Submission S41

Caitlin Gardner

From: [redacted]
To: FedRedistribution - QLD
Subject: [Redistribution QLD - Submission] *WWW* [SEC=OFFICIAL]
Date: Tuesday, 13 October 2026 4:20:25 AM
Attachments: [Redistribution]-Submission--Caitlin Gardner.pdf

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Australian Federal Government. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Form submitted: 13/10/2026 05:19 AM

, Caitlin Gardner - Redistribution QLD - Submission

Personal details

Name:	Caitlin Gardner
Organisation:	
Email:	[redacted]

Submission details

Submission:	Names and Boundaries
Details:	I think that we should be extending train lines out through the electorate regions. I say this as someone who has lived in WA, SA, VIC, NSW and QLD. Trams are amazing as well, but we are so isolated where I am in Toowoomba. We are the same distance from the city as the Gold Coast. We should be able to jump on a train at a whim and go to the city for the day. Also I would like to request that Email and text be considered as vital form of communication as a phone call. We used to do things by Morse code without a phone. You have the date, time and name of the person you are emailing automatically filed in your email. You can

search for one single word, and find the conversation. I feel email is more sensible that a phone call for the above reasons, and more.

I have been rejected for help by the government for choosing not to consent to making a phone call.
Written using the free version of Chat GPT. If you have any questions, you can upload or copy and paste my submission to chat gpt, and then ask it to elaborate on any section.

As to names I would automatically love to have areas named after places in the Bible, or names from the bible. Having places named after the areas that are suffereing from war in the Middle East may spark curiosity, and it might get people to search up where we would be in relation to the wars. I believe Persia is currently being destroyed, which was in the bible. It is sacred land.

Maybe like Plants have a scientific name and English name, we could have an English name and an Indigeneous name for each region.

PROPOSED REDISTRIBUTION OF QUEENSLAND'S 30 FEDERAL ELECTORATES

A planning framework for population balance, regional representation, practical travel and communication access

Prepared: 13 October 2026

Purpose: to set out a transparent, non-partisan framework for reviewing Queensland's federal electorate boundaries. This is a proposal for consideration, not an official Australian Electoral Commission boundary plan.

Prepared for public discussion and possible submission to the Australian Electoral Commission (AEC)

1. Purpose and status of this proposal

This document proposes a structured way to assess Queensland's 30 federal electorates during a redistribution. It aims to balance enrolment numbers with the practical realities of representing communities across a large state. It is intended as a planning and consultation framework, not a final map or a claim that particular suburbs must move between electorates.

Important limitation: the electorate figures below are reproduced from the figures used in the earlier draft of this proposal and should be checked against the latest AEC material before formal submission. No suburb-by-suburb or Statistical Area Level 1 (SA1) boundary transfers have been calculated for this document. Accordingly, the review zones and actions are recommendations for investigation rather than verified boundary changes.

2. Electoral quota and enrolment figures to verify

The earlier draft used the following figures: current quota 127,259; current statutory range 114,534–139,984; projected quota at 27 August 2028 of 132,526; and a projected range of 127,888–137,164 as far as practicable. These figures should be confirmed against the AEC's official quota and enrolment-data pages before relying on them.

The AEC's redistribution process must comply with the Commonwealth Electoral Act. Population equality is important, but the statutory considerations also include community of interest, means of communication and travel, physical features, and existing boundaries where relevant.

3. Queensland electorate enrolment snapshot

The following table reproduces the projected enrolment snapshot used in the earlier draft. Percentages are relative to the projected quota used in that draft; verify all values with the AEC before submission.

