the name of an effectively unchanged division. The augmented Commission has "an open discretion in the naming of divisions".³ But there are guidelines which, as the same report made clear, are followed "as a matter of practice". After an introductory paragraph referring to the development of the guidelines, their first substantive statement is:

"The guidelines are used in situations where divisions are to be created or where divisions are to be abolished during a redistribution process..."

It is not the practice to rename an unchanged division.
22. The guidelines contain two other rules of practice, which are pertinent:
 - "Every effort should be made to retain the names of original Federation Divisions."
 - "Names of Divisions should not be changed or transferred to new areas without very strong reasons."

³ Ibid. Section 8.7

23. As to these, it was suggested no Tasmanian division bears the name of an original federation division because none was defined and named at the time of the first federal election in 1901, which was therefore held in Tasmania on a State-wide basis. But as soon as divisions were defined and named, before the second federal election, the name Denison was bestowed on the Division of Denison as it then stood, ie in 1903. The name was therefore, in a quite meaningful sense, the name of an original federation division in Tasmania. But it is inappropriate, in any case, to construe guidelines too strictly, or as statutes have sometimes been erroneously construed, in a narrowly semantic way. It can at least be said it would be contrary to the spirit of the guidelines to change this name “without very strong reasons”. And it should be added that there are also other provisions of the guidelines which indicate the basis of a change of name contemplated by them is the creation of “new Divisions” or a situation where “two or more Divisions are partially combined”.
24. Whatever may have been the position before the guidelines were developed, or before 1995, the “practice” of utilising the guidelines has been followed by successive augmented Commissions. To cite the latest example, the report of the augmented Commission for Western Australia last year introduced a discussion of whether the names previously borne by two divisions should be reviewed as follows:
- “In the light of the extent of the changes made to [their] boundaries...”
25. Acknowledging, as the augmented Commission does, that it has an open discretion, it will exercise that discretion, not arbitrarily, but in a principled way, accepting the assistance offered by the guidelines in the particular circumstances.
26. In the present circumstances, the augmented Commission considers it is very important not to disturb a familiar and long accepted divisional name, given that there is a complete absence of the kind of trigger contemplated by the guidelines. In the exercise of its discretion, it adopts the broad view that a name should not be changed in isolation from other changes affecting the division concerned. To act otherwise would be to introduce a very undesirable precedent for future redistributions.
27. The augmented Commission has decided to retain the divisional name Denison.

The proposed Braddon/Lyons boundaries

28. A significant proportion of the objections were concerned with the proposed transfer of the Latrobe LGA into the Division of Lyons. At the public inquiry the augmented Commission heard submissions in support of and opposing the proposal.
29. Crucially, the augmented Commission agreed with the Committee’s reasoning favouring a transfer of the West Coast LGA to Braddon. The augmented Commission concurred with the Committee’s finding that the West Coast LGA shares a strong community of interests with its neighbouring councils to the north.

30. But the augmented Commission was also persuaded of the truth of the position put that the Latrobe LGA similarly shares a strong community of interests with its neighbouring councils to the west. However, the augmented Commission was conscious of the numerical constraints imposed by the Electoral Act which made it impossible for the Latrobe LGA to be wholly accommodated within the Division of Braddon together with the West Coast LGA.
31. Very little comment resulted from the Committee's proposal to move the Kentish LGA into Braddon. The Cradle Coast Authority's objection, while welcoming the inclusion of Kentish, noted that the consequential removal of Latrobe "effectively negates the significant community of interests benefits of adding . . . Kentish . . . to Braddon". At the Devonport hearing, Mr Gaffney and Mr Monson noted that Kentish shares a stronger community of interests with other LGAs in Lyons, by virtue of sharing some tourism links, than does Latrobe.
32. The augmented Commission accepted the arguments put that the Kentish LGA does share a stronger community of interests with Lyons than does Latrobe, so as to provide a ground for retaining it in Lyons rather than affirming the transfer of the whole of Latrobe to Lyons.
33. To the conclusions noted in the four preceding paragraphs, the augmented Commission, taking into account all the material before it, added the conclusion that a strong community of interests exists between Braddon and the more urbanised parts of the Latrobe LGA. Having regard to and balancing all of these conclusions, and in all the circumstances, the augmented Commission concluded that the West Coast LGA should, as the Committee proposed, be transferred to Braddon; that the Kentish LGA should be retained in Lyons; and that the western part of the Latrobe LGA, including the township of Latrobe, should be retained in Braddon, but the more rural eastern part of the LGA should be transferred to Lyons.

