REALIGNMENT OF BOUNDARIES AND INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF CONSTITUENCIES

January 6, 2010
INTRODUCTION

This Report sets out the advice of the Electoral Commission of Jamaica to the Standing Committee of Boundaries of Parliament, concerning the realignment of boundaries of constituencies and the addition of three new constituencies, which will increase the total number of constituencies into which Jamaica is divided from 60 to 63. Prior to setting out the advice, the Report describes the mechanisms, processes and procedures that were employed by the Commission in arriving at its advice.

BACKGROUND

Following the approval of the Report of the Standing Committee on Boundaries by Parliament in March 2004 the Electoral Advisory Committee (EAC) anticipated that the next period of General Review, which would commence in March 2008, would be challenging. Parliament had approved the necessary steps to be taken to amend the Constitution of Jamaica such that the upper limit of the number of constituencies into which Jamaica is divided be increased from 60 to 65. Parliament had also approved, following the amendment of the Constitution, that the number of constituencies be increased from 60 to 63 in the first instance.

The EAC therefore held a Seminar on boundaries in July 2005 to which it invited and received submissions from Citizens Action for Free and Fair Elections, the National Democratic Movement, the Jamaica Labour Party, the Peoples National Party, and from Elections Canada the International Foundation for Electoral System, (IFES) concerning best practices around the world. Following the Seminar the Principles of Agreement resulting from the Seminar were independently confirmed in writing by all the stakeholder groups that participated in the Seminar. These Principles of Agreement were as follows:

1. That the Commission would apply Geographic Information Systems (GIS) technology to the exercise of defining polling divisions, electoral divisions and
constituency boundaries and in the decision-making processes related to these matters.

2. That in each parish a Parish Boundaries Forum would be established and would be comprised of all Members of Parliament, Councillors, Caretakers or Constituency Chairmen, Political Liaison Officers and chaired by a Senior Returning Officer of the parish named by the Director of Elections.

3. That in each parish there would be established a Parish Boundaries Committee comprising five members from each political party represented on the Forum and named by the General Secretary of the Party and chaired by the Senior Returning Officer named by the Director of Elections.

4. That the Parish Forums and Advisory Committees would consider and seek to agree on the definition of polling divisions, splits, mergers and the resolution of anomalies.

5. That where constituencies in a parish are within the limits set by the Constitution but the Advisory Committee of the parish agrees and recommends changes that would result in greater equality in the number of electors in each constituency then boundary adjustments would be made. Where there was no agreement existing boundaries would remain.

6. That where constituencies in a parish were in breach of the constitutional limits, the Advisory Committees of those parishes would seek to agree on the realignment of boundaries in those parishes to correct the breaches.

7. That if no agreement was reached by the Parish Boundaries Advisory Committee, the matter would be referred to the Nominated Members and the Director of Elections for resolution.

8. That if the Nominated Commissioners and the Director could not resolve the disagreements, the matter would be referred to the Selected Commissioners for final decision.
9. That the Commission would make the decision to add constituencies based on the mathematical principles set out by the Constitution.

INSTRUCTIONS FROM THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON BOUNDARIES: MARCH 2008

In March 2008 the Speaker of the House conveyed by letter the general instructions of the Standing Committee on Boundaries with respect to the conduct of the current period of General Review of constituency boundaries. Those general instructions included instructions to proceed to conduct the General Review based on 63 constituencies.

IMPLEMENTATION BY THE ELECTORAL COMMISSION

The general instructions of the Standing Committee, conveyed by the Speaker, assumed that the amendment to the Constitution to increase the upper limit, which had been tabled in Parliament, would be passed during this period of General Review. Prudence dictated, however, that the Commission should not ignore the provisions of the Constitution as obtained in March 2008 which provided for the 60 existing constituencies. Seeing that the General Review included more than increasing the number of constituencies, the Commission adopted a two stage approach in implementing the instructions of the Standing Committee. Three considerations informed this approach. First, there had not been a comprehensive and general review of polling division descriptions and definitions for more than 25 years. The defining features of several polling divisions had disappeared and many of the people who knew them were no longer available. Second, the application of Geographic Information Systems (GIS) technology to the definition of boundaries required, as a pre-condition, affirmation of the definition of the elemental unit of electoral organisation, which is the polling division. Third, the General Review included the correction of any breaches that existed with respect to the upper and lower limits set by the Constitution for the size of constituencies.

The two stages of the implementation process were as follows:
1. Stage 1: The exercise to define and describe the physical features of all existing polling divisions in the existing 60 constituencies in the fourteen parishes; recording these physical features by geographical coordinates through the application of GIS technology; and the correction of breaches of the constitutional limits, where such existed.