Electorate	Projected enrolment	Difference from projected quota
Blair	157,342	+18.73%
Bonner	117,450	–11.38%
Bowman	129,421	–2.34%
Brisbane	133,341	+0.61%
Capricornia	121,630	–8.22%
Dawson	122,150	–7.83%
Dickson	124,841	–5.80%
Fadden	146,349	+10.43%
Fairfax	138,602	+4.58%
Fisher	153,731	+16.00%
Flynn	124,442	–6.10%
Forde	149,098	+12.50%
Griffith	129,371	–2.38%
Groom	126,667	–4.42%
Herbert	128,270	–3.21%
Hinkler	136,398	+2.92%
Kennedy	130,523	–1.51%
Leichhardt	130,809	–1.30%
Lilley	122,571	–7.51%
Longman	156,827	+18.34%
McPherson	127,590	–3.72%
Maranoa	120,748	–8.89%

Electorate	Projected enrolment	Difference from projected quota
Moncrieff	133,259	+0.55%
Moreton	113,083	–14.67%
Oxley	129,999	–1.91%
Petrie	143,120	+7.99%
Rankin	121,280	–8.49%
Ryan	118,545	–10.55%
Wide Bay	129,468	–2.31%
Wright	158,859	+19.87%

Interpretation: the figures are a starting point for identifying where detailed boundary modelling may be needed. A percentage outside a preferred range does not by itself determine which streets or communities should be transferred.

4. Six regional review zones

Brisbane metropolitan area

Review Brisbane, Griffith, Lilley, Ryan, Moreton, Oxley and adjacent boundaries for population balance, community ties, transport corridors and practical electorate-office access.

Moreton Bay and northern growth corridor

Review Dickson, Longman, Petrie, Forde and nearby boundaries against current and forecast housing growth, transport links and shared community services.

Sunshine Coast and Wide Bay

Review Fairfax, Fisher, Wide Bay and neighbouring boundaries to maintain coherent coastal and hinterland communities while addressing enrolment differences.

Toowoomba, Darling Downs and inland growth

Review Groom, Maranoa, Wright and Blair interfaces with attention to Toowoomba’s regional connections, growth areas, rural service centres and the distances involved in representation.

Gold Coast and Logan

Review Fadden, Moncrieff, McPherson, Forde, Rankin and nearby boundaries in light of growth, transport corridors and community connections.

Central, North and Far North Queensland

Review Capricornia, Dawson, Flynn, Herbert, Kennedy, Leichhardt and Hinkler, recognising long travel distances, remote communities, coastal geography and regional service networks.

5. Electorate-by-electorate review instructions

Electorate	Recommended review focus
Blair	Review growth and boundary relationships with adjacent regional and outer-metropolitan communities; test whether population can be balanced without splitting established communities.
Bonner	Investigate the enrolment shortfall and possible boundary adjustments that preserve connected Brisbane bayside communities and practical access.
Bowman	Check the balance between population, bayside community identity, transport links and neighbouring electorate boundaries.
Brisbane	Maintain coherent inner-city communities and account for population change, transport networks and access to electorate services.
Capricornia	Review regional population balance while protecting links among coastal, rural and central Queensland service communities.
Dawson	Consider long-distance representation, regional service networks, transport and communication links when modelling any boundary changes.
Dickson	Review the northern metropolitan boundary against growth, community connections and neighbouring enrolments.
Fadden	Test options to reduce projected enrolment pressure while keeping local communities and transport corridors together where practicable.
Fairfax	Assess coastal and hinterland community ties, population forecasts and connections to neighbouring Sunshine Coast electorates.
Fisher	Review projected growth and potential adjustments that avoid unnecessary division of connected Sunshine Coast communities.
Flynn	Balance enrolment with regional geography, travel times, and links between towns and service centres.
Forde	Examine growth and connections across the Logan–Gold Coast and surrounding corridor; avoid separating closely linked communities without good reason.
Griffith	Review inner-south Brisbane community ties, local transport and population balance at adjoining boundaries.
Groom	Protect Toowoomba's coherent representation and its regional links while testing options to address enrolment balance across neighbouring seats.
Herbert	Consider Townsville's community connections, regional service access and practical travel for representation.
Hinkler	Review Bundaberg and surrounding community links, regional travel and population forecasts.
Kennedy	Give particular attention to geographic scale, remote communities, road and air connections, telecommunications and realistic access to electorate services.
Leichhardt	Account for the distance between communities, coastal and island geography, remote settlements, transport options and communication access.
Lilley	Review northern Brisbane community ties, public transport and the relationship with neighbouring metropolitan boundaries.
Longman	Investigate projected enrolment pressure with careful attention to connected Moreton Bay communities and growth patterns.
McPherson	Review population balance and Gold Coast community links, including transport corridors and practical representation access.
Maranoa	Consider the very large geographic area, rural and remote service centres, road travel, mobile coverage and communication alternatives.
Moncrieff	Review population balance while preserving coherent central Gold Coast communities and local access.
Moreton	Investigate the projected enrolment shortfall and possible adjustments that preserve connected southern Brisbane communities.
Oxley	Review population balance, local community ties and transport links with adjacent western and southern Brisbane areas.
Petrie	Assess growth and boundary options in the northern metropolitan corridor while keeping connected communities together.
Rankin	Review population balance and community links across the Logan area, including transport and service networks.
Ryan	Consider western Brisbane community ties, population forecasts, transport connections and accessible electorate services.
Wide Bay	Review rural, coastal and regional service-centre connections, travel distances and forecast population change.