The proposed Franklin/Lyons boundaries

34. The augmented Commission noted objections to the proposed boundary between Lyons and Franklin at the margins of the Clarence LGA and within the Brighton LGA at Bridgewater/Gagebrook. The number of electors in each of the affected areas is similar.
35. The augmented Commission was persuaded by arguments that the Richmond township shares a strong community of interests with the remainder of the Clarence LGA, and that the townships of Bridgewater and Gagebrook also share a strong community of interests. The logic of these conclusions was not displaced, in the augmented Commission's opinion, by countervailing considerations.
36. The augmented Commission therefore decided to transfer the locality of Gagebrook into Lyons, thereby joining it with the neighbouring locality of Bridgewater, and at the same time to unite the whole of the Clarence LGA in Franklin by aligning the northern boundary of Franklin with the Clarence LGA boundary at Richmond.

Other questions

37. The remaining objections and submissions were concerned with minor boundary changes, involving small numbers of electors. The augmented Commission decided to adopt the boundaries proposed by the Committee in each case, and subject to the particular matters expressly discussed in these reasons, it agreed generally with the proposal made by the Committee.

Whether the augmented Electoral Commission's proposal is "significantly different" from the Redistribution Committee's proposal

38. The augmented Commission's decision to propose to determine the names and boundaries of the divisions into which the State of Tasmania is to be distributed, by affirming the Committee's proposal subject to the stated variations, leaves a further question outstanding under section 72(12) of the Electoral Act. This question is whether, "in the opinion of the augmented Electoral Commission", its proposal is "significantly different" from that of the Committee.
39. Whether the proposals are significantly different is to be decided in the light of the nature of the Committee's proposal, to which the changes made by the augmented Commission relate. The Committee attempted to reflect the various communities of interests involved, as well as the other factors set out in the Electoral Act, in ways that redrew, to quite a considerable extent, the divisional map of Tasmania.
40. The augmented Commission accepted the broad thrust of the Committee's proposals, but made a relatively small adjustment to the boundary between the divisions of Franklin and Lyons to retain the link between two localities outside Hobart, and, more importantly, restored the LGA of Latrobe (but not entirely) to the Division of Braddon. At the same time, in order to meet the test of the projected numbers, it was unavoidable to restore the Kentish LGA to the Division of Lyons. But the crucial proposal of the Committee to accept the case of the West Coast region for inclusion in the Division of Braddon was adhered to. While the communities of interests at stake in Latrobe were, it appears, held tenaciously by the electors living in that area, and were acknowledged by the decision, and those in the Kentish LGA were also of real concern, in the context of the changes virtually across Tasmania, the variations made by the augmented Commission ought not to be regarded as significant. On the issue of the name of Denison, which attracted a number of objections and submissions, the augmented Commission accepted the Committee's proposal. Substantially, the way the Committee proposed to effect the redistribution has been adopted, although with some variations.
41. The augmented Electoral Commission for Tasmania is of the opinion that the proposal now adopted by it is not significantly different within the meaning of section 72(12) of the Electoral Act from the proposal of the Redistribution Committee, and the augmented Commission has so determined.

Determination made by the augmented Electoral Commission for Tasmania

42. For the foregoing reasons stated under section 74 of the Electoral Act, the augmented Commission, having considered all objections, comments and submissions, made the determination, the terms of which are set out above, by notice published in the Gazette on the 16th day of February 2009. The augmented Commission had issued on 28 November 2008 a public announcement in compliance with section 72(10) and (12) of the Electoral Act. As a consequence of the opinion stated in paragraph 41 there was no occasion for the augmented Commission to issue the invitation or to hold the further inquiry referred to in section 72(12)(d) and (13) of the Electoral Act.

