

Central Hawke's Bay District Council – Report

TO: Council
FROM: Chief Executive
DATE: 7 August 2008
FILE REF: ELE1-100
SUBJECT: ELECTORAL SYSTEM FOR 2010 TRIENNIAL GENERAL ELECTION

1.0 SUMMARY

The Local Electoral Act 2001 offers the choice between two electoral systems for local government elections; first past the post (FPP) and the single transferable vote (STV).

Councils now have the option to decide, by 12 September 2008, whether to stay with their current electoral system (either FPP or STV), or whether to change to the alternative system for the 2010 elections.

Whether or not a council passes a resolution by 12 September 2008, it must give public notice by 19 September 2008 of the right for 5% of electors to demand a poll on the electoral system to be used at the 2010 local elections.

2.0 RECOMMENDATION

THAT

1. That Council receives the report.
2. That Council retains the First Past the Post (FPP) electoral system for the triennial local elections in 2010 and gives the required statutory public notification regarding this including the right of the public to demand a poll.

REASON

Council has the option to decide, by 12 September 2008, whether to stay with its current electoral system (FPP) or whether to change to the alternative system for the 2010 elections. Council must give public notice by 19 September 2008 of the right for 5% of electors to demand a poll on the electoral system to be used at the 2010 local elections.

3.0 BACKGROUND

The option of FPP and STV was first offered for the 2004 local government elections. As a result of that option ten city/district councils used STV at the 2004 elections (Kaipara, Papakura, Matamata-Piako, Thames-Coromandel, Kapiti Coast, Porirua, Wellington, Marlborough, Dunedin and the Chatham Islands). After the 2004 election, two councils (Papakura and Matamata-Piako) resolved to change back to FPP. The remaining eight councils used STV at the 2007 elections.

The attached guide prepared for the Department of Internal Affairs has been developed to help councils reach their decision. It is also intended to provide a basis for information to help local communities understand the issues. Communities have an important role to play in the decision. They must be consulted by way of public notice and may be polled on their preferred electoral system or demand a poll themselves.

The guide includes:

1. A brief description of the two electoral systems including important differences.
2. Some commonly identified advantages and disadvantages of each electoral system.
3. Responses to common concerns and questions councils and the public have raised about each electoral system and the electoral option.

The guide does not intend to influence councils either way in their decision-making. It presents arguments for and against both systems and encourages councils to make an informed choice about the electoral system best suited for their community.

The statutory timeframes under the Local Electoral Act 2001 are:

12 September 2008 – Under Section 27 a local authority may resolve to change electoral systems not later than this date. If the decision is made to change the system, this will apply for the next two triennial general elections.

19 September 2008 – Under Section 28, a local authority must, not later than this date, give public notice of the right to demand a poll on the electoral system to be used for the elections of the local authority.

4.0 OPTIONS

Option 1

Council retains the FPP electoral system for the triennial local elections in 2010 and give the required statutory public notification requirements under the Local Electoral Act 2001.

Option 2

Council changes the electoral system to STV for the next two triennial general elections and carries out the statutory public notification requirements under the Local Electoral Act 2001.

5.0 STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

The Local Electoral Act 2001 governs the conduct of local elections and polls.

6.0 CONSULTATION

6.1 External

None

6.2 Internal

Elected members

7.0 FINANCIAL

There may be financial implications should a poll be demanded. It is estimated this would cost the ratepayer approximately \$15,000.

8.0 STRATEGIC LINKS

- LTCCP

9.0 POLICY/DELEGATION REFERENCE

N/A

John Freeman
Chief Executive

The Local Government Electoral Option 2008

This guide was prepared for the Department of Internal Affairs,
the Society of Local Government Managers Electoral Working Party
and Local Government New Zealand

Introduction

The Local Electoral Act 2001 offers the choice between two electoral systems for local government elections: first past the post (FPP) and the single transferable vote (STV).

Introduction

The Local Electoral Act 2001 offers the choice between two electoral systems for local government elections: first past the post (FPP) and the single transferable vote (STV).

The option was first offered for the 2004 local government elections. As a result of that option, ten city/district councils used STV at the 2004 elections (Kaipara, Papakura, Matamata-Piako, Thames-Coromandel, Kapiti Coast, Porirua, Wellington, Marlborough, Dunedin and the Chatham Islands). After the 2004 election, two councils (Papakura and Matamata-Piako) resolved to change back to FPP. The remaining eight councils used STV at the 2007 elections.

