



Advice to the Premier in relation to revising Tasmania's electoral boundaries from 5 to 7 divisions

Andrew Hawkey – Electoral Commissioner

24 June 2022

Executive summary

Following his announcement to commit to restoring the House of Assembly from 25 to 35 seats, the Premier wrote to the Electoral Commissioner on 3 June 2022, requesting advice on the consequences of revising the existing House of Assembly electoral boundaries from 5 electorates to 7 electorates, including but not limited to the impact on quotas and any related costs of administering such a change. The Premier also raised the impact of such a change on the current geographical divide in the division of Franklin and the expanse of the division of Lyons.

This paper outlines the current arrangements for setting electoral boundaries in both Houses of the Tasmanian Parliament, explores and compares the possible processes to change the House to either five 7-member divisions¹ or seven 5-member divisions, including discussing possible impacts on the operation of the Hare-Clark system and electoral administration costs. The paper then provides analysis on the impact the two models have in relation to the quota and how the creation of seven House of Assembly divisions might impact the current configuration of Franklin and Lyons divisions.

Changing the House of Assembly to five 7-member divisions would involve minimal legislative and administrative changes. The additional cost per State election is estimated at \$100,000.

Changing the House of Assembly to seven 5-member divisions would break the nexus between Commonwealth and State lower house electoral boundaries and would require:

- the enactment of new House of Assembly electoral boundary redistribution legislation, likely along the lines of the *Legislative Council Electoral Boundaries Act 1995*,
- the appointment of an independent body to conduct a redistribution process,
- the creation of seven new divisions and new names for each division,
- the process of allocating the new House of Assembly divisions codes to all Tasmanian addresses in the national enrolment address database, and
- a significant multi-faceted education and awareness campaign for all Tasmanian electors, including a direct mail-out to every Tasmanian elector.

A very rough estimate of the time and cost in adopting the seven 5-member divisions model for the House of Assembly would be around two years and over \$2,500,000. The additional cost per State election is estimated at \$300,000.

When analysing the impact the two models have on the quota, the paper outlines that both models will produce a quota lower than the current five 5-member division model, with the five 7-member model providing a higher quota than the seven 5-member model.

The last section of this paper discusses the processes and considerations undertaken when creating and reviewing electoral boundaries and what issues may either be solved or created as a possible consequence of seven divisions. While a possible example of seven divisions can remove the circumstances of a divided division, it is likely to create a major split through the Hobart City municipal area and create community of interest concerns for northern Tasmania. Due to the geography and concentrations of the Tasmanian population, it is highly likely that a central expansive division, similar to the current division of Lyons, will be created under all models.

¹ From 1959 until 1996 the House of Assembly consisted of five 7-member divisions.

Current arrangements

Section 22 of the *Constitution Act 1934* provides [inter alia] that the Assembly is to be constituted of 25 members and, for the purpose of returning members to serve in the Assembly, the State is divided into 5 divisions, each of which is to return 5 members. The electoral boundaries of these divisions are described in Schedule 4 of the Act, which specifies the Central Plan numbers (survey plans) for each electoral division. Section 22(4) of the Act establishes the names of the divisions.

There is no legislative process in Tasmania for the redistribution of House of Assembly electoral boundaries. The longstanding convention has been that after a Federal redistribution, the Tasmanian Parliament passes amendments to the *Constitution Act 1934* to adopt the Federal electoral boundaries and, if required, names.

The adoption of Federal electoral boundaries in the House of Assembly dates back to 1906, when the *Constitution Amendment Act 1906* reduced the number of Assembly districts (divisions) to five (Bass, Darwin, Denison, Franklin and Wilmot), the boundaries of which were to be identical with the five Commonwealth electoral districts. The last time the State adopted the Federal boundaries was under the *Constitution Amendment (House of Assembly Electoral Boundaries) Act 2018* which came into effect on 28 September 2018 and included adopting the division name of Clark (replacing Denison).

The *Legislative Council Electoral Boundaries Act 1995* established an independent process to determine electoral boundaries for the Legislative Council divisions to give effect to the principle of "one vote, one value" so that each member represents the same number of electors (within a tolerance of plus or minus 10%). Prior to this, Legislative Council Members had been responsible for varying the boundaries.

Changes to the size of the Houses of the Tasmanian Parliament

The size of the Tasmanian House of Assembly has changed from 35 to 30 to 35 to 25 members through its history. The size of the Legislative Council varied between 18 and 19 members from 1885 until 1998 when it reduced to 15 members.