James Burchett
Chairperson

Edward Killesteyn
Member

Brian Pink
Member

Peter Weldon
Member

Peter Murphy
Member

Mike Blake
Member

augmented Electoral Commission for Tasmania
16 February 2009

1.3 STATISTICAL SUMMARY

STATISTICAL SUMMARY AND GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE MANNER IN WHICH EACH PROPOSED DIVISION HAS BEEN CONSTITUTED

Table 1: Determination of the Quota and Enrolment Projections

| DETERMINATION OF QUOTA | |
|--|---------|
| Number of divisions into which Tasmania is to be distributed | 5 |
| Number of electors in Tasmania at 13 February 2008 | 352 203 |
| Quota for Tasmania | 70 441 |
| Permissible maximum number of electors (+10%) in a division | 77 485 |
| Permissible minimum number of electors (-10%) in a division | 63 397 |
| ENROLMENT PROJECTIONS AT 15 AUGUST 2012 | |
| Projected number of electors in Tasmania | 365 034 |
| Average enrolment for Tasmania | 73 007 |
| 103.5% of average enrolment projected | 75 562 |
| 96.5% of average enrolment projected | 70 452 |
| ENROLMENT PROJECTIONS AT 16 AUGUST 2012 | |
| Projected number of electors in Tasmania | 365 041 |
| Average enrolment for Tasmania | 73 008 |
| 103.5% of average enrolment projected | 75 563 |
| 96.5% of average enrolment projected | 70 453 |

Table 2: Summary of Divisions

| Division | Actual Enrolment 13 Feb 2008 | Variance % (Average) | Projected Enrolment 15 August 2012 | Variance % (Projected) | Projected Enrolment 16 August 2012 | Variance % (Projected) | Approximate Area (sq km) |
|-----------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|--|---------------------------|--|---------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Bass | 71 084 | 0.91 | 73 250 | 0.33 | 73 250 | 0.33 | 7 378.75 |
| Braddon | 71 294 | 1.21 | 72 936 | -0.10 | 72 936 | -0.10 | 20 826.18 |
| Denison | 71 085 | 0.91 | 72 594 | -0.57 | 72 595 | -0.57 | 288.72 |
| Franklin | 68 550 | -2.68 | 71 745 | -1.73 | 71 749 | -1.72 | 6 514.21 |
| Lyons | 70 190 | -0.36 | 74 509 | 2.06 | 74 511 | 2.06 | 32 910.62 |
| Tasmania | 352 203 | | 365 034 | | 365 041 | | 67 918.48 |

Table 3: Summary of Movement of Electors between Divisions

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Number of electors remaining in their existing division | 336 370 |
| Number of electors transferred to another division (This results in 4.5% electors moving divisions) | 15 833 |
| TOTAL | 352 203 |

1.4 DESCRIPTION OF THE METHOD USED TO CALCULATE THE AREAS OF ELECTORAL DIVISIONS

The areas of electoral divisions in Tasmania has been calculated by aggregating the area of:

- all land-based CCDs;
- any parts of land-based CCDs; and
- any lakes ponds rivers creeks wetlands or marshes not already included in land-based CCDs that are wholly contained within the divisional boundary of each electoral division.

Areas are calculated on the geocentric datum of Australia (GDA94) spheroid using the AEC Electoral Boundary Mapping System (EBMS) developed within the proprietary “MapInfo Professional” software package.

1.5 GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF EACH ELECTORAL DIVISION

The tables on the following pages set out how each electoral division is constituted and arranged under SLAs. Each SLA comprises a number of CCDs. The CCDs which applied at the 2006 Census of Population and Housing have been used.