2. Stage 2: The exercise to increase the number of constituencies from 60 to 63.

The planned and also happy coincidence of the two-stage approach was that the process to define and describe the physical features of all polling divisions was completed by March 31, 2008 and the final step in the amendment of the Constitution occurred on March 31, 2008 when the Governor General signed the appropriate document. Further, the Commission had used the May 31, 2008 Voters List as the guide in scheduling the order in which the parishes should be mapped. The result was that Stage 1 flowed smoothly into Stage 2 and allowed for a timely conclusion of the entire exercise.
IMPLEMENTATION OF STAGE 1

In April 2008 the Commission confirmed and made minor adjustments to the Principles of Agreement previously outlined. A Parish Boundaries Forum and a Parish Boundaries Advisory Committee were established in each of the fourteen parishes. Following the establishment of the Forum in each parish the Commission requested that each Political Party recognised by the Commission appoint scrutineers to participate in the field work related to the General Review of boundaries.

Describing and Defining Polling Divisions in Each Constituency

The Polling Division (PD) is the elemental unit of electoral organisation in Jamaica. While there has been some modification and adjustment to Polling Divisions, there has not been a comprehensive review of Polling Divisions (PDs) for more than twenty five years. The Commission decided that it was essential to carry out a comprehensive review of the description and definition of polling division boundaries in all existing 60 constituencies. Working with the Parish Boundaries Forum in each parish, the staff of the Commission in each parish along with scrutineers nominated by the political parties carried out the field work to describe and define the physical boundaries of each PD in each constituency of each of the fourteen parishes. A draft of the description and definition of all PDs in each of the constituencies in each parish was then circulated to members of the Parish Forum for their independent confirmation. The General Secretary of each political party recognised by the Commission authorised a member of his party in each constituency to sign the agreement on the description and definition of Polling Divisions within each constituency. The Returning Officer of each constituency signed on behalf of the Director of Elections.

A similar protocol was followed with respect to instances where decisions had to be made to eliminate no-elector Polling Divisions, merge existing Polling Divisions with small numbers of electors, and split Polling Divisions that were larger than prescribed by the Representation of the People Act (ROPA).
In some instances the Commission had evidence to the effect that some electors were on the Voters’ List in one constituency but actually resided in a neighbouring constituency. Such instances generally occurred where electors resided close to the boundaries of two or more constituencies. These cases were treated as anomalies. Again, the staff of the Commission along with scrutineers appointed by the political parties did the field work necessary to resolve such anomalies. The protocol adopted with respect to description and definition of Polling Divisions and with respect to the elimination of no-elector PDs and splits and mergers was also applied to the resolution of anomalies.

Unanimous agreements were reached in each Parish Boundaries Advisory Committee on the description and definition of each polling division, the elimination of no-elector PDs and splits, mergers and the resolution of anomalies in each of the existing 60 Constituencies. The Returning Officer in each constituency then proposed the re-numbering of Polling Divisions in each constituency. The draft proposal was submitted to the Parish Boundaries Forum and to the Parish Boundaries Advisory Committee for perusal, discussion, amendment and final agreement.

Following the receipt of signed agreements on Polling Divisions descriptions and definitions by the Parish Boundaries Advisory Committees of the fourteen parishes the Commission approved these definitions and descriptions. Agreements were therefore reached on the definitions and descriptions of 6,240 Polling Divisions across the country. These definitions and descriptions were Gazetted on June 26, 2009.

**Applying GIS Technology to the Demarcation of Boundaries**

The physical descriptions and definitions of polling divisions are based on existing features such as roads, rivers, buildings, large trees and in some instances imaginary lines drawn between two or more of such features. Because such physical features are subject to change over time and the fact that persons most familiar with these features retire,
move on and sometimes die, disagreements arise with respect to the definitions and
descriptions of some Polling Divisions. This has sometimes been the cause of
controversy between contending parties, candidates and their agents.

Jamaica has been an acknowledged leader within the Hemisphere and internationally in
the application of information and communication technology to the electoral system.
Such applications have contributed to the improvement and enhancement of the electoral
process in the country, with resultant increase in confidence with respect to the fairness
of elections.

Geographic Information Systems, (GIS), allows for physical features on the surface of the
earth to be recorded in relation to co-ordinates of longitude and latitude. Applied to
boundaries it means that Polling Divisions, Electoral Divisions and Constituencies can be
defined and recorded by geographical co-ordinates. This considerably reduces errors
related to the demarcation of boundaries and by extension to disputes that invariably
arise.

