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Introduction

This report summarizes the results of the survey that AMCTO carried out early in 2007 to gather information on the administration of the 2006 municipal elections in Ontario. Some of the information varies slightly from what was presented in the March 29, 2007 interim report. As with the surveys conducted for the 2000 and 2003 elections, the purpose of the survey for the 2006 election was to collect information to help improve policies and practices for future elections. The survey was conducted between January 10 and February 8, 2007, using an online survey tool.

All 415 of Ontario’s 445 municipalities responsible for conducting elections for council and school trustee positions were invited to participate. The invitation went to the municipal clerk. As can be seen from the table below, 85.8% of the municipalities answered the call.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Participating</th>
<th>Rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2,000</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000 to 10,000</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 25,000</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>97.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000 to 50,000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 to 100,000</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 to 300,000</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 300,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>85.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chart below shows the breakdown of survey participants by type of municipality.
AMCTO’s Municipal Elections Project Team is reviewing the survey results to provide recommendations to the review of the Municipal Elections Act that the Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs & Housing has initiated. Questions about the survey can be directed to the AMCTO Office.

Incidence of Elections

Only nine of the 356 municipalities that participated in the survey did not have an election in November 2006—see below.

![](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality with a Question on the Ballot</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town of Ajax</td>
<td>Elect regional chair directly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Brockville</td>
<td>Dissolve ward system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Dryden</td>
<td>Fluoridate water supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Guelph</td>
<td>Retain current ward system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Huntsville</td>
<td>Use only mail-in ballot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality of Norfolk</td>
<td>Liquor vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Oshawa</td>
<td>Elect regional chair + councillors directly; move to at large system for city council (3 questions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township of Russell*</td>
<td>Change from at-large to ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Pickering</td>
<td>Elect regional chair directly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Stratford</td>
<td>Mail-in ballot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* From a survey conducted by Association of Municipalities of Ontario.
Election Turnout†

A total of 3,125,883 of the 8,098,294 qualified electors in the municipalities participating in the AMCTO survey voted in the November 2006 elections. This yields a weighted average turnout rate of 38.6%. The simple average rate, calculated by adding up all the individual turnout rates and dividing this by the total number of municipalities participating in the survey, was 41.9%. The discrepancy is explained by the fact that smaller municipalities generally had higher turnout rates than more populous ones. The table below shows the simple averages by population size. The highest municipal turnout rate was 80.3%, the lowest, 7.8%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Size</th>
<th>Turnout Rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avg</td>
<td>44.2% 42.2% 42.2% 38.3% 38.6% 34.0% 37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>74.7% 80.3% 58.3% 54.3% 52.8% 42.1% 53.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>14.6% 7.8% 8.2% 20.1% 23.2% 24.3% 20.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Turnout rates were calculated by dividing the number of citizens casting votes, by the number of qualified electors at the end of Voting Day (where this figure was available—otherwise the number as of the start of the day was used). For all the calculations, we excluded 9 municipalities where all positions were acclaimed, 17 municipalities that held an election for school trustee purposes only and 27 municipalities whose data could not be verified. This left 303 municipalities.

Respondents were asked whether their 2006 turnout was up or down from the previous election in 2003. The results are shown in the chart on the following page.

† This page includes minor corrections to the version of the report released on July 16, 2007.
Respondents were also asked, “In your opinion, what were the factors affecting the turnout in 2006?” See Appendix A and B for all the comments offered. In those municipalities where turn-out was up significantly, 14 of 49 respondents mentioned the mail-in balloting system as a factor, with other factors including Internet voting, hotly contested races and the lack of contests in 2003. In those municipalities where turn-out was down significantly, the lack of a contest for head of council was the factor most commonly mentioned.

### Wards vs. At-Large

Participants were asked if their municipality had a ward system or if all of council was elected at large. Of the 321 municipalities responding to this question, slightly more than half said they had a ward system. The number of wards ranged from two to 44.
Vote Casting Methods

Municipalities were asked, “What vote casting method(s) did the municipality use for the 2006 election?” The results are summarized below. Appendix C provides a complete listing of municipalities by vote casting method.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vote Casting Methods in 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper ballot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touch screen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail-in balloting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote by phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote by Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Respondents</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey asked what vote casting method the municipalities had used in the 2003 election in order to allow us to track shifts from one method to another. As shown below, the traditional paper ballot lost ground to “alternative” methods over the three years.
The chart below summarizes election managers’ satisfaction with the vote casting methods used in the 2006 municipal elections. Most managers expressed satisfaction with the method their municipality had used—that is, they gave it a “score” of 3, 4 or 5). Of the 20 that expressed dissatisfaction, 11 had used paper ballots and nine, mail-in ballots.

![Image of satisfaction chart]

The survey sought to verify media reports about problems encountered with the mail-in ballot voting method. The survey asked, “If you used MAIL-IN BALLOTING, what was the number of returned ballot kits that were rejected?” The percentages of rejected ballots ranged from less than 1% to a high of 19.0%. Appendix D to this report provides further details.