Division 1: Bass

| How constituted | Actual enrolment 13.02.08 | Projected enrolment 15/16.08.12 |
|--|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| SLAs received from the existing Division of Bass | | |
| Dorset (M) | 5 261 | 5 212 |
| Flinders (M) | 685 | 682 |
| George Town (M) – Pt A | 3 915 | 3 954 |
| George Town (M) – Pt B | 774 | 792 |
| Launceston (C) – Inner | 191 | 192 |
| Launceston (C) – Pt B | 43 305 | 44 580 |
| Launceston (C) – Pt C | 2 145 | 2 107 |
| Meander Valley (M) – Pt A | 4 864 | 5 289 |
| West Tamar (M) – Pt A | 8 422 | 8 780 |
| Total from the existing Division of Bass | 69 562 | 71 588 |
| SLAs received from the existing Division of Lyons | | |
| Launceston (C) – Pt B | 226 | 236 |
| Meander Valley (M) – Pt A | 1 296 | 1 426 |
| West Tamar (M) – Pt A | 0 | 0 |
| Total received from the existing Division of Lyons | 1 522 | 1 662 |
| Total for the Division of Bass | 71 084 | 73 250 |

Division 2: Braddon

| How constituted | Actual enrolment 13.02.08 | Projected enrolment 15/16.08.12 |
|---|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| SLAs received from the existing Division of Braddon | | |
| Burnie (C) – Pt A | 12 470 | 12 990 |
| Burnie (C) – Pt B | 1 492 | 1 585 |
| Central Coast (M) – Pt A | 13 677 | 14 086 |
| Central Coast (M) – Pt B | 2 239 | 2 269 |
| Circular Head (M) | 5 576 | 5 563 |
| Devonport (C) | 18 001 | 18 222 |
| King Island (M) | 1 184 | 1 165 |
| Latrobe (M) – Pt A | 3 076 | 3 225 |
| Latrobe (M) – Pt B | 136 | 141 |
| Waratah/Wynyard (M) – Pt A | 8 345 | 8 618 |
| Waratah/Wynyard (M) – Pt B | 1 704 | 1 775 |
| Total from the existing Division of Braddon | 67 900 | 69 639 |
| SLAs received from the existing Division of Lyons | | |
| West Coast (M) | 3 394 | 3 297 |
| Total received from the existing Division of Lyons | 3 394 | 3 297 |
| Total for the Division of Braddon | 71 294 | 72 936 |
| SLAs transferred to the Division of Lyons | | |
| Latrobe (M) – Pt A | 3 156 | 3 430 |
| Latrobe (M) – Pt B | 421 | 461 |
| Total transferred to the Division of Lyons | 3 577 | 3 891 |

Division 3: Division of Denison

| How constituted | Actual enrolment 13.02.08 | Projected enrolment 15.08.12 | Projected enrolment 16.08.12 |
|---|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| SLAs received from the existing Division of Denison | | | |
| Glenorchy (C) | 31 792 | 31 842 | 31 843 |
| Hobart (C) – Inner | 300 | 319 | 319 |
| Hobart (C) – Remainder | 34 769 | 36 001 | 36 001 |
| Kingborough (M) – Pt A | 2 422 | 2 459 | 2 459 |
| Total from the existing Division of Denison | 69 283 | 70 621 | 70 622 |
| SLAs received from the existing Division of Franklin | | | |
| Kingborough (M) – Pt A | 1 802 | 1 973 | 1 973 |
| Total received from the existing Division of Franklin | 1 802 | 1 973 | 1 973 |
| Total for the Division of Denison | 71 085 | 72 594 | 72 595 |