Because the Polling Division is the elemental unit of electoral organisation in Jamaica,
the most critical action in applying GIS technology to boundaries is that of recording the
boundaries of each Polling Division in terms of geographical co-ordinates. The work
done in obtaining agreement on polling division descriptions and definitions, on splits,
mergers and the resolution of anomalies became conditions precedent to the application
of GIS technology to boundaries. Once agreements had been reached on physical
descriptions of Polling Divisions in each constituency it became feasible to implement
the decision to apply GIS technology to the demarcation of boundaries.

Establishment of the GIS Unit
The Commission sought and contracted the services of Mona Geoinformatics, of the
University of the West Indies, Mona, to undertake the task of training and guiding the
staff of the Commission in the application of GIS technology to boundaries and also in
giving advice with respect to the establishment of a GIS Unit. Mona Geoinformatics was contracted to:

1. Provide the training needed for EOJ personnel;
2. Provide training and oversight during the pilot phase in;
   a. Quality control from data collection to data transfer;
   b. Conversion of data;
   c. Editing and analysis of the data;
   d. Updating of the existing GIS database;
   e. Quality control in the creation of maps;
   f. Guidance in integration of the spatial and election databases;
   g. Assistance in developing methods of displaying maps, graphs and reports.

A cascade model of training was adopted. Mona Geoinformatics provided training for Headquarters staff of the Commission who once trained, then trained technicians in the constituencies in the collection of data in the field.

**Staffing**

The Commission sought and recruited graduates of the University of Technology trained in the area of GIS technology to operate in the following capacities:

1. GIS Manager
2. GIS Analysis and
3. Mapping Specialist

In addition, two members of the Systems and Technical staff of the Information Systems Department were trained in the use of GPS hand held devices and the manipulation of data collected.

The core group of persons trained by the Mona Geoinformatics was subsequently used to train the Field Technicians hired to conduct the field work.
Equipment
To facilitate the establishment of the department, the Commission procured:

- Forty (40) hand held GPS units
- Four (4) computers with required software – ARC Info and ARC View
- Plotter
- Scanner
- Printer

Pilot Project in Mapping
In July 2008 a pilot project was launched to map the constituencies in the parishes of St. Andrew and St. Ann. These two parishes were selected because they represented the landscape (rural and urban) which was expected to be encountered throughout the rest of the island. Twenty (20) Field Technicians and two (2) Supervisors were initially recruited and trained and deployed evenly between the two parishes.

The Global Positioning System (GPS) technology was used to physically map and by extension determine the precise co-ordinates for polling division boundaries. The data collected, under the supervision of Mona Geo Informatics was used to create digital electoral maps using the GIS software. These maps reflect constituencies, electoral divisions and polling division boundaries.

On completion of the pilot project a review was done of the exercise. The problems associated with the collection, transfer and processing of the data were assessed and resolved.

External Assistance

Research by the Commission showed that Canada was one of the leading countries in the use of GIS technology in mapping electoral boundaries. Elections Canada made the generous offer of giving the Commission, free of cost, the software application it had developed for linking electoral data with electronic maps of constituencies. Following
consultations with Elections Canada, two members of staff from the Commission visited their head office in Ottawa Canada from January 19 to January 21, 2009 where they were exposed to the operations of that organisation and the relevant software application. Plans are in place to have an expert from Elections Canada visit and provide advice on further development of the Jamaican system at a later date. It should be noted that Ridings (constituencies) in Canada are determined, defined, described and realigned on the basis of population data from each Census. Constituencies in Jamaica are determined, defined, described and realigned in relation to electoral data. Hence, it was not possible to accept specific GIS software applications developed for use in realigning Ridings in Canada for application in realigning constituency boundaries in Jamaica. However, the general features and principles of these software applications are helpful in our process to develop software linking GIS maps with electoral data.

**General Review of Constituency Boundaries**

The Electoral Commission approved and issued the following criteria and guidelines to Parish Boundaries Forums and Parish Boundaries Advisory Committees with respect to the matter of realigning constituency boundaries:

1. Polling Divisions are indivisible. If a polling division is to be moved from one constituency or electoral division to another, the entire polling division has to be moved and not just some electors residing in the polling division.

2. Constituencies must be comprised of polling divisions that are contiguous, that is, next to or touching each other.

3. Sections of a constituency should not be cut off from each other. As far as is possible topographical features should be considered such that sections of a constituency are not separated from other sections by inaccessible mountains, ravines and other such physical features.
4. Natural Divides should serve as constituency Boundaries. Natural divides, where available, should serve as lines of demarcation of constituencies. These include, but are not limited to, rivers, gullies, ravines and roadways.