Electorate	Recommended review focus
Wright	Investigate projected enrolment pressure and the relationship between inland growth communities and neighbouring electorates.

6. Communication and accessibility within each electorate

Communication and access should be an explicit part of the boundary review. The aim is not to promise that every resident will have identical connectivity, but to help ensure that electorate boundaries and representation arrangements reflect how people can realistically contact one another and reach services.

• **Mobile coverage:** identify areas with weak, intermittent or absent mobile reception, including roads and settlements where communication failures affect safety and access.

• **Internet access:** consider the availability and reliability of fixed-line, wireless and satellite internet, as well as affordability and digital exclusion.

• **Road and transport links:** assess actual travel routes and times between communities, not only straight-line distances; include road closures, seasonal access, ferries and limited public transport where relevant.

• **Geographic barriers:** account for mountains, waterways, islands, remote distances and other physical features that can make nearby places difficult to reach.

• **Electorate office access:** consider reasonable travel to electorate offices and the practicality of outreach visits, mobile offices and scheduled regional clinics.

• **Multiple ways to communicate:** encourage accessible options including telephone, postal mail, in-person appointments, community meetings, email and online services.

• **Accessible communication:** consider people with disability, older residents, people with limited digital skills, language needs and residents who cannot reliably use online-only services.

• **Emergency communication:** consider whether communities depend on particular roads, radio services, satellite links or other channels during disasters and network outages.

• **Local and Indigenous community connections:** consult relevant communities about established service, cultural, language and communication networks rather than assuming that administrative boundaries reflect lived connections.

• **Digital exclusion:** avoid treating an online channel as an adequate substitute for all other contact methods, particularly in rural and remote areas.

Areas needing particular attention: Kennedy, Leichhardt and Maranoa because of geographic scale and remote communities; and growing outer-metropolitan and regional areas where population and infrastructure may change at different rates.

Suggested evidence: map road travel times, transport links, mobile coverage and internet availability; record community submissions about barriers; and explain how these factors were weighed alongside enrolment equality and other statutory considerations.

Suggested question to the AEC: “How were means of communication and travel, including digital connectivity, mobile coverage, road access, geographic barriers and the practical ability of electors to contact their representative, assessed when developing and evaluating proposed boundaries?”

7. Principles for a fair and workable redistribution

1. Population equality: work within the applicable statutory enrolment requirements and use the official AEC quota and forecast data.

2. Community of interest: keep communities with strong social, economic, cultural, service and transport connections together where practicable.

3. Regional representation: consider the scale and diversity of rural, regional, remote, coastal and metropolitan electorates.