**Voter Identification**

The chart below presents information from the survey about practices followed with respect to requiring voters to provide evidence of their eligibility to vote. (Note: The municipalities that answered, “Not relevant because of voting method used,” were generally those that used mail-in balloting, where the statutory declaration in the ballot kit served as the voter’s proof of identity.)

![Image of voter identification chart]
Vote Counting Methods

Question 22 in the survey was, “What vote counting method(s) did the municipality use for the 2006 election?” As will be seen, the manual count still predominates in Ontario. Of the 344 survey respondents, 30 said they used more than one method on Voting Day. Appendix E provides a listing of municipalities by counting method used on Voting Day.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vote Counting Methods in 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central tabulator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poll tabulators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touch screen system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(skipped this question)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The survey asked what counting method the municipality had used in the 2003 election. This allowed us to track shifts from one method to another. As will be seen, manual counting lost some ground to “alternative” methods over the three years.

The chart below shows the levels of satisfaction with the vote counting methods used. Most election managers expressed satisfaction with the method their municipality had used. Of the 15 that expressed dissatisfaction, 11 used a manual count, two used a central tabulator and two a telephone system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 341
skipped question 15
Election Recounts

Ontario’s Municipal Elections Act required recounts of election results under certain circumstances, including where the vote is tied (sec. 56), on the adoption of a resolution by the municipal council (sec. 57) and by court order (sec. 58 and 63). The act also authorizes an application to a court for a declaration that an election is "controverted," requiring a new election. Only one municipality reported having a tied vote recount in 2006. However, 29 municipalities reported recounts by resolution, with four having two such recounts. Four municipalities had judicial recounts. The municipalities with recounts arising from the 2006 election are listed in Appendix F.

Advance Votes

Question 29 in the survey was, “How many advance vote dates did you have?” Of the 221 respondents that did not use mail, telephone or Internet voting (where the question would generally not be applicable), the answers ranged from one to 11 days. Some municipalities offered a continuous advance poll over a number of days rather than—or in addition to—advance polls on particular days.

Vote Anywhere

Question 31 in the survey was, “If you had voters cast their ballots at voting places, did you allow them to Vote Anywhere in the municipality?” Fifty-nine municipalities using paper ballot or touch screen as their vote casting method said that they had used a vote anywhere system for the Advance Vote, and 16, so on Voting Day. It should be noted, however, that 159 of the 356 survey participants skipped this question.

Voters List Management

The survey asked how Ontario municipalities managed their voters’ list. A summary of the responses is shown below.
MPAC Products

The survey included several questions about the enumeration data that Municipal Property Assessment Corporation provided for the municipal Voters’ Lists. MPAC is responsible under the Municipal Elections Act for preparing the preliminary list of electors for municipalities. MPAC supplies a series of products designed to help municipalities optimize the accuracy of the final voters’ list. At MPAC’s request, the AMCTO survey included a question on the usefulness of MPAC’s products.

The products in question were:

- PLE (July 31 paper version of Preliminary List of Electors)
- VNF (Voter Notification File - electronic version of PLE but containing additional elector and property information)
- SPLE (September and October versions of July PLE)
- SVNF (September and October versions of July 31 VNF)
- EVNF (differences only, between July and September, and July and October VNFs)
- EDFR (Elector Differences Found Report - field-by-field identification of changes for every record on the EVNF)

The chart on below summarizes the municipal responses.
The survey asked municipal election managers to rate the accuracy of MPAC's data (putting aside the issue of unconfirmed citizenship, discussed below). The results are shown in the chart below.

Survey participants were also asked for their suggestions for how MPAC’s data could be improved for the next municipal election in 2010. Over 190 of the 356 survey participants offered suggestions. No central theme emerges. The suggestions ran the gamut from having MPAC go back to the system of physical enumeration of electors to municipalities taking over the enumeration function from MPAC. The detailed responses are set out in Appendix G.

### Unconfirmed Citizenship

For the 2006 elections, MPAC took steps to assist municipalities with confirming that electors shown on the voters’ list met the requirement of Canadian citizenship to vote in Ontario municipal elections. In its electronic products, MPAC placed a “U” (for “unconfirmed”) next to the name of those electors whose citizenship could not confirmed through MPAC’s normal confirmation procedures.

Municipalities dealt with the “U” issue in a variety of ways. Some attempted to contact individuals to let them know that they might be struck from the voters’ list, while others used the information to check when electors came to the polls to vote. Municipalities using mail-in balloting generally did not take any specific action and relied on the statutory declaration of qualification to ensure that everyone met the citizenship requirement. Our survey probed the issue with additional questions on the issue. The three charts below summarize the results.
We also asked how problematic the unconfirmed citizen issue had been for the municipality and what course of action the election manager would recommend for the elections in 2010. The results are shown in the two charts on the next page.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48. What method(s) of communication did you use? [Check all that apply]</td>
<td>Sent notices by mail</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tried to contact by phone</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Used advertising</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Included in mail-in ballot kits</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Answered question</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skipped question</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49. How did you get unconfirmed citizens to CONFIRM their eligibility to vote? [Check all that apply]</td>
<td>Made no special effort to confirm eligibility</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Had them come to the office and present ID</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accepted written declarations delivered by hand or by mail</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Took oral declarations over the telephone</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Took oral declarations at the voting place</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Required written declarations at the voting place</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Included on the declaration in the mail-in ballot kit</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Answered question</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skipped question</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of the responses to this question by population size reveals that the “U” issue was mainly a problem for larger municipalities (i.e., those with a population of 50,000 or more).