5. Distinct communities should be kept intact. Every effort should be made to draw boundaries that keep existing communities intact.

6. Communities next to each other with similar histories, occupational pursuits, sporting traditions and general interests should not be separated if historically they have shared representation.

7. In realigning boundaries in parishes in which constituencies are in breach of the prescribed constitutional limits, the population density should be considered with a view to ensuring that the number of electors within each constituency in a given parish is as close in number as possible.

Both the May 31, 2008 and November 30, 2008 Voters’ Lists showed that St Ann North Eastern was in breach of the upper limit for the size of a constituency and St Andrew North Eastern was in breach of the lower limit for the size of a constituency as set by the Constitution. In the other twelve parishes all constituencies fell within the constitutionally prescribed limits.

The Fifth Principle of General Agreement previously referred to stated that where constituencies in a parish are within the limits set by the Constitution but the Advisory Committee of that parish agrees and recommends changes that would result in greater equality in the number of electors in each constituency then boundary adjustments would be made. Where there was no agreement existing boundaries would remain. Adhering to this Principle of Agreement and the Commission’s Guidelines for Realigning Boundaries ten parishes concluded that the existing boundaries in each of these parishes should remain unchanged. These parishes are: St Thomas, Portland, St Mary, Trelawny, Hanover, St Elizabeth, Manchester, Clarendon, Westmoreland and Kingston.
Corrections of Breaches in St. Ann and St. Andrew

Consistent with the Principles of Agreement the Parish Boundaries Forum and Parish Boundaries Advisory Committees of St. Ann and St. Andrew were requested to consider and make recommendations concerning the realignment of Boundaries in their respective parishes in order to restore conformity to the constitutionally defined limits. While in each case there were several areas of agreement, neither Parish Advisory Committee was able to reach agreement on realigning the boundaries in either parish. In each case the matter was therefore referred to the Director and the Nominated Commissioners for resolution.

In the case of St Andrew the Nominated Commissioners and the Director of Elections reached agreement on the realignment of boundaries in the parish in such a way that ensured that all constituencies in the parish conformed to the constitutionally set limits. The agreement reached was accepted by the Commission.

In the case of St Ann the Nominated Commissioners and the Director of Elections reached partial agreement. The Nominated Commissioners of the PNP put up their proposal, the Nominated Commissioners of the JLP put forward their proposal as did the Director. The Director’s proposal was informed by inputs from the Returning Officers of the parish, the Regional Manager of the Electoral Office and the Deputy Director Field Operations. The Nominated Commissioners of the PNP accepted the Director’s Proposal in its entirety. The Nominated Commissioners of the Jamaica Labour Party accepted most of the Director’s Proposal but disagreed with the location of six polling divisions. The disagreement was submitted to the Selected Commissioners who then made the final decision.
IMPLEMENTATION OF STAGE 2

The Commission decided to use the May 31, 2009 Voters List as the basis for equalizing the number of constituencies among parishes and for increasing the number to 63. (fn 1). Because of the By-Election in North East St Catherine the publication of the May 31, 2009 Voters’ List was delayed until June 20, 2009. The Commission also agreed to an adjustment to Principle of Agreement 6 with respect to its application to the increase in the number of constituencies. That adjustment was that for the Commission to accept, without change, an agreement of the Parishes Boundaries Advisory Committee that Agreement not only had to be signed by all eleven members of the Committee but also by the General Secretaries of both political parties.

At the Meeting of the Commission on July 1, 2009 the Selected Commissioners circulated the data for the May 31, 2009 Voters’ List and the mathematical calculations that were used in applying the Principles of Agreement and the Constitutional provision. Based on these calculations the parish of St Catherine deserved two additional constituencies and the parish of St James one additional constituency. Westmoreland also deserved an additional constituency and Kingston should lose one constituency. Following standard procedure Nominated Commissioners were asked to discuss the data and calculations with their respective parties.

At the Meeting of the Commission on July 15, 2009 the Nominated Commissioners of the JLP reported that given the importance of the matter the JLP had convened a meeting of its Central Executive in order to determine its position. The position of the JLP was to accept the proposal. The Nominated Commissioners of the PNP reported that they needed more time to complete their internal consultation. However, there was agreement that two additional constituencies should be allocated to St Catherine.