Division 4: Franklin

| How constituted | Actual enrolment 13.02.08 | Projected enrolment 15.08.12 | Projected enrolment 16.08.12 |
|--|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| SLAs received from the existing Division of Franklin | | | |
| Brighton (M) | 1 804 | 2 068 | 2 068 |
| Clarence (C) | 36 124 | 37 187 | 37 188 |
| Huon Valley (M) | 10 252 | 10 802 | 10 802 |
| Kingborough (M) – Pt A | 16 800 | 17 970 | 17 972 |
| Kingborough (M) – Pt B | 2 143 | 2 219 | 2 220 |
| Total from the existing Division of Franklin | 67 123 | 70 246 | 70 250 |
| SLAs received from the existing Division of Lyons | | | |
| Brighton (M) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Clarence (C) | 1 427 | 1 499 | 1 499 |
| Total received from the existing Division of Lyons | 1 427 | 1 499 | 1 499 |
| Total for the Division of Franklin | 68 550 | 71 745 | 71 749 |
| SLAs transferred to the Division of Denison | | | |
| Kingborough (M) – Pt A | 1 802 | 1 973 | 1 973 |
| Total transferred to the Division of Denison | 1 802 | 1 973 | 1 973 |
| SLAs transferred to the Division of Lyons | | | |
| Brighton (M) | 4 111 | 4 262 | 4 262 |
| Derwent Valley (M) – Pt B | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total transferred to the Division of Lyons | 4 111 | 4 262 | 4 262 |

Division 5: Lyons

| How constituted | Actual enrolment 13.02.08 | Projected enrolment 15.08.12 | Projected enrolment 16.08.12 |
|--|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| SLAs received from the existing Division of Lyons | | | |
| Break O'Day (M) | 4 613 | 4 878 | 4 878 |
| Brighton (M) | 3 545 | 4 097 | 4 097 |
| Central Highlands (M) | 1 719 | 1 681 | 1 681 |
| Derwent Valley (M) – Pt A | 4 712 | 4 962 | 4 962 |
| Derwent Valley (M) – Pt B | 1 988 | 2 095 | 2 095 |
| Glamorgan/Spring Bay (M) | 3 306 | 3 501 | 3 502 |
| Kentish (M) | 4 188 | 4 471 | 4 471 |
| Meander Valley (M) – Pt B | 7 442 | 7 645 | 7 645 |
| Northern Midlands (M) – Pt A | 5 536 | 5 905 | 5 905 |
| Northern Midlands (M) – Pt B | 3 413 | 3 507 | 3 507 |
| Sorell (M) – Pt A | 8 189 | 9 045 | 9 045 |
| Sorell (M) – Pt B | 741 | 795 | 795 |
| Southern Midlands (M) | 4 195 | 4 345 | 4 345 |
| Tasman (M) | 1 791 | 1 850 | 1 850 |
| West Tamar (M) – Pt A | 5 755 | 6 104 | 6 105 |
| West Tamar (M) – Pt B | 1 369 | 1 475 | 1 475 |
| Total from the existing Division of Lyons | 62 502 | 66 356 | 66 358 |
| SLAs received from the existing Division of Braddon | | | |
| Latrobe (M) – Pt A | 3 156 | 3 430 | 3 430 |
| Latrobe (M) – Pt B | 421 | 461 | 461 |
| Total received from the existing Division of Braddon | 3 577 | 3 891 | 3 891 |
| SLAs received from the existing Division of Franklin | | | |
| Brighton (M) | 4 111 | 4 262 | 4 262 |
| Derwent Valley (M) – Pt B | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total received from the existing Division of Franklin | 4 111 | 4 262 | 4 262 |
| Total for the Division of Lyons | 70 190 | 74 509 | 74 511 |

| How constituted | Actual enrolment 13.02.08 | Projected enrolment 15.08.12 | Projected enrolment 16.08.12 |
|--|--|---|---|
| SLAs transferred to the Division of Bass | | | |
| Launceston (C) – Pt B | 226 | 236 | 236 |
| Meander Valley (M) – Pt B | 1 296 | 1 426 | 1 426 |
| West Tamar (M) – Pt B | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total transferred to the Division of Bass | 1 522 | 1 662 | 1 662 |
| SLAs transferred to the Division of Braddon | | | |
| West Coast (M) | 3 394 | 3 297 | 3 297 |
| Total transferred to the Division of Braddon | 3 394 | 3 297 | 3 297 |
| SLAs transferred to the Division of Franklin | | | |
| Brighton (M) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Clarence (C) | 1 427 | 1 499 | 1 499 |
| Total transferred to the Division of Franklin | 1 427 | 1 499 | 1 499 |