In July 1998 the Tasmanian Parliament passed the *Parliamentary Reform Act 1998*, which had the effect of reducing the number of members of the Tasmanian Parliament from 54 to 40.

The House of Assembly was reduced from 35 to 25 members. This change was implemented by reducing the number of members elected within each of the five divisions from seven to five at the 1998 State election. Minimal amendments to the *Constitution Act 1934* and *Electoral Act 1985* were required to enable this change.

The Legislative Council was reduced from 19 to 15 members. This required a full electoral boundaries redistribution that created the 15 new Legislative Council divisions.

Consequences from changing to five 7-member divisions

From 1959 until 1996 the House Assembly consisted of five 7-member divisions. Returning the House of Assembly to five 7-member divisions would involve minimal legislative and administrative changes as discussed below.

Legislative implications

It is expected that increasing the number of members to seven for each of the existing five House of Assembly divisions would involve minimal legislative changes to the *Constitution Act 1934* and the *Electoral Act 2004*. Without pre-empting legal advice, the following amendments may be required:

Constitution Act 1934

Section 22 – *Constitution of Assembly*. The number of members would need to be increased to 35, with each of the 5 divisions returning 7 members.

Section 25 – *Quorum of the Assembly*. The quorum is currently 10 and it is expected that this would be restored to 14.

Section 8A – *Limit on number of Ministers of the Crown*. The limit is currently 9 and it may be appropriate to restore the limit to 10.

Electoral Act 2004

In essence, the provisions listed below require amendment to increase the reference to the number of candidates from "5" to "7":

- Section 90 – *Death of a candidate*
- Section 100 – *Instructions on ballot papers*
- Section 102 – *Marking on ballot papers*
- Section 103 – *Informal ballot papers*
- Schedule 3 – *Printing and collation of ballot papers*

The procedural and electoral administration consequences

The change to 7-member divisions would have little impact on general electoral preparation and would involve no changes in relation to the management of the electoral roll.

There would be increased costs at each State election. As the TEC noted in its submission to the Independent Appointee to the *2010 Report on the Size of the House of Assembly*, such a change would likely result in:

- an increase in the number of candidates,
- a requirement for voters to record a minimum of seven, rather than five, preferences, and
- an increase in the time taken to check ballot paper formality and conduct the scrutines.

A rough estimate of costs for the increased processes would be \$100,000 per election.

Public awareness and education

The current election awareness campaign would need to be modified to highlight the new formality requirements.

Consequences from changing to seven 5-member divisions

The request for advice specifically refers to a model that contains seven 5-member divisions across the State. This model would require new legislation, a new independent body charged with the responsibility of the creation and cyclic review of electoral boundaries and names for seven divisions, a period to create these divisions and establish them against all addresses in the national enrolment address database and a significant education, production of new electoral material, increased State election costs and an extensive awareness campaign for all Tasmanian electors.

Legislative implications

The creation of seven House of Assembly divisions would mean the State could no longer adopt Federal lower house electoral boundaries or division names. A separate Act along the lines of the *Legislative Council Electoral Boundaries Act 1995* or the redistribution provisions contained in the *Commonwealth Electoral Act 1918* would be required to be enacted. Amendments to the *Constitution Act 1934* and possibly the *Electoral Act 2004* would also be necessary.

The procedural and electoral administration consequences

The creation of seven House of Assembly divisions

If a redistribution process similar to that contained in the *Legislative Council Electoral Boundaries Act 1995* were to be enacted, this would involve the appointment of a Redistribution Committee (comprising the Electoral Commissioner, the Surveyor-General and a nominee of the Australian Statistician) and the Augmented Electoral Commission, which comprises the members of the Redistribution Committee together with the Chair and Other Member of the Tasmanian Electoral Commission.

As a first step, the Committee makes and publishes an initial proposal. Any person or organisation may lodge with the Augmented Electoral Commission a written comment, suggestion or objection in relation to the Initial Redistribution Proposal.

The Augmented Electoral Commission is to consider all comments, suggestions and objections lodged and give notice of its intention to hold an inquiry – including public hearings.

After the Augmented Electoral Commission has finished its inquiries, a further redistribution proposal is made and published together with the substance of the Augmented Electoral Commission's findings and conclusions. The Augmented Electoral Commission will state whether its further redistribution proposal is significantly different from the initial proposal.