1 Even though the May 31st voters’ list was the basis for the decisions, figures from the November 30th voters’ list confirm the decisions and are included in all tables for information and comparison.
At the meeting of the Commission of July 29, 2009 the Nominated Commissioners of the PNP reported that the Party had convened a meeting of its National Executive Council in order to finalise its position. On the question of Kingston and Westmoreland the Nominated Commissioners of the PNP reported that the Party’s position was that the status quo should remain in both Kingston and Westmoreland on two grounds. First, based on the calculations Westmoreland only marginally qualified for an additional constituency. Second, the Commission would need to make adjustments to boundaries in five parishes which could put at risk completion of the exercise by the end of the period of General Review. The Commission deferred decision on Westmoreland and Kingston pending further examination of the data. The Commission voted 8 in favour, with one abstention, to allocate an additional constituency to St James.

Following review of the data and calculations over the last eight Voters’ Lists, the Commission at its Meeting on September 2, 2009 decided that the status quo should remain in Kingston and Westmoreland based on a slight downward trend in Westmoreland and its marginal position in qualifying for an additional constituency.

The Commission came to its decision on the following grounds. The principles set out in the Constitution for allocating constituencies to parishes do so in whole numbers. However, it is only rarely that in applying the electorate quota to the Voters’ List that the resulting electorate quotients are in whole numbers. While the standard mathematical principle is to round up to the next whole number if the fraction is above one half and to round down to the next whole number if the fraction is below one half, the automatic application of this mathematical principle to the equalization of constituencies between parishes may not be prudent for two reasons. First, such action is drastic at several levels. Second, the Commission now produces two Voters’ Lists annually as a result of the addition of newly registered electors and the removal of dead electors. It is, therefore, entirely possible that the electorate quotients for parishes will vary from one Voters’ List to another. It is also entirely possible that such fluctuations in the quotients could vary slightly above or below 0.5.
Given the drastic nature of the decision and the fluctuations that are possible with the production of two Voters’ Lists annually, prudence dictates that consideration be given to the trends in the electorate quotients over at least the previous six Voters’ List and also that a band be established for both parishes that could lose and parishes that could gain constituencies. For example, if over the last six Voters’ Lists the electorate quotient of a parish consistently falls below 0.4, that parish would deserve to lose a constituency. Also, if over the last six Voters’ Lists the electorate quotient of a parish rises and reaches above 0.6 percent that parish would deserve to gain a constituency. It is in applying these considerations that the Commission came to the decision that the status quo should remain in Kingston and Westmoreland. While Kingston deserved to lose a constituency, the case for allocating that constituency to Westmoreland was not unequivocal.

The Parish Advisory Committees of St. James and St. Catherine were asked to consider and recommend the realignment of boundaries in each parish that would allow the addition of one and two constituencies, respectively.
St. James

The proposals put forward by the political parties at the parish level differed significantly. After a series of meetings it was decided that no agreement would be reached at that level and so the matter was referred to the Nominated Members of the Commission and the Director of Elections. At meetings with the Nominated Commissioners the Director put forward his proposal for the realignment to boundaries in St James to accommodate one additional constituency. The Nominated Commissioners of the People’s National Party accepted the Director’s proposal in its entirety. The Nominated Commissioners of the JLP also accepted the Director’s proposal with the caveat that two polling divisions in the Salt Spring Division of St. James East Central should be included in the new constituency. As a result of this disagreement the matter was referred to the Selected Commissioners for final decision.

The Selected Commissioners held a Hearing on November 11th, 2009 at which they listened to oral presentations from the Nominated Commissioners and the Director of Elections concerning the inclusion or exclusions of the two polling divisions from the St. James East Central Constituency in the new constituency. The Selected Commissioners tabled their decision at the meeting of the Commission on November 18th, 2009.
St. Catherine

The members of the Parish Forum Committee met and considered proposals to add the two new constituencies to the parish of St. Catherine. At the end of the deliberations, substantial progress was made except in one fundamental area. The proposal was made to add a new constituency to the Portmore area and its composition and location was agreed by all members of the Committee. The second constituency was proposed for the Spanish Town area and was substantially agreed except that the JLP wanted the division of Homestead (currently in St. Catherine Central) to be included in the new constituency, while the PNP flatly refused this and proposed that the division of Bellevue (currently located in St. Catherine West Central) be included instead. All members of the Advisory Committee signed a document setting out the above. Neither General Secretary signed the document. The matter was referred to the Nominated Commissioners and the Director of Elections for possible resolution.