APPENDIX A: COMPOSITION OF THE AUGMENTED ELECTORAL COMMISSION FOR TASMANIA AND THE REDISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE FOR TASMANIA

Members of the augmented Electoral Commission for Tasmania

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Hon. James Burchett, QC | Chairperson of the Australian Electoral Commission |
| Mr Paul Dacey | Acting Electoral Commissioner (until 4 January 2009 and thereafter, the Electoral Commissioner, Mr Edward Killesteyn) |
| Mr Brian Pink | Australian Statistician |
| Ms Marie Neilson | Australian Electoral Officer for Tasmania (until 4 January 2009 and thereafter, the acting Australian Electoral Commissioner, Mr Peter Weldon) |
| Mr Peter Murphy | Surveyor-General, Tasmania |
| Mr Mike Blake | Auditor-General, Tasmania |

Members of the Redistribution Committee for Tasmania

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Mr Ian Campbell | Electoral Commissioner |
| Ms Marie Neilson | Australian Electoral Officer for Tasmania |
| Mr Peter Murphy | Surveyor-General, Tasmania |
| Mr Mike Blake | Auditor-General, Tasmania. |

**APPENDIX B: LIST OF OBJECTIONS LODGED WITH THE
AUSTRALIAN ELECTORAL COMMISSION
PURSUANT TO SECTION 69(1) OF THE
COMMONWEALTH ELECTORAL ACT 1918**

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| 1. Ms Ceridwen Davies | 26. Ms Tracy Nutting |
| 2. Mr Bob Holderness-Roddam | 27. Australian Labor Party |
| 3. Mr Martin Gordon | 28. Mr Grant Atkins |
| 4. Ms Rachel Fanning | 29. Mr Brian Dowse |
| 5. Mr Rob Valentine | 30. Mr Russell Broomhall |
| 6. Mr Colin Berry | 31. Mr John Biggs |
| 7. Mr Paul Fenton | 32. Mr Bob Holderness-Roddam |
| 8. Mr John Gale | 33. Miss Rondaleen Cockshutt |
| 9. Mrs Carolin Parremore | 34. Latrobe Council |
| 10. Ms Wendy Stothers | 35. Mr Colvin R Smith |
| 11. Mrs Mary and Mr Wolfgang Purins | 36. Mr Garry Sims |
| 12. Mr Gordon Goward | 37. Mr Peter Maloney |
| 13. Alderman Doug Chipman | 38. Mrs Sandra Suitor |
| 14. Mrs Zofia Pilimon | 39. Lyons Greens |
| 15. Mr Steve Martin JP | 40. Mr Charles Radford OAM |
| 16. Mr AR and Mrs TA Day | 41. Mr Corey James Peterson |
| 17. Mr Ian and Mrs Avis Finch | 42. Mr Ian Duncan |
| 18. Ms Norma Jamieson MLC | 43. Alderman Helen Burnet |
| 19. Mr John Carr | 44. Ms Elizabeth Perey |
| 20. Jordan River Service Inc | 45. Mr James Walker |
| 21. Mrs Jan and Mr Daryl Carr | 46. Devonport City Council |
| 22. Mr Peter Schulze | 47. Ms Glenda West |
| 23. Mr Kem Perkins OAM | 48. Liberal Party of Australia (Tasmanian Division) |
| 24. Mr Jeffrey F Matthews | 49. Cradle Coast Authority |
| 25. Mr Peter D Jones | |

A copy of the objections is included on the CD enclosed with this Report.

**APPENDIX C: LIST OF COMMENTS ON OBJECTIONS
LODGED WITH THE AUSTRALIAN ELECTORAL
COMMISSION PURSUANT TO SECTION 69(3) OF
THE COMMONWEALTH ELECTORAL ACT 1918**

1. Mr Peter Tucker
2. Mr Bob Holderness-Roddam
3. West Coast Council
4. Mr Peter Reid
5. Australian Labor Party
6. Mr Brian Mitchell
7. Latrobe Council
8. Ms Cassy O'Connor, MP
9. Mr James Walker

A copy of the comments on objections is included on the CD enclosed with this Report.