As can be seen from the chart above, there was no clear “winner” in terms of what should be done about the “U” issue for 2010. Further analysis revealed that the lack of a clear pattern was true irrespective of a municipality’s population size or voting method.

**Candidate Gender**

Our survey collected information on the gender of candidates for both municipal council and school trustee elections. However, further effort to “clean up” the data is required before we can present results. In the meantime, the Association of Municipalities of Ontario has provided a gender breakdown for successful council candidates (elected or acclaimed). This shows that three out of four Ontario municipal councillors are male, and one out of four, female.
Candidate Information Sessions

Our survey sought information on whether municipalities offered information sessions for individuals running for office. Nearly a third of municipalities did so. See Appendix H for kinds of information that candidates received at these sessions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>50. Did you hold INFORMATION SESSIONS for candidates?</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sign Regulation

The two charts below summarize the information obtained from the survey about municipalities’ regulation of candidates’ campaign signs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>84. Does your municipality have a by-law regulating candidates’ CAMPAIGN SIGNS?</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>85. If yes, does the by-law [Skip question if not applicable]</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specify how many days before voting day signs can be erected?</td>
<td>54.7% (75)</td>
<td>45.3% (62)</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require compliance within a specified period of time?</td>
<td>66.2% (88)</td>
<td>33.8% (45)</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require payment of a deposit to ensure removal?</td>
<td>10.6% (14)</td>
<td>89.4% (118)</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide for keeping all or part of the deposit in cases of non-compliance?</td>
<td>3.6% (12)</td>
<td>96.4% (113)</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 138
skipped question 219
Use of Schools

Many municipalities utilized school premises as voting locations. Below is a snapshot of how municipal election managers saw the relationship with schools and school boards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answered</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipped</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accessibility Measures

The chart below outlines the various measures that municipalities used in the 2006 elections to ensure equal access to the vote for Ontarians with disabilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physically accessible voting locations</td>
<td></td>
<td>89.6%</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large text</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnifying sheets</td>
<td></td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pictorial/graphic material</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballot templates</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braille templates/forms</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio ballots</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign language interpreters</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free transportation to and from voting place</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answered</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipped</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Election Financing

The survey included a question designed to identify those municipalities developing new arrangements to manage compliance with the election financing requirements of the Municipal Elections Act.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you have a body separate from council to review compliance audits?</td>
<td>5.8% (10)</td>
<td>94.2% (310)</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow electronic filing of financial disclosure statement?</td>
<td>3.1% (10)</td>
<td>96.9% (315)</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have an election contribution rebate program?</td>
<td>2.5% (9)</td>
<td>97.5% (318)</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Election Staffing

The survey included questions about how municipalities recruited and trained election staff. The results are presented below and in Appendix I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you hire contract staff to work at the municipal office to help deliver the election (apart from temporary staff hired for voting day only)?</td>
<td>Response Percent</td>
<td>Response Count</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>No special measures</th>
<th>Written test</th>
<th>Oral interview</th>
<th>Other (please specify)</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answered question</th>
<th>Skipped question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>388</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Sources of Support**

Question 92 of the survey asked election managers about the sources of support they drew on to deal with issues arising in the course of the elections. The results are shown in the chart below.

![Usefulness of Sources of Support](chart.png)

**Conclusion**

AMCTO’s post-election survey for the 2006 municipal elections built on the successful surveys the association carried out for the 2000 and 2003 elections. Of the 415 municipal managers responsible for conducting elections in November 2006, 356 took the time to complete the 100-question survey circulated. The exercise has produced a rich database of information about how the 2006 elections were managed. The information will be of use in assessing legislative, policy and procedural changes advisable for the next elections in 2010. The present report presents the high-level results of the survey. Detailed results and analysis are being supplied to AMCTO’s Municipal Elections Project Team and to individual municipalities wanting to compare their results and practices. Information requests can be directed to the AMCTO Office.
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Appendix A

Factors Increasing Turnout

Answers given to Question 20, “In your opinion, what were the factors affecting the turnout in 2006?” in those municipalities where turnout was reported to be up significantly from 2003.