If the Augmented Electoral Commission stated that its further redistribution proposal is significantly different from the initial proposal, a person or organisation may lodge a further written comment, suggestion or objection with the Augmented Electoral Commission.

The Augmented Electoral Commission must hold an inquiry into any further comment, suggestion, or objection, and may have occasion to consider further objections at a later time before making a final determination. These later stages may be repeated if the Augmented Electoral Commission states that a further proposal is significantly different from the proposal preceding it².

The Augmented Electoral Commission will make and publish a final determination of the names and boundaries.

² At the 1998 Legislative Council redistribution, the Redistribution Committee made an initial proposal, and the Tribunal made a further proposal and a second further proposal before the final determination of names and boundaries.

In relation to any transition arrangements, as the adoption of this model would increase the number of members and divisions in the House, it would seem appropriate that the new divisions would take effect at the next State election, which could be set out in the legislation.

A redistribution to create seven House of Assembly divisions would likely take over 12 months. The initial redistribution under the *Legislative Council Electoral Boundaries Act 1995* (undertaken in 1995) is understood to have cost approximately \$700,000. This may provide a guide to the likely expected costs of an initial redistribution of the House of Assembly divisions, which would equate to a current cost of around \$1,300,000.

Establishing new boundaries on the national enrolment address system

The national roll, which includes the Tasmanian State roll identifies all Federal, State and local government boundaries at the individual address level. The establishment of seven new divisions would require the Australian Electoral Commission to incorporate the new House of Assembly division codes for all Tasmanian addresses. It is unclear what the workload and cost for undertaking this process would be. The timeframe to complete the works would also need to not coincide with any other significant election event in Tasmania, including a federal election.

New election material and training resources

Changing to seven House of Assembly divisions would then require all House of Assembly election material and training resources to be replaced with the names of the new seven divisions and be adjusted for any increased complexity due to the additional divisions. This will involve amendments to a broad range of manuals, returns, packing material, online training information and training videos. There would also be IT programming costs of election systems due to the new configuration. The rough estimate of costs for these changes is estimated at \$300,000.

Increases for each State election

Conducting the State election involving seven divisions would significantly increase costs. The new structure would require for each State election:

- two additional returning officers, assistant returning officers,
- the production of rotated ballot papers for seven divisions, rather than five,
- rolling out ballot papers for seven divisions to each polling place, rather than five,
- increased provisional and other declaration votes due to elector confusion,
- a more complex exchange of material between divisions following polling day,
- an increased casual workforce for scrutiny processes,
- additional workspaces for the additional divisions, and
- conducting two additional Hare-Clark scrutinies.

The costs for additional material, processes and staffing is estimated at \$300,000 per State election.

Public awareness and education consequences

The long-standing stability of shared divisions has produced the situation where awareness of State and Commonwealth division names and boundaries is uniquely high amongst Tasmanian electors. Further, a model where new House of Assembly division names stand alongside the continuing Federal divisions would create high levels of confusion and possible disenfranchisement for some electors. This may be accentuated by the real possibility that the next Federal and State elections could occur concurrently in May 2025.

The education and acceptance by the broader public of separate House of Assembly divisions would take time and require an extensive multi-faceted education and awareness campaign leading up to any elections.

Prior to the first occurrence of the new divisions, the Commission would look to produce a direct mail out to every Tasmanian elector. The mail out would need to explain the creation of additional divisions and include the names of the divisions the individual was now enrolled for. For example, the card for an elector enrolled at 100 Steele Street Devonport would show:

- House of Representatives division (Braddon),
- House of Assembly division (name of new division),
- Legislative Council division (Mersey), and
- local government area division (Devonport City).

The Hare-Clark system and the configuration of the House of Assembly

The Hare-Clark counting system was introduced alongside the adoption of the Federal electoral boundaries in 1906. Hare-Clark enables parties, groups and independents to be elected to the House of Assembly in proportion to their support in the division. In other words, compared to other counting systems, the composition of the House more closely reflects the proportion of primary votes for each party on a state-wide basis.