Councils now have the option to decide, by 12 September 2008, whether to stay with their current electoral system (either FPP or STV), or whether to change to the alternative system for the 2010 elections.¹

Whether or not a council passes a resolution by 12 September 2008, it must give public notice by 19 September of the right for 5% of electors to demand a poll on the electoral system to be used at the 2010 local elections.

This guide has been developed to help councils reach their decision. It is also intended to provide a basis for information to help local communities understand the issues. Communities have an important role to play in the decision. They must be consulted by way of public notice and may be polled on their preferred electoral system or demand a poll themselves.

The guide includes:

1. a brief description of the two electoral systems including important differences
2. some commonly identified advantages and disadvantages of each electoral system
3. responses to common concerns and questions councils and the public have raised about each electoral system and the electoral option.

This guide does not intend to influence councils either way in their decision-making. It presents arguments for and against both systems and encourages councils to make an informed choice about the electoral system best suited for their community.

¹ This option does not apply for any council that for the 2007 elections had the electoral system determined by way of a poll. The outcome of such a poll applies for two triennial elections i.e. 2007 and 2010.

1. The Choice: First Past the Post (FPP) or the Single Transferable Vote (STV)

(a) How do the two electoral systems work?

FPP	STV
<p>FPP: casting a vote</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> You place ticks equal to the number of vacancies next to the candidate(s) you wish to vote for. In multi-member wards/constituencies you cast one vote for each vacancy to be filled, as above. In single-member wards/constituencies you cast one vote. <p>FPP: counting votes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The candidate(s) with the most votes win(s). Each winning candidate is unlikely to have a majority of votes, just the largest number of votes cast. 	<p>STV: casting a vote</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> You cast one <i>single</i> vote regardless of the number of vacancies. You cast this <i>single</i> vote by consecutively 'ranking' your preferred candidates beginning with your most preferred candidate ('1') your next preferred candidate ('2') and so on. In multi-member wards/constituencies you cast a <i>single</i> vote by ranking as few or as many candidates as you wish, as above. In single-member wards/constituencies you cast a <i>single</i> vote by ranking as few or as many candidates as you wish. <p>STV: counting votes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The candidate(s) are elected by reaching the 'quota' (the number of votes required to be elected).² Vote counting is carried out by computer.³ First preference votes ('1s') are counted. Candidates who reach the quota are 'elected'. The 'surplus' votes for elected candidates are transferred according to voters' second preferences. Candidates who reach the quota by including second preferences are 'elected'. This process repeats until the required number of candidates is elected.⁴

² The quota is calculated using the total number of valid votes cast and the number of vacancies.

³ The New Zealand method of STV uses the 'Meek method' of counting votes. Because this method transfers proportions of votes between candidates, it requires a computer program (the STV calculator).

⁴ If at any point there are no surpluses left to transfer, the candidate with the lowest number of votes is excluded and the votes redistributed according to voters' next preferences.

FPP	STV
<p>FPP: announcing results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FPP results can usually be announced soon after voting ends. • Results are announced and published showing the total votes received by each candidate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In multi-member constituencies, despite voters casting only a <i>single</i> vote, a voter may influence the election of more than one representative (if their vote can be transferred to other candidates according to voters' preferences) <p>STV: announcing results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Because vote counting is multi-part, it is likely to take longer than for FPP election results. • Results are announced and published showing elected candidates in the order they reached the quota and unsuccessful candidates in the reverse order they were excluded. All elected candidates will have the same share of the vote.

(b) What are the most important differences between the two electoral systems?

To understand the important differences between the two electoral systems it is helpful to think about what happens to 'wasted votes' in both cases. A 'wasted vote' is a vote that does not help to elect a candidate. This might be because the candidate was very popular (so did not need all the votes received), or was very unpopular (and had no chance of being elected).

Let's imagine that you vote in a local government FPP election to fill two vacancies, with four candidates standing for election. You vote for Candidates A and B. Imagine Candidate A wins by a landslide and Candidate B is the least popular of all the candidates. The vote for the other candidate to be elected is very close between Candidates C and D; in the end Candidate D wins the second vacancy by a very small margin. Candidate D is your least preferred candidate.