- number of candidates and issues facing the north
- possibly the Mayoralty race
- 2003 was school board only
- Implemented Vote by Mail for 2006 election.
- Election for Mayor.
- Use of the Vote By Mail method
- Use of Vote by Mail voting method.
- Mail in.
- Mayor and Deputy Mayor race record number of candidates running for municipal council seats
- Election for the Mayor, three (3) candidates for one (1) position
- There was no mayoral election in 2003 and no school board elections in 2003.
- In 2003 there was no election for Mayor and in 2006 there was.
- Four individuals running for Mayor Community interest
- In 2003, we held an election for School Trustees only. Mayor and Council were full acclamation.
- Advance Poll location - centrally located shopping mall...opened for 6 days better race offered
- There were 5 candidates for Mayor and 12 candidates for Councillor. It was quite the race. The changes in the Polling Subdivision boundaries also affected the vote; residents didn't like the initial changes and lobbied to have them put back. We accommodated some, but still removed one location.
- There was a resident running for Council, who is infamous within the countryside and people were not wanting this person to get in.
- First election using Vote by Mail
- candidates promises
- Residents wanting a change
- every position in 2003 acclaimed - no election
- Vote By Mail
- Mayoral race In the previous election most of the candidates were acclaimed. In the 2006 election all but one position had a race. Significant local issues (dump site location).
- Electronic vote over the internet. 1267 voted by internet, 605 by phone and 1254 paper ballots
- 2006 there was election for french only, none in our municipality supports the french board. We were satisfied with voter turnout. The numbers seem very small, but only
about 40 people reside in our municipality, other voters are seasonal dwellers and property owners not in the area.

- Last election only had 3 wards challenged, Mayor, Deputy Mayor and 4 ward Councillors were acclaimed. -Plus established Vote by Mail for this election.
- Very intense Mayor's race
- In 2003 the full Council was acclaimed and only election for school trustee. In 2006 there was an election for Councillors and school trustee.
- Public involvement and awareness local issues
- Our municipality had a vote by mail for the first time in 2006. Plus there was an election for all the Council positions with a number of candidates for all the offices. In regards to question 14 above, the municipality went from a ward system to a combo system (4 at large Councillors and 4 Ward Councillors).
- A controversial Councillor was running for re-election.
- All municipal positions acclaimed in 2003
- Went to vote by mail only for the first time
- There was an election for four (4) "Councillor" positions. In 2003 there was only an election for one (1) school trustee position.
- Hotly contested races for all Council positions
- Our voter turnout was up significantly probably because of the Vote by Mail, most of our population is non-residents that don't usually vote, but had the chance for 2006.
- Mayoral Race
- Strong race for Mayor's position between incumbent and former Council member.
- Our non-residents have never been big on voting in our municipality, no matter what voting method we have offered. ...We even offered a secondary method of voting "Vote by Mail by completing an Application - registering to vote", sending out the application in all tax bills with a complete explanation of the process, etc., posting the application and information to educate the electorate on our website, writing to over 30 cottage and other associations, advertising for 6 months and it still did not attract many non-residents to vote.
- Went to internet/telephone voting; turnout increased from 35% to 46%. Three-way race for Mayor may have had an impact, but was likely countered by an acclamation for council positions in one of the three wards.
- Using Vote By Mail
- Successful internet voting program - An effective and comprehensive Communications Plan which included an interactive website. - An exciting Regional Councillor race
- First time sending Voter Notification Cards Run for Head of Council - more campaigning by candidates More offices to be elected - 2 offices were acclaimed last election
- One central location for all election events. Voter interest in change of Mayor. Two additional advance vote dates.
- Vote by mail process
- Clarification: 2003 - 16.5%, 2006 - 34.8% Factors: Mayor's Race Councillors races Trustee races 3 members of local council leaving office Regional Chair race lots of publicity
- Interesting Mayor race; large number of candidates running

---

• Controversy in the Township increased voter participation, interest and turn-out.
• Utilized Vote by Mail
Appendix B
Factors Decreasing Turnout

Answers given to Question 20, “In your opinion, what were the factors affecting the turnout in 2006?” in those municipalities where turnout was reported to be down significantly from 2003.

- large contest, too many candidates to chose from;
- No Mayoralty Race No Issues
- No Mayoralty race and two councillor ward positions open. No excitement in campaigns
- No council election - only school boards
- School Board election only
- Voter Apathy
- 19.7 percent rejected ballot kits in 2006 as a result of Declarations not being included in the return envelopes.
- No mayoralty race and no controversial issues to prompt voter turnout
- Election for English Public School Board Trustee only.
- Voter turnout was very high in 2003 (48%) compared to 41% in 2006. This was still considered to be a good turnout ... just down from last election. It's hard to attribute any factors as to why it was down other than perhaps "Elector Fatigue", having just participated in a Federal Election earlier in the same year.
- Municipal council elected by acclamation
- Less Candidates running, No big issues, not a highly contentious Mayor race
- Mayor and Deputy Mayor elected by acclamation
- Only having an election for one ward councillor significantly reduced voter interest. School board trustees didn't seem to do their house to house visits and that reduced interest as well.
- Lack of a mayorality race.
- no municipal council election
- We went to internet/telephone voting from a mail in ballot which may have intimidated a number of voters
- Voters re-elected the same council. The challenge to the Mayor was not a strong candidate in the elector's eyes
- majors position and two ward councillors acclaimed few major municipal issues outstanding
- Election only for public school supporters
- Two candidates for Mayor but one of them was not a strong candidate. Five of the six ward councillors were elected by acclamation. The result of this was fewer candidates canvassing the electors and less advertising and campaigning. Board of Education candidates advertize in newspapers but do not go door to door. Over-all result: less public interest in the election. Board of Education candidates advertize in newspapers but do not go door to door.
'quiet' election, mayor's race was a 'no contest', no candidates debates organized by usual community groups

no election for council members- all acclaimed

We only had a school board election for English public.