History of Party Representation in the House of Assembly 1959-2021

	Liberal Party		ALP		Tasmanian Greens		Other		
	Proportion of seats	Seats won							
2021	12.18	13	7.05	9	3.09	2	2.67	1	25 members
2018	12.56	13	8.16	10	2.57	2	1.70	0	25 members
2014	12.80	15	6.83	7	3.46	3	1.91	0	25 members
2010	9.75	10	9.22	10	5.40	5	0.63	0	25 members
2006	7.95	7	12.32	14	4.16	4	0.57	0	25 members
2002	6.85	7	12.97	14	4.53	4	0.65	0	25 members
1998	9.51	10	11.20	14	2.55	1	1.74	0	25 members
1996	14.42	16	14.17	14	3.90	4	2.52	1	35 members
1992	18.94	19	10.10	11	4.63	5	1.33	0	35 members
1989	16.42	17	12.15	13	6.86	5	0.14	0	35 members
1986*	18.97	19	12.30	14	2.22	2	0.93	0	35 members
1982*	16.98	19	12.90	14	0.71	1	5.13	1	35 members
1979	14.46	15	19.01	20			1.53	0	35 members
1976	15.57	17	18.36	18			1.07	0	35 members
1972	13.43	14	19.22	21			2.35	0	35 members
1969	14.68	17	15.91	17			4.41	1	35 members
1964	13.47	16	17.97	19			3.56	0	35 members
1959	14.37	16	15.58	17			5.05	2	35 members

*Independents in 1982 and 1986 elections became members of the Green Independents

The greatest impact on the degree of proportionality achieved is determined by the number of members to be elected per division. As a rule, the more members to be elected, and the smaller the quota, the more proportional is the result achieved.

How would each model effect the configuration of the House?

When discussions arise on the Hare-Clark system, one aspect often raised is how hard (or easy) it is for minor parties or independents to be elected — in particular, what proportion of the vote should be required for a candidate to be elected (or more specifically to reach the quota).

For 5-member divisions, the quota is one sixth (or 16.7%) of the formal vote. While for 7-member divisions, the quota is one eighth (or 12.5%) of the formal vote. The higher quota the higher the bar for minor parties and independents to win a seat.

One might then assume that minor parties and independents have a better chance of winning a seat whenever there are 7-member seats rather than 5-member seats. But this is not always the case.

Which is the lesser: an eighth of a fifth or a sixth of a seventh?

The models being discussed in this paper — seven 5-member divisions and five 7-member divisions — both create a 35-member House. So the proportion of the vote required to reach the quota within a division is only part of the assessment. A more accurate way to consider the impact of the two models on the quota is to analyse the estimated number of votes required to reach the quota under each model.

Put another way, both models will have lower quotas compared to the current five 5-member divisions structure, but which will be lower? Increasing from 5 to 7 members divisions will reduce the quota - by reducing the proportion of the vote required to be elected. However, increasing the number of divisions from five to seven will also reduce the quota - as the number of electors within each division will be lower.

In short, the current arrangement and two proposed models can be summarised as follows:

	Five 5-member divisions	Five 7-member divisions	Seven 5-member divisions
Proportion of the State roll (per division)	1/5 (20%)	1/5 (20%)	1/7 (14.3%)
Quota as a proportion of the vote (within division)	1/6 th (16.7%)	1/8 th (12.5%)	1/6 th (16.7%)
Quota as a proportion of the State roll (across the state)	1/5 x 1/6 or 3.33%	1/8 x 1/5 or 2.50%	1/6 x 1/7 or 2.38%

The tables below illustrate the differences between the models by looking at the relevant statistics from the 2021 State election and providing extrapolated estimates of how the two proposed models are likely to effect the quota using the 2021 election as a base.

2021 House of Assembly election statistics

	Enrolment	% of State Enrolment	Elected	Formal vote	% Division Enrolment	Quota	Last elected candidate's votes	% of quota
Bass	78 182	19.8%	5	67 352	86.1%	11 226	11 183	99.6%
Braddon	81 211	20.6%	5	69 961	86.1%	11 661	10 859	93.1%
Clark	73 998	18.8%	5	63 753	86.2%	10 626	9 970	93.8%
Franklin	78 130	19.8%	5	69 258	88.6%	11 544	11 548	100.0%
Lyons	82 911	21.0%	5	71 026	85.7%	11 838	13 405	113.2%
Total	394 432	100.0%	25	341 350				
Average					86.6%	11 379		

The 2021 House of Assembly election statistics table provides:

- the enrolment of each division – note the variations in the proportion of the State enrolment,
- the number to be elected – which is a central element for calculating the quota,
- the formal vote – note that the proportion of the division enrolment is consistently around 86%³, which assists us with our extrapolation of the two models shown below, and
- the number of votes received by the last elected candidate – whose final votes total can vary considerably above and below the quota.