You might think to yourself, once you see the results, 'I wish I had known that Candidate A didn't need my vote to win, and that Candidate B didn't have a chance of being elected as I would have voted differently. I may have still voted for Candidate A, but would have voted for Candidate C instead of Candidate B.'

Now imagine you vote in the same election using STV. You have a *single* transferable vote even though there are two positions to fill. Again Candidate A wins by a landslide and Candidate B is the least popular candidate. Candidates C and D are very close on first preference votes and so second and subsequent preferences become important.

You cast your vote by ranking the candidates according to your preferences; you rank Candidate A as '1', Candidate B as '2' and Candidate C as '3'. You don't rank candidate D at all because you don't want that candidate to be elected. Under STV:

- Candidate A is very popular and is elected on first preferences
- Candidate A has votes surplus to the number required to reach the quota and these are transferred according to voters' second preferences
- the surplus portion of your vote for Candidate A is transferred to your second preference, Candidate B
- both Candidates C and D are very close to the quota at this point and Candidate B is least popular
- Candidate B is excluded and the proportion of your vote for this candidate is transferred to your third preference, Candidate C
- when preferences are counted again Candidate C reaches the quota and is elected.

Under STV, unlike the FPP election, your ranking of the candidates made your vote more effective and avoided it being 'wasted' on Candidates A (who had a surplus of first preference votes) and B (who was excluded once surplus votes from Candidate A were transferred). In other words, despite Candidates A and B being your most preferred candidates, under STV you were also able to influence the race between Candidates C and D because you showed a preference between them on your voting document.⁵

These election results reveal an important difference between FPP and STV electoral systems. Think again about your FPP vote. You voted for two candidates to fill two vacancies. If you are part of the largest group of like-minded voters, even if that group is not the majority, you could determine the election of both candidates. Other voters (from perhaps only slightly smaller groups) won't have gained any representation at all.

In the STV election, however, you cast only one *single* transferable vote, even in multi-member wards/constituencies. That vote is used to greater effect as long as you rank all the candidates you like in order of preference. Because your vote is a single vote that can be transferred in whole or in part according to your wishes, you and other voters will not be over-represented or under-represented. This is why STV, unlike FPP, in multi-member wards or constituencies, is called a proportional representation system. The outcomes potentially better reflect community views.

⁵ These scenarios oversimplify how the vote count actually works under NZSTV, in order to explain the principle of vote transfers. The STV calculator uses a complex mathematical set of rules to ensure that the appropriate proportions of votes are transferred between candidates.

2. What are the advantages and disadvantages of each system?

No electoral system is perfect. Both FPP and STV have advantages and disadvantages.

Overall, the advantages of STV relate to the people who get elected using STV. The system potentially achieves:

- broad proportionality (in multi-member wards/constituencies)
- majority outcomes in single-member elections
- more equitable minority representation
- a reduction in the number of wasted votes.

The disadvantages of STV relate to:

- the public being less familiar with the system and possibly finding it harder to understand
- matters of process such as the way votes are cast and counted (for example perceived complexity may discourage some voters)
- the information conveyed in election results.

The advantages of FPP, on the other hand, relate to the simplicity of the process including the ways votes are cast, counted and announced.

The disadvantages of FPP relate to:

- the results of the election, including the generally 'less representative' nature of FPP councils
- the obstacles to minority candidate election
- the number of wasted votes.

Deciding which electoral system is best for your community may come down to deciding which is more important: process, or outcome. Unfortunately, neither electoral system can claim to achieve well in both.