No election for the Head of Council

No race for Mayor 4 of 7 position were acclaimed Confusion with the ballot

In our municipality there was no buring issue, no council conflict and the Mayor's position was not contested. As well, we returned to the traditional vote from vote-by-mail.

Lack of election campaign by candidates. Media was not interested in the election of our municipality.

No election for Reeve and less candidates for Council

Acclamations resulted in little interest in the election

no significant issues head of council acclaimed
Appendix C

Vote Casting Methods

These are the methods used on Voting Day. 14 of 356 respondents skipped this question.

Paper ballot

Adelaide-Metcalfe
Adjala-Tosorontio
Ajax
Alfred and Plantagenet
Alnwick/Haldimand
Amherstburg
Arms
Assiniboine
Athens
Atikokan
Augusta
Aylmer
Baldwin
Barrie Island
Bayham
Beckwith
Belleville
Billings
Black River-Matheson
Blandford-Blenheim
Blind River
Bonfield
Bradford-West
Gwillimbury
Brampton
Brant
Brantford
Breath
Brockton
Brockville
Brooke-Alvinston
Bruce Mines
Burk's Falls
Burlington
Burpee and Mills
Caledon
Callander
Calvin
Cambridge
Carleton Place
Casey
Cavan-Millbrook-North
Monaghan
Central Elgin
Central Huron
Chamberlain
Chapeau
Chapple
Chatham-Kent
Chisholm
Cobalt
Cobourg
Cochrane
Cockburn Island
Coleman
Conmee
Cornwall
Dawn-Euphemia
Dawson
Deep River
Deseronto
Drummond/North
Elmsley
Dubreuilville
Ear Falls
East Gwillimbury
East Zorra-Tavistock
Edwardsburgh/Cardinal
Elizabethtown-Kitley
Elliot Lake
Englehart
Enniskillen
Espanola
Essa
Essex
Fauquier-Strickland
Fort Erie
Front of Yonge
Frontenac Islands
Galway-Cavendish &
Harvey
Gauthier
Georgina
Gillies
Goderich
Gordon & Allan West
Gore Bay
Greater Madawaska
Greater Napanee
Greater Sudbury
Guelph
Haldimand
Halton Hills
Hamilton (City)
Hamilton (Twp)
Harley
Harris
Head, Clara & Maria
Hearst
Hudson
Huntsville
Huron East
Huron Shores
Iroquois Falls
James
Kerns
King
Kingston
Kirkland Lake
Kitchener
Laird
LaSalle
Laurentian Hills
Paper ballot (cont.)

Limerick*
Lincoln
London
Loyalist
Lucan Biddulph
Machin
Magnetawan
Malahide
Marathon
Markham
Matachewan
Mattawa
McGarry
McNab/Braeside
Melancthon
Midland
Milton
Mississauga
Montague
Moosonee
Morley
Nairn and Hyman
Newbury
Newmarket
Niagara Falls
Niagara-on-the-Lake
Nipigon
Norfolk
North Grenville
North Huron
North Middlesex
Norwich
Oakville
O’Connor
Oil Springs
Oliver Paipoong
Opasatika
Orangeville
Orillia
Oro-Medonte
Oshawa
Ottawa
Owen Sound
Papineau-Cameron
Parry Sound
Pelham
Penetanguishene
Perth East
Perth South
Petawawa
Peterborough
Petrolia
Pickering
Point Edward
Port Colborne
Port Hope
Powassan
Prescott
Prince
Prince Edward
Puslinch
Quinte West
Rainy River
Red Lake
Red Rock
Renfrew
Richmond Hill
Ryerson
Sables-Spanish Rivers
Sarnia
Sault Ste. Marie
Schreiber
Selburne
Shuniah
Southgate
Southwest Middlesex
South-West Oxford
Spanish
Springwater
St. Marys
St. Thomas
Stone Mills
Stratford*
Tarbutt & Tarbutt
Additional
Tay
Temiskaming Shores
Terrace Bay
The North Shore
Thessalon
Thornloe
Thorold
Thunder Bay
Tillsonburg
Timmins
Toronto
Val Rita-Harty
Vaughan*
Wainfleet
Warwick
Waterloo
Welland*
Wellesley
Wellington North
West Elgin
West Grey
West Lincoln
West Perth
Westport
Whitby
Whitchurch-Stouffville
Wilmot
Windsor
Woodstock*
Woolwich

Touch screen

Barrie
South Stormont
Stratford*
Wasaga Beach*
Welland*
Woodstock*

Mail-In

Armour
Amprior
Ashfield-Colborne-Wawanosh
Mail-In (cont.)