With 85-88% of electors casting a formal vote, the quotas for the current five 5-member divisions range between 2.69% and 3.0% of the State enrolment (average 11 379).

2021 House of Assembly election estimate – five 7-member divisions

	Enrolment	% of State Enrolment	Elected	Formal vote	% Division Enrolment	Quota (Extrapolated)
Bass	78 182	19.8%	7	67 352	86.1%	8 420
Braddon	81 211	20.6%	7	69 961	86.1%	8 746
Clark	73 998	18.8%	7	63 753	86.2%	7 970
Franklin	78 130	19.8%	7	69 258	88.6%	8 658
Lyons	82 911	21.0%	7	71 026	85.7%	8 879
Total	394 432	100.0%	35	341 350		
Average					86.6%	8 535

As the five 7-member divisions model maintains the current House of Assembly divisions, the table only differs from the first table in relation to the number to be elected and the adjusted quotas.

Under this estimate, the quotas for the five 7-member divisions range between 2.02% and 2.25% of the State enrolment (average 8 535).

³ The remaining ~14% of electors either did not vote or cast an invalid or informal vote.

2021 House of Assembly election estimate – Seven 5-member divisions

	% of State Enrolment (Estimate)	Enrolment (Extrapolated)	Elected	Formal vote as % Enrolment (Average)	Formal vote (Extrapolated)	Quota (Extrapolated)
Division 1	13.0%	51 276	5	86.6%	44 380	7 397
Division 2	14.5%	57 193	5	86.6%	49 502	8 251
Division 3	14.3%	56 404	5	86.6%	48 819	8 137
Division 4	16.0%	63 109	5	86.6%	54 622	9 104
Division 5	15.1%	59 559	5	86.6%	51 549	8 592
Division 6	13.1%	51 671	5	86.6%	44 722	7 454
Division 7	14.0%	55 220	5	86.6%	47 794	7 966
Total	100.0%	394 432	35		341 350	
Average				86.6%		8 129

The table for the seven 5-member divisions model needs to include other extrapolations such as the proportion of the State vote located within each division. The table attempts to mimic the slight variations between divisions existing across the current five divisions. It is important to note that all three tables have the same State enrolment figure. The table also uses the average of the proportion of formal votes from the 2021 election statistics to extrapolate the expected formal votes and quota for each division.

Under these extrapolations, the quotas for the seven 5-member divisions range between 1.88% and 2.31% of the State enrolment (average 8 129).

In this analysis, the average quota under the five 7-member division model is 406 votes higher than the average quota under the seven 5-member division model.

Undertaking a similar process for the last six State elections shows that the average quota is consistently higher under the five 7-member division model than the seven 5-member division model.

Year	State enrolment	Formal vote as % of enrolment (average)	Average quota		
			Five 5-member divisions	Five 7-member divisions	Seven 5-member divisions
2021	394 432	86.6%	11 379	8 535	8 129
2018	381 183	87.8%	11 163	8 372	7 972
2014	366 442	89.0%	10 873	8 155	7 766
2010	357 315	89.7%	10 682	8 012	7 631
2006	341 481	90.7%	10 321	7 741	7 372
2002	332 473	89.2%	9 883	7 412	7 059

The configuration of seven House of Assembly divisions

The Premier's request for advice also seeks clarification as to how seven House of Assembly divisions might address the Franklin division divide and the expanse of the division of Lyons. This section discusses the processes and considerations undertaken when creating and reviewing electoral boundaries and what issues may either be solved or created as a possible consequence of seven divisions.

The development of electoral boundaries

Modern Australian redistribution legislation includes three priorities when establishing or reviewing electoral divisions:

- 1st priority: "one vote, one value"— as far as practicable, the number of electors in each division is close to the average division enrolment.
- 2nd priority: a shared community of interest within each division.
- 3rd priority: consideration of other matters, such as:
 - the means of communication and travel within the division,
 - the physical features and area of the division,
 - existing electoral boundaries, and
 - distinct natural boundaries.

The process of establishing new electoral boundaries involves the combining of small geographical areas defined by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) as Statistical Area 1s (SA1). Using ABS data, each SA1 has a current total for adult persons and a projected (5 years) total for adult persons. Prior to 2017, ABS CCD areas were used as the basic geographical areas in which to build divisions.

The current Franklin divide and the expanse of Lyons

Creation of electoral boundaries within Tasmania are heavily affected by the geography and elector concentrations across the state.