More detailed advantages and disadvantages

FPP	STV
<p>FPP: casting votes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FPP is a straightforward system of voting. • FPP is familiar to most people. • ‘Tactical’ voting is possible; votes can be used with a view to preventing a candidate from winning in certain circumstances. <p>FPP: counting votes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FPP is a straightforward system for counting votes. • Votes can be counted in different locations and then aggregated. • Election results are usually announced soon after voting ends. <p>FPP: election results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Official results show exactly how many people voted for which candidates. • Results are easy to understand. • A ‘block’ of like-minded voters can determine the election of multiple candidates in multi-member wards/constituencies, without having a majority of the votes, thereby ‘over-representing’ themselves. • The overall election results will not be proportional to voters’ wishes, and will not reflect the electoral wishes of the <i>majority</i> of voters, only the <i>largest group</i> of voters who may not be the majority. 	<p>STV: casting votes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STV is a less straightforward system of voting. • There is a need for more information for people to understand the STV ranking system of candidates. • It is virtually impossible to cast a ‘tactical’ vote under STV. As a result, voters are encouraged to express their true preferences. <p>STV: counting votes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STV vote counting requires a computer program (the STV calculator). • Votes must be aggregated first and then counted in one location. • Election results will usually take a little longer to produce. <p>STV: election results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Official results will identify which candidates have been elected and which have not and in which order. They do not show how many votes candidates got overall, as all successful candidates will have the same proportion of the vote (the quota). This information, at stages of the count, can still be requested. • Results can be easy to understand if presented appropriately. • STV moderates ‘block’ voting as each voter casts only one <i>single</i> vote, even in multi-member wards/constituencies. • The overall election results reflect the wishes of the majority of voters in proportion to their support for a variety of candidates.

FPP	STV
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In single-member elections, the winner is unlikely to have the majority of votes, just the largest group of votes. • There will be more 'wasted' votes (votes that do not contribute to the election of a candidate). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In single-member wards/constituencies, the winner will have the majority of votes (preferences). • Every vote is as effective as possible (depending on the number of preferences indicated) meaning there are fewer 'wasted votes' and more votes will contribute to the election of a candidate than under FPP.

3. Common Questions and Concerns

FPP ain't broke: so why fix it?

For those voters supporting candidates who tend to get elected under FPP, it can appear that there is nothing wrong with this system. But FPP councils do not truly 'represent' their community in terms of their composition. STV is a proportional representation voting system that means (if a diversity of candidates stand for election and a diversity of electors vote) the candidates elected will better represent the wishes of a greater number, and a wider diversity of voters.

FPP is easy to understand. I can't trust a complicated system like STV.

It is true that FPP is a very easy way to vote, and to count votes. Voting under STV is less straightforward, but as long as a voter knows how to rank their preferred candidates, they will find it easy to vote. A post-election survey has found that most people found it easy to fill in the STV voting document and rank their preferred candidates. The way votes are counted is complicated. That is why it requires a computer program (STV calculator). The STV calculator has been independently certified and voters *can* trust that it only transfers a vote according to voters' preferences ranked on their voting documents. Nothing (and no person) can influence the transfer of votes set out on voting documents.

Won't voters be put off if the voting system is too complicated?

Voter turnout (the number of people voting) in 2004 and 2007 in the STV local body elections was mixed. Some councils' turnout was higher than the national average, and some lower. Turnout for DHB elections (which must use STV) can be seen to be influenced by a range of factors including elections being at large for seven vacancies, the number of candidates (and often less well-known than council candidates) and the fact this issue is usually at the end of the voting document).

Overall, voter turnout has been on the decline for many years. It is possible that *more* voters would turn out to local elections in the future if they feel with STV they have a

better chance of electing a representative who better represents them than FPP has in the past.

Won't there be more blank and informal votes under STV, which is not good for democracy?

Despite voters saying in the Local Government Commission survey that they generally found STV an easy way to vote, some voters did cast an invalid vote in STV elections (including DHB elections). A small proportion of these voters seemed confused by the voting system. But most blank and informal votes are thought to be due to two different voting systems (FPP and STV) appearing on the same voting document and to other factors, rather than being due to the way STV votes are cast.

STV will not work for our council because of our ward/at large system.

Eight of the ten councils using STV in 2004 had wards, one used the at large system, and one had a combination of wards and at large. There is no 'rule' about the need or otherwise for wards or constituencies, but STV can be seen to provide the greatest benefit in wards or constituencies of between three and nine candidates. If there are fewer than three candidates, the benefits of the transferable vote in terms of proportionality are not likely to be evident. If there are a very large number of candidates to choose from, voters are likely to find it a more difficult task to rank preferred candidates (though there is no need to rank all candidates).

STV hasn't made any difference to the diversity of representation in STV councils

Until a greater variety of people stand for local body election and a wide diversity of electors vote, no representation system will be able to improve the diversity of representatives elected. There has been some change in the gender, ethnicity and age of some members elected by STV in 2004 and 2007 which may be due to STV. But it will take some time for a diversity of candidates to see the opportunities of standing in an STV election and more electors to see the potential benefits of voting under a proportional representation system. Two elections in a small number of councils is not enough time to judge the difference STV could make over time.