**APPENDIX D: LIST OF PERSONS WHO APPEARED AT THE
PUBLIC INQUIRY INTO OBJECTIONS HELD BY
THE AUGMENTED ELECTORAL COMMISSION
FOR TASMANIA, HOBART, 8 OCTOBER 2008**

1. Mr Bob Holderness-Roddam
2. The Hon Duncan Kerr SC MP
3. Mr John Dowling
4. Mr Jonathan Hawkes
5. Mr James Walker
6. Alderman Helen Burnet

A copy of the transcript of the inquiry is included on the CD enclosed with this Report.

**APPENDIX E: LIST OF PERSONS WHO APPEARED AT
THE PUBLIC INQUIRY INTO OBJECTIONS
HELD BY THE AUGMENTED ELECTORAL
COMMISSION FOR TASMANIA, DEVONPORT,
27 OCTOBER 2008**

1. Mr Brian Dowse
2. Cr Mike Gaffney
3. Mr Gerald Monson
4. Mr Kem Perkins OAM
5. Mr Roger Jaensch
6. Cr Darryl Gerrity
7. Mr Grant Atkins

A copy of the transcript of the inquiry is included on the CD enclosed with this Report.

APPENDIX F: GUIDELINES FOR THE NAMING OF ELECTORAL DIVISIONS

Naming of Federal Divisions has been the subject of a number of recommendations from Parliamentary Committees. The subject was dealt with most recently by the 1995 Inquiry of the Joint Standing Committee on Electoral Matters. From these recommendations, a set of guidelines or conventions has been developed and these are referred to by Redistribution Committees and augmented Electoral Commissions.

The guidelines are used in situations where divisions are to be created or where divisions are to be abolished during a redistribution process and are offered to interested persons in the advertising of redistributions.

It should be noted that neither Redistribution Committees nor augmented Electoral Commissions are in any way bound by the guidelines, which are reproduced below.

Naming after persons

In the main, Divisions should be named after deceased Australians who have rendered outstanding service to their country. When new Divisions are created the names of former Prime Ministers should be considered.

Federation Divisional names

Every effort should be made to retain the names of original Federation Divisions.

Geographical names

Locality or place names should generally be avoided, but in certain areas the use of geographical features may be appropriate (eg Perth, Kalgoorlie).

Aboriginal names

Aboriginal names should be used where appropriate and as far as possible existing Aboriginal Divisional names should be retained.

Other criteria

- The names of Commonwealth Divisions should not duplicate existing State Districts.
- Qualifying names may be used where appropriate (eg Melbourne Ports, Port Adelaide).
- Names of Divisions should not be changed or transferred to new areas without very strong reasons.
- When two or more Divisions are partially combined, as far as possible the name of the new Division should be that of the old Division which had the greatest number of electors within the new boundaries. However, where the socio-demographic nature of the Division in question has changed significantly, this should override the numerical formula.

APPENDIX G: REDISTRIBUTION TIMETABLE

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| 13 February 2008 | Direction for Tasmania to be redistributed |
| 19 February 2008 | Quota of electors determined |
| 26 March 2008 | Public suggestions and comments on public suggestions invited |
| 9 April 2008 | Redistribution Committee appointed |
| 28 April 2008 | Public suggestions closed |
| 9 May 2008 | Public comments on suggestions closed |
| 22 August 2008 | Redistribution Committee for Tasmania gave notice in the Gazette of its proposal |
| 19 September 2008 | Objections closed |
| 3 October 2008 | Comments on objections closed |
| 8 October 2008 | Inquiry into objections to the proposed redistribution (Hobart) |
| 27 October 2008 | Inquiry into objections to the proposed redistribution (Devonport) |
| 28 November 2008 | Public announcement of the decision of the augmented Electoral Commission for Tasmania |
| 16 February 2009 | Determination of names and boundaries |