The creation of the 15 Legislative Council electoral boundaries in 1998 was based on understood key community of interest elements within Tasmania. The Committee commenced the allocation of CCD building blocks to divisions from three positions:

- building divisions from the far north-west corner (in recognition of the strong north-west community of interest),
- the community of interest of the greater Tamar valley (which had an elector base equating to three Legislative Council divisions), and
- building divisions from the far south (in recognition of the impact of the southern mountain topography as limiting factors on transport, population and community of interest).

Due to these strong factors and the low density of populations within the central and east coast areas of the State, divisions such as Apsley and Rowallan covered larger areas.

Electoral divisions are usually required to be contiguous, that is, all areas within a division are connected. The division of Franklin is the only national or Tasmanian electoral division that is not considered contiguous — although it can be argued that all areas of the division are connected by either land or the Derwent River.

The establishment of a capital city division (of Denison/Clark) under historical Commonwealth redistributions would suggest that those who created the division held the view that this was an important community of interest factor that overrode the need for a contiguous division of Franklin.

It could also be argued that the stable longevity of the division of Franklin has created its own sense of community and political interests as 12 Federal and 72 State members have represented and created political debate and dialogue with those communities over the last 100 years.

Essentially, the division of Lyons (previously Wilmot), which is the largest Tasmanian division, has always taken the central regions of Tasmania that do not fit into the north-west corner, the Tamar and the north-east corner or the Hobart region. Interestingly, the physical size of Lyons is currently smaller than for previous redistributions where it included the west coast region, the Latrobe and West Tamar region or both. Following the 2000 Commonwealth redistribution of Tasmania, the division of Lyons contained a northern, southern, eastern and western coastline.

A possible structure for seven House of Assembly divisions

Development of electoral boundaries is an intricate process that cannot be simply predicted or pre-empted. Furthermore, it would not be appropriate or accurate for this paper to provide anything more than general comments on what might have to be considered if establishing seven House of Assembly divisions. That said, a cursory examination of enrolment levels within local government municipal areas and Legislative Council electoral boundaries⁴ can provide us with one possible scenario and a broad brush of the associated issues arising from the scenario.

In line with the 1st priority (shown on the previous page), the seven House of Assembly divisions would be designed to contain around 56,000 electors each. In broad terms, seven House of Assembly divisions would likely create three southern, three northern and one central division.

The three southern divisions

Using current local government enrolment totals the following configurations may be possible:

- Combining the electors within the municipal areas of Huon Valley, Kingborough, Hobart City and Glenorchy, which would equate to 112,317 electors — provides sufficient numbers for two of the seven House of Assembly divisions.
- A third southern division could incorporate either:
 - Brighton and Clarence municipal areas (57,9250 electors), or
 - Clarence, Sorell and Tasman municipal areas (59,234 electors).
- Whichever southern municipal areas are not included in the third southern division would then become part of the central (final) division.

While the divided Franklin division would no longer exist, the delineation of the first two southern divisions would require splitting the Hobart City municipal area as around one third of Hobart City electors would need to be included in the new southernmost House of Assembly division. This delineation may be a point of objection for the redistribution process.

The three northern divisions

Using current local government and Legislative Council enrolment totals we can deduce the following:

- The far north-western division seems an easy fit as the elector totals for the Legislative Council divisions of Murchison and Montgomery equates to 57,303 electors. These boundaries also essentially align to the combined municipal areas of King Island, Circular Head, Waratah-Wynyard, West Coast, Burnie City and Central Coast.
- Combining the municipal areas of Kentish, Devonport City, Latrobe and Meander Valley equates to 50,296 electors, which is most likely too low to equate to a House of Assembly

⁴ Divisional enrolment numbers are as at 22 June 2022.

division. The northern region of West Tamar municipal area could be added to the Devonport-based division to increase its enrolment.

- The Launceston City municipal area (49,274 electors) is not far short of being a House of Assembly division. However, it is more likely that the Launceston City municipal area would need to be split as the remaining area of West Tamar would contain far too many electors to simply be added to the Launceston City Council municipal area (~63,000 electors combined).
- North-eastern municipal areas would then become part of the central (final) division.

The central (final) division

Under the scenario outlined here, the central (final) division would include the municipal areas of George Town, Flinders, Dorset, Northern Midlands, Southern Midlands, Break O'Day, Glamorgan-Spring Bay, Central Highlands, Derwent Valley and either Brighton or Sorell and Tasman.