4. Growth and change: consider reliable population forecasts and emerging residential areas, while avoiding unsupported assumptions about future growth.

5. Practical geography: use sensible, identifiable boundaries and consider terrain, waterways, islands and realistic travel routes.

6. Communication access: assess whether residents can communicate with one another and access their representative through practical and inclusive channels.

7. Transparency: explain the evidence and trade-offs behind proposed changes, including where one criterion cannot be fully satisfied without affecting another.

8. Non-partisanship: assess options on community, geography and enrolment grounds rather than attempting to advantage a political party or candidate.

8. Naming and boundary design

• Retain established electorate names where they continue to describe the area accurately and remain useful to residents.

• Where a name no longer fits a changed boundary, consider recognisable local geographic, regional or community references.

• Use a consistent and transparent process for assessing name suggestions, including local consultation and checks for clarity, duplication and cultural appropriateness.

• Do not invent Indigenous-language words or use a word without appropriate linguistic and community advice. Where an Indigenous name is proposed, consult the relevant Traditional Owners and qualified language custodians.

• Use small, identifiable geographic units—such as SA1s—when modelling possible transfers, then test whether the resulting boundaries keep connected communities together.

9. Recommended technical workflow

1. Download the latest official AEC enrolment, quota and boundary data.

2. Map current electorates and enrolment totals using consistent geographic units, preferably SA1s where suitable data are available.

3. Identify electorates outside or approaching the relevant quota limits, and seats with substantial forecast growth or decline.

4. Develop more than one boundary option for each affected area rather than assuming a single solution.

5. For each option, calculate enrolment totals and compare the impacts on community connections, travel, communication, geography and existing boundaries.

6. Map road travel times, public transport constraints, remote-access issues, mobile coverage and internet availability where reliable data exist.

7. Consult affected councils, community organisations, First Nations communities, residents and other stakeholders.

8. Publish the reasons for the preferred option and clearly identify unresolved trade-offs.

10. Draft public submission to the AEC

Subject: Queensland federal redistribution — population balance, community connections and communication access

To the Redistribution Committee for Queensland,

I submit this proposal as a framework for considering Queensland's 30 federal electorates. I ask that any boundary review balance enrolment requirements with community of interest, geography, means of communication and travel, and the practical ability of residents to contact their elected representative.

I recommend a systematic review of metropolitan growth corridors, the Sunshine Coast and Wide Bay, Toowoomba and the Darling Downs, the Gold Coast and Logan, and Central, North and Far North Queensland. The review should use current official enrolment and forecast data and should model boundary changes at a sufficiently detailed geographic level before proposing specific transfers.

I ask that communication and accessibility be expressly assessed, including mobile and internet coverage, road travel times, public transport, geographic barriers, remote-community access, electorate office locations, and the availability of non-digital communication options. Particular attention should be paid to geographically extensive and remote electorates, including Kennedy, Leichhardt and Maranoa, without presuming that any particular boundary change is the only solution.

Please explain how the statutory criteria were weighed, what evidence was used to assess communication and travel, and how community submissions influenced the proposed boundaries. I support a transparent, evidence-based and non-partisan process that treats all Queensland electors fairly.

Yours faithfully, [Your name] [Your town or region — optional]

11. Official AEC resources

- **Queensland redistribution overview:** https://www.aec.gov.au/redistributions/2025/qld/index.html
- **Enrolment data:** https://www.aec.gov.au/redistributions/2025/qld/enrolment-data.html
- **Quota information:** https://www.aec.gov.au/redistributions/2025/qld/quota.html
- **Suggestions and submissions:** https://www.aec.gov.au/redistributions/2025/qld/suggestions.html

12. Final note

This document is a structured proposal for discussion. It does not establish official AEC figures, determine statutory compliance, or provide a validated map. Before submitting it, check the latest AEC timetable, quota, enrolment figures, boundary files and submission requirements. A complete boundary proposal would require detailed mapping and calculations using official data, followed by testing against all relevant statutory criteria.