Asphodel-Norwood
Assignack*
Bancroft
Bluewater
Bonnechere Valley
Bracebridge
Brighton
Brock
Brooke-Alvinston*
Carling
Central Manitoulin
Centre Wellington
Clarington
Collingwood
Cramahe
Douro-Dummer
Dryden
Dysart et al
Erie
Faraday
Fort Frances
French River
Galway-Cavendish &
Harvey*
Georgian Bay
Georgian Bluffs
Gravenhurst
Greater Madawaska*
Greenstone
Grey Highlands
Grimsby
Guelph/Eramosa
Hanover
Hastings Highlands
Havelock-Belmont-
Methuen
Highlands East
Horton
Howick
Huntsville*
Huron-Kinloss
Ignace
Ingersoll
Innisfil
Jocelyn
Kapuskasing*
Kawartha Lakes*
Kearney
Kenora
Killaloe, Hagarty and
Richards
Killarney
Kincardine
Kingsville
Lake of Bays
Lake of the Woods
Lambton Shores
Lanark Highlands
Laurentian Valley
Leamington
Leeds and the Thousand
Islands
Limerick*
Machar
Madawaska Valley
McKellar
McMurrich/Monteith
Meaford
Merrickville-Wolford
Middlesex Centre
Minden Hills
Minto
Mississippi Mills
Morris-Turnberry
Mulmur
Muskoka Lakes
Neebing
North Algonia
Wilberforce
North Frontenac
North Kawartha
Northeastern Manitoulin
and the Islands
Northern Bruce
Peninsula
Otonabee-South
Monaghan
Pelee
Perry
Ramara
Rideau Lakes
Saugeen Shores
Scugog
Seguin
Sioux Lookout
Sioux Narrows-Nestor
Falls
Smith-Ennismore-
Lakefield
Smiths Falls
South Bruce
South Huron
Southwold
St. Clair
Strathroy-Caradoc
Tecumseh
Thames Centre
The Blue Mountains
Tiny
Trent Hills
Tweed
Uxbridge
West Nipissing
Whitestone
Whitewater Region
Zorra

Telephone

Addington Highlands*
Augusta*
Champlain*
Clarence-Rockland*
Cobourg*
East Hawkesbury*
Edwardsburgh/Cardinal*
Hawkesbury*
North Dundas*
North Stormont*
Perth*
South Dundas*
### Telephone (cont.)

- South Frontenac*
- South Glengarry*
- South Stormont
- Tay Valley*
- The Archipelago*
- The Nation*

### Internet

- Addington Highlands*
- Augusta*

---

*Users of Multiple Casting Methods on Voting Day*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Paper Ballot</th>
<th>Touch Screen</th>
<th>Mail-In Balloting</th>
<th>Vote Phone</th>
<th>Vote by Internet</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addington Highlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assiginack</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooke-Alvinston</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champlain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence-Rockland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobourg</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Hawkesbury</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwardsburgh/Cardinal</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galway-Cav. &amp; Harvey</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Madawaska</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntsville</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapuskasing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawartha Lakes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limerick</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dundas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Stormont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dundas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Frontenac</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Glengarry</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Stormont</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratford</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Paper Ballot</td>
<td>Touch Screen</td>
<td>Mail-In Balloting</td>
<td>Vote Phone</td>
<td>Vote by Internet</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tay Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Archipelago</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Nation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welland</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodstock</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Rejection of Mail-In Ballots