At the meeting of the Director of Elections and the Nominated Members the Director introduced his proposal. This Proposal agreed with the general approach of the Advisory Committee that one constituency should be added in the Portmore area and the other in the Spanish Town area. However, the Director’s proposal differed in significant details from that put forward by the Advisory Committee. The Director’s proposal agreed with the inclusion of the Homestead Division in the new constituency to be located in the Spanish Town area. It pointed out however that for this to happen, some of the other polling divisions proposed to be included, would have to be omitted in order to ensure equalisation of numbers in the parish and to ensure communities remained intact and it took into consideration the natural movement of the residents as it related to shopping and schools. In addition the Director’s proposal sought to correct existing inconsistencies in the alignment boundaries related to other constituencies in the parish. A decision could not be reached and so the matter was referred to the Selected Members of the Commission for a decision.
**The Hearing and Decision**

The Selected Commissioners held a Hearing on November 11th, 2009 and were presented with the following:

- The written proposal of the St Catherine Parish Boundaries Advisory Committee, which had been signed by all eleven Members of the Committee.
- The written proposal of the Director of Elections.
- An oral presentation by the Nominated Commissioners of the JLP.
- An oral presentation by the Nominated Commissioners of the PNP.
- An oral presentation by the Director of Elections.

In the free flowing discussion that followed the Oral Presentations the point was made that it had been agreed by the Commission that the General Secretaries of both parties needed to sign the agreement of the Parish Boundaries Advisory Committee for that agreement to be accepted by the Commission. One argument was that in the absence of signatures of the General Secretaries there was no agreement. The Selected Members clarified the matter of the approval of the General Secretaries of agreements at the parish level by confirming that the absence of their signatures meant that the Commission would not automatically accept the agreement at the parish level but it did not mean that the Selected Members could not consider such agreements in circumstances where disagreements were referred to them.

In concluding the Hearing the Chairman summarized the matter thus: that what was before the Selected Commissioners for decision were the following:

1. The Agreement of Parish Advisory Committee with Homestead.
2. The Agreement of the Parish Advisory Committee with Bellevue.
3. The Director’s Proposal.

This was agreed.
An opportunity for clarification was requested and granted by the Selected Commissioners at the end of the Meeting of the Commission on November 18th, 2009. The final position of the Nominated Commissioners of the JLP was that if the Selected Commissioners did not accept the Parish Advisory Committee’s proposal with the Homestead Electoral Division, the Nominated Commissioners of the JLP would accept the Director’s proposal in its entirety. The final position of the Nominated Commissioners of the PNP was that if the Selected Commissioners did not accept the Parish Advisory Committee’s proposal with the Bellevue Electoral Division, the Nominated Commissioners of the PNP would accept the Director’s proposal with the omission of Homestead Electoral Division and the inclusion of Bellevue Electoral Division.

The Selected Commissioners tabled their decision at the meeting of the Commission held on December 2nd, 2009.
RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations of the Electoral Commission with respect to the General Review of Boundaries, correction of breaches with respect to the sizes of constituencies as prescribed by the Constitution and with respect to the addition of three new constituencies are that:

1. The existing constituency boundaries in the parishes of Kingston, St Thomas, Portland, St Mary, Trelawny, Hanover, Westmoreland, St Elizabeth, Manchester, and Clarendon should remain unchanged.

2. The constituency boundaries in the parish of St Andrew be adjusted to correct the breach that occurred in St Andrew North Eastern by transferring polling divisions 6, 7 and 9 from St. Andrew East Rural to St. Andrew North Eastern. In order to better equalize the distribution of electors within the parish, polling division 8 was also transferred from East Rural to Eastern and polling divisions 94, 95, 124 and 125 were transferred from St. Andrew West Rural to St. Andrew Western, polling divisions 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92 and 93 transferred from West Rural to North West, polling divisions 53, 82, 83, 84, 85 and 86 transferred from West Rural to North Central and polling divisions 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35 transferred from St. Andrew Western to St. Andrew North Western. Polling Divisions 67 and 9 were transferred from St. Andrew East Rural to St. Andrew North Eastern and Polling Division 8 also from East Rural to St. Andrew Eastern. These changes are reflected in Appendix I Table I.

3. The constituency boundaries in the parish of St Ann be adjusted to correct the breach that occurred in St Ann North Eastern by removing from the constituency polling divisions 20-24, 55-59, 61-70, 79, 86-90, 92-94 and 99 and adding them to St. Ann South Eastern. The following polling divisions were also transferred with a view to equalising the number of electors within the constituencies and correcting anomalies, namely polling divisions 50, 60, 63-67, and 70 from South
Eastern to South West and polling divisions 91 and 112 from North West to South West. These changes are reflected in Appendix I Table II.

4. One additional constituency be added to St James to increase the number of constituencies in that parish from four to five by removing 23 polling divisions from St. James East Central, 24 from St. James North West and 31 from St. James West Central. The details are shown in Appendix II. The map of St. James showing the new constituency is included as Appendix III.

5. Two additional constituencies be added to St Catherine to increase the number of constituencies in that parish from nine to eleven by adding one new constituency in the Spanish Town area and another in the Portmore area. The constituency in the Spanish Town area was created by removing 33 polling divisions from St. Catherine South West, 31 from St. Catherine Central, 8 from St. Catherine West Central and 16 from St. Catherine South Central. The new constituency in the Portmore area was created by transferring 33 polling divisions from St. Catherine South, 6 from St. Catherine South East and 36 from St. Catherine South Central.

Details on the formation of the new constituencies are contained in Appendix IV. Appendix V shows the map of St. Catherine including the two new constituencies.

6. It be noted that should current demographic trends continue it is very likely that there will be need for the realignment of constituency boundaries in the parish of Trelawny.

7. It be noted that should current demographic trends continue it is very likely that the parishes of Kingston and St Andrew should each lose one constituency.
CONCLUSION

In executing the task given to the Electoral Commission by the Standing Committee on Boundaries to conduct this period of General Review of electoral boundaries there are several noteworthy accomplishments that should be highlighted. These can be listed briefly as follows:

- The EAC initiated a consultative process that resulted in agreement of new principles, structures and procedures that should be employed in realigning constituency boundaries. These were accepted and implemented successfully by the Commission and should become permanent features of such exercises in the future.

- The Constitution of Jamaica was amended by Parliament to increase the upper limit of the number of constituencies into which Jamaica is divided to an odd number, which facilitated the immediate increase in the number of constituencies also to an odd number. The prospect of a General Election ending in a tie has therefore been obviated.

- Over 800 political representatives engaged in a participatory and interactive process that allowed for agreement on the definition and physical description of all 6234 polling divisions across the country.

- Given the fact that this is the first time that the Commission has conducted a General Review and also the fact that it is the first time a General Review has been conducted on the Principles of Agreement, the Commission will undertake to hold a consultation to review the entire process and to make changes where warranted.

- The geographic coordinates of all 6234 polling divisions have been established. Electronic electoral maps have been drawn for all 227 existing Electoral Divisions, for the existing 60 constituencies and for the proposed 63 constituencies. All future General Reviews of constituency boundaries will
benefit from this innovation in the application of GIS technology to the review process.

- Where disagreements occurred at the parish level with respect to the realignment of boundaries in a parish, the Director with the assistance from Returning Officers, Zonal Managers, Regional Managers and the Deputy Director of Elections were able to put forward proposals that formed the basis of resolving most of the disagreements. Indeed, the disagreements that had to be referred to the Selected Commissioners for decision were in respect of six polling divisions in St Ann, two polling divisions in St James and two electoral divisions in St Catherine.

- The entire process of General Review has been conducted in a timely fashion and without charges of gerrymandering.

It would be remiss not to record that on two occasions members of Parliament issued public statements with respect to internal discussions within the respective parties related to the realignment of boundaries. In one instance, intemperate utterances were made predicting possible violent outcomes should particular recommendations be made by the Commission to Parliament. While these utterances had no influence whatsoever on the decision making processes of the Commission, such utterances were unfortunate in any circumstances and particularly where adherence to Constitutional provisions were being contemplated.
APPENDIX 1

TABLE I

Realignment – St. Andrew Constituencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFFECTED CONSTITUENCIES</th>
<th>DIVISIONS</th>
<th>POLLING DIVISIONS</th>
<th># OF P.Ds</th>
<th>ELECTORS MOVED MAY 30,2009 VOTERS LIST</th>
<th>ELECTORS MOVED NOV. 30,2009 VOTERS LIST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Rural to North Eastern</td>
<td>Gordon Town</td>
<td>6, 7, 9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Rural to Eastern</td>
<td>Gordon Town</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Rural to Western</td>
<td>Chancery Hall Red Hills</td>
<td>94, 95, 124, 125</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Rural to North West</td>
<td>Chancery Hall</td>
<td>87-93</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,762</td>
<td>1,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Rural to North Central</td>
<td>Stony Hill</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Rural to North Central</td>
<td>Chancery Hall</td>
<td>82-86</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,159</td>
<td>1,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western to North Western</td>
<td>Duhaney Park</td>
<td>23, 24, 26-33, 35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2,802</td>
<td>2,887</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II