Answers given to the question “If you used MAIL-IN BALLOTING, what was the number of returned ballot kits that were rejected?” for the 103 responses where the percentage of rejected ballots could be calculated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Rejected</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>-Once again, ballot distribution company still has a few issues to iron out with ballots, declarations etc. -80% of returned ballots got the process right though!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>Had 23% rejection. I knew verification was in ballot envelope because of weight. Amended procedures, sliced open secrecy envelopes on the side of the envelope in front of two other persons and extracted verification without disturbing ballot. Rejection dropped to 17%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>Declaration card not included within the yellow return envelope Ballot not sealed within the white secrecy envelope Declaration card not signed More than one declaration cards with only one yellow return envelope Identifiable marks on the white secrecy envelope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>Without opening the secrecy envelopes we were unable to determine if signed declarations were present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>People did not follow instructions. Did not sign the declaration or put the declaration in the secrecy envelope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>Declaration not signed Ballot not included in secrecy envelope No declaration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>Ballot and declaration in same envelope or declaration not signed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>No Voter Declarations Voter Declarations not signed Return Kits contained only Voter Declaration Form Signed Ballots and/or Secrecy Envelopes Deceased Ineligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>Unknown for certain, however could have been that the yellow return envelope was not a window envelope which would have required the declaration to be placed inside to show the return address for mailing. As well the declaration form was on the reverse of the instruction sheet. Vote By Mail was utilized in the 2003 election but there was no problem with rejected kits. At that time a window envelope was used and the declaration on the front of the instruction sheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>Voter declaration was placed in the same envelope as the actual ballot, therefore we could identify how the elector voted. This was the case in 139 of the 145 rejected ballots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>Number of ballots cast that could be used were 742 and there were an additional that were rejected due to no declaration in the envelope or in the secrecy envelope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Rejected</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>no declaration or declaration not signed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>No declaration form 4807 Declaration Form not signed 382 Ballot not in secrecy envelope 370 ID on secrecy envelope 58 Other 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>Possibilities include the signature block being on the back of the declaration form (data fix); poor directions on the form (seemed very good to me); Voter complacency after three previous mail in elections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>This was our second mail in vote and I believe the voters thought they understood the process, and did not read the instructions. This resulted in declaration forms being included with the secrecy envelopes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>As stated before, the lack of window on Return Envelope removed a mechanical check that would have prevented many voters from stuffing their ballots and declaration card into same envelope, thereby voiding their vote.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>Declaration forms not signed, no declaration form, comments written on the ballot (mostly due to question on the ballot which generated this, I believe). Also, including the declaration form in with the ballot in the white secrecy envelope; however, we undertook measures to address this issue through a public notice campaign to have electors check with the revision centre to see if their vote was counted and, if not, followed a process to issue a replacement kit. Also, we reviewed the rejected return kits and recounted those that had included a signed declaration form in with their ballot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>Voters did not read the instructions. They either did not sign the declarations for place the declarations inside the secrecy envelopes with the ballot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>Declaration not separate from secrecy envelope Declaration not signed Envelope used for other purpose than election</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>declaration not signed; no declaration or ballot in secrecy envelope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>Poor instructions and clarity on voting kits - people not reading instructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>No declaration returned (majority) - either inside the secrecy envelope or not returned at all Some declarations weren't signed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Individuals did not follow the instructions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>No voter declaration form, declaration form not signed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>Voters did not return the Declaration with their Ballot, voters did not sign the Declaration, voters deposited their Declaration in the yellow envelope and their Ballot Secrecy envelope separately and therefore we were not able to identify the voter who cast the ballot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>374 kits were rejected because there was no voter declaration form enclosed. We did however issue 148 replacement kits to those people that came in because they had returned their kits but were not recorded as having voting thereby indicating there had been a problem with their returned kit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>The kits were rejected because they did not contain a voter declaration. A few did not contain a ballot and some people wrote their names.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>No declaration forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>declaration form not included declaration form not signed ballot and declaration not in secrecy envelope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Rejected</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>Declarations not signed - 94  No declaration included - 612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>no voter identification cards included or the cards were unsigned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>There were no declarations included with the ballots. We reissued a large number of replacement ballots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>no declaration enclosed  declaration not signed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>No window return envelopes and voters did not include their identification section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Voter error - no Declaration form returned or it may have been inside the secrecy envelope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Declaration - omitted - not signed or placed within sealed ballot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Did mail in for school board. Most returned because the elector moved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>- Voters did not include the Voter Declaration Forms with the ballots (1,040). - Voter Declaration Form only (no ballot) (22) - Blank Envelopes (3) - Unsigned Voter Declaration Form (132) - Rejected Ballots (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>We opened the secrecy envelopes and was able to process an additional 161 ballots. This process took place on Nov 6, 11 and 13th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>There was several rejected ballots: - declaration not signed - declaration not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>returned only the ballot without the voter declaration form. We did contact those parties who sent back their voter declarations unsigned to give them a second chance to vote.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>signed declaration not enclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>No declaration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Voter declaration form not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>no declaration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>The declaration form as not returned or was in the secrecy envelop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>failure by the voter to read and follow the instructions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>the return envelope allowed the voter to send back their ballot without the declaration form being enclosed. Needs to be changed so that they have to mail it back inorder for the Twp to get the ballot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Declaration forms not enclosed in returned voting kits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Voter declaration forms not included with voting kit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Voters did not follow instructions on voter kits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>No declaration included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Declaration not signed, or not included or placed in with secrecy envelope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>I would say failure to fully read the directions, some media reports relating that the [specific vendor] kits did not feature a window return envelope which would have forced the voter to acknowledge the Voter Declaration Form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Rejected</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>The voter declaration form was not included in the return envelope. We originally had 177 rejected ballots. Because of this large number, we sought and received a legal opinion that I would open the secrecy envelope in front of the candidates at the close of poll to see if the declaration form was in that envelope. Only I saw the ballot. We found 51 declaration forms with the ballot and were able to process these votes, which left 126 rejected ballots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Either no ballot enclosed only the Declaration form inside the ballot or only the ballot and no Declaration form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>No affidavit with ballot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Most of the rejected ballots did not contain a signed declaration. Some ballots kits were returned with a signed declaration and no ballot. Some kits were returned with empty envelopes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Voters forgot to include their declaration when they returned their secrecy envelopes. The instructions should have been more clear which is an easy thing to correct for next time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>The Declaration Form was two sided with the signing line on the reverse page which electors did not realize and therefore many of the forms were not signed. In my opinion this was a grave error and the Declaration Form should only be one page in length with the signing line at the bottom and clearly marked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>They were generally tenants who had moved out of the community and the landlord had not informed MPAC of the change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>As above - the total number was 256 and we replaced 105.