Realignment – St. Ann Constituencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFFECTED CONSTITUENCIES</th>
<th>DIVISIONS</th>
<th>POLLING DIVISIONS</th>
<th># OF P.Ds</th>
<th>ELECTORS MOVED MAY 30,2009 VOTERS LIST</th>
<th>ELECTORS MOVED NOV. 30,2009 VOTERS LIST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Eastern to South Eastern</td>
<td>Exchange Beecher Town Lime Hall</td>
<td>20-24, 55-59, 61-70, 79 86-90, 92-94, 99</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,469</td>
<td>1,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3,889</td>
<td>3,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2,096</td>
<td>2,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Eastern to South Western</td>
<td>Bensonton Calderwood</td>
<td>50, 60, 63-67, 70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,576</td>
<td>1,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Western to South Western</td>
<td>Brown’s Town</td>
<td>91, 112</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2

Electoral Divisions & Polling Divisions making up new Constituency - St. James

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTITUENCIES</th>
<th>ELECTORAL DIVISIONS INVOLVED</th>
<th>POLLING DIVISIONS</th>
<th># OF P.Ds</th>
<th>ELECTORS MOVED MAY 30,2009 VOTERS LIST</th>
<th>ELECTORS MOVED NOV. 30,2009 VOTERS LIST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. James East Central</td>
<td>Salt Spring</td>
<td>86, 91-92, 95, 97-117</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6,242</td>
<td>6,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. James North Western</td>
<td>Montego Bay North</td>
<td>72-73</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>435</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. James North Western</td>
<td>Montego Bay South</td>
<td>79-88</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2,741</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. James North Western</td>
<td>Montego Bay West</td>
<td>89-100</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3,335</td>
<td>3,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. James West Central</td>
<td>Montego Bay North East</td>
<td>1-25, 29-34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9,023</td>
<td>9,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,776</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,279</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 3

ST. JAMES CONSTITUENCIES
INDEPENDENT MEMBERS’ DECISION
## APPENDIX 4

**ELECTORAL DIVISIONS & POLLING DIVISIONS MAKING UP NEW CONSTITUENCIES**

**ST. CATHERINE**

### NEW CONSTITUENCY 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituencies</th>
<th>Electoral Divisions</th>
<th>Polling Divisions</th>
<th># of P.Ds</th>
<th>Electors Moved May 30, 2009 Voters List</th>
<th>Electors Moved Nov. 30, 2009 Voters List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Catherine South Western</td>
<td>Church Pen</td>
<td>79-84, 107</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,031</td>
<td>2,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Catherine South Western</td>
<td>Sydenham</td>
<td>108-133</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6,311</td>
<td>6,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Catherine Central</td>
<td>Homestead</td>
<td>68-98</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6,728</td>
<td>6,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Catherine West Central</td>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>94-101</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,938</td>
<td>2,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Catherine South Central</td>
<td>De La Vega City</td>
<td>57-67, 69-73</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3,443</td>
<td>3,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL NEW CONSTITUENCY 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>88</strong></td>
<td><strong>20,451</strong></td>
<td><strong>20,648</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ELECTORAL DIVISIONS & POLLING DIVISIONS MAKING UP NEW CONSTITUENCIES

**ST. CATHERINE**

### NEW CONSTITUENCY 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituencies</th>
<th>Electoral Divisions</th>
<th>Polling Divisions</th>
<th># of P.Ds</th>
<th>Electors Moved May 30, 2009 Voters List</th>
<th>Electors Moved Nov. 30, 2009 Voters List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Catherine Southern</td>
<td>Bernard Lodge</td>
<td>1-9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,704</td>
<td>1,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Catherine Southern</td>
<td>Naggo Head</td>
<td>7-29, 34-41</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5,967</td>
<td>6,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Catherine Southern</td>
<td>Greater Portmore</td>
<td>67-69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Catherine South</td>
<td>Independence City</td>
<td>41-42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Catherine South</td>
<td>Westchester</td>
<td>63, 65-67</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,069</td>
<td>1,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Catherine South</td>
<td>Gregory Park</td>
<td>98-133</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8,725</td>
<td>9,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL NEW CONSTITUENCY 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,670</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,338</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 5

ST. CATHERINE CONSTITUENCIES
INDEPENDENT MEMBERS’ DECISION
THE ELECTORAL COMMISSION OF JAMAICA

NOMINATED COMMISSIONERS
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Mr. Peter Bunting The Hon. Minister Karl Samuda

.................................................. ..................................................
Mr. Donald Buchanan Senator Thomas Tavares-Finson

SELECTED COMMISSIONERS
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..................................................
Dr. Herbert Thompson C.D.

..................................................
Professor The Hon. Errol Miller, OJ, CD
Chairman
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..................................................
Mr. Orrette Fisher