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>No declaration enclosed, spoiled ballots (marked).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>Unsigned declarations, no declaration included, signed declaration and ballot both placed in the secrecy envelope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>THE RETURN ENVELOPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>Of the 468 that were rejected, we had 317 residents came to the Town Hall to obtain new ballots. We had a form which they filled out that indicated they had returned their ballot package and realized that they had not signed their declaration form or had included only their ballot in the envelope. We advertised in the local newspapers, sent out flyers, etc., in order to get the word out. The return envelopes were not appropriate and there were no instructions on the envelope guiding the resident through the process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2.9        | 31 Ballot was not in the Secrecy Envelope 53 Voter Declaration Card not signed 73 Voter Declaration Card missing: 58 Secrecy Envelope ONLY 02 Secrecy Envelope ONLY but with page 1 of the printed instructions from the Voter Kit showing the elector's name 01 Secrecy Envelope ONLY but Secrecy Envelope has the address of the Municipality and a Candidate's name hand written across the Secrecy Envelope 02 Secrecy Envelope ONLY but Secrecy Envelope has the address of the Municipality hand written across the Secrecy Envelope 10 Ballot ONLY - no Voter Declaration Card and no Secrecy Envelope 13 Identifiable marks such as hand-written initials on the...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Rejected</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>Ballot not in secrecy envelope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Ballot not inserted in secrecy envelope. Secrecy envelope not returned in white return envelope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Declarations not signed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Unsigned Declaration Form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Ballot loose in envelope. No privacy envelope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>*main reason: Ballot not in Secrecy Envelope (33%) *second-highest reason: Voter Declaration Form not signed (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Declaration was not signed. Declaration was not enclosed in return envelop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1. No signed declaration slip. 2. Ballot not in secrecy envelope. 3. Declaration slip &amp; ballot in sealed secrecy envelope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1. did not sign declaration 2. did not put declaration in proper envelope 3. did not include ballot only declaration 4. did not read instructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>No Secrecy Envelope - 12 No Declaration Form in return envelope - 11 Declaration not signed - 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Did not sign declaration form or did not include the declaration form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>unsigned declarations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Did not follow instructions - declaration form not signed or placed within secrecy envelope. Rejected ballots accounted for 4% - same as 2003.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Voter Declaration Form not signed Ballot not put and sealed in Secrecy Envelope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>The declaration form was not returned with the secrecy envelope. For anyone who returned their declaration form in the secrecy envelope, we had specific staff at 8:01 p.m. on November 13th commissioned to open the secrecy envelopes and pull out the declaration forms and then the secrecy envelopes were set aside into the four polls and the ballots counted. We also double checked to confirm these people had not already voted. There was so much media attention about the declaration forms that some people attended our office and claimed to have inserted their declaration form in the secrecy envelope and they requested a new Voters' Kit. This was prior to the decision made to open the secrecy envelopes on November 13th and remove the declaration forms. I received advice from our lawyer about this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Not taking the time to put the kit together properly for return and not signing declaration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>not in secrecy envelope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Rejected</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>-ballots only, NO declarations -Declarations not signed -Declarations only, NO ballots - around 50 others, Not a Canadian Citizen, deceased, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>rejected during opening of envelopes - 192 reasons - declaration and ballot in same envelope - declaration not signed - either ballot or declaration not enclosed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Secrecy envelope not sealed in return envelope with Voter Declaration Card.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>Not signing the declaration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>The majority of the ballots rejected were those that included their Voter Declaration Form in the ballot envelope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>No Voter Declaration Form Declaration Form not signed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>#NAME?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>vote by mail was done in house and voters followed instructions. We had a few that we given new ballots (about 10) which reduced the number of rejected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>Incomplete returns (ie. voter declaration form not signed or ballot returned without a voter declaration form).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>voter declaration form not signed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>voter declaration not filled out, no voter declaration or enclosed in secrecy envelope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>the mail out instructions can be improved, however, most were returned perfectly done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>Main reason was an incomplete returned kit, being the Voter declaration was not signed, not included, or the ballot not included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Sent to wrong municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Incorrect marking of ballot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>more than one candidates name marked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>Not signed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix E

## Vote Counting Methods

These are the methods used on Voting Day. 16 of 356 respondents skipped this question.

### Manual Count

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide-Metcalfe</td>
<td>Callander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjala-Tosorontio</td>
<td>Calvin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred and Plantagenet</td>
<td>Carleton Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alnwick/Haldimand</td>
<td>Carling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amherstburg</td>
<td>Casey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armour</td>
<td>Cavan-Millbrook-North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td>Central Huron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amprior</td>
<td>Central Manitoulin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashfield-Colborne-</td>
<td>Chamberlain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wawanosh</td>
<td>Chapleau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphodel-Norwood</td>
<td>Chapple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assiginack</td>
<td>Chatham-Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>Chisholm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atikokan</td>
<td>Cobalt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta</td>
<td>Cockburn Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aylmer</td>
<td>Coleman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin</td>
<td>Connee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bancroft</td>
<td>Cramahe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrie Island</td>
<td>Dawn-Euphemia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayham</td>
<td>Dawson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckwith</td>
<td>Deep River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billings</td>
<td>Deseronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black River-Matheson</td>
<td>Drummond/North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blandford-Blenheim</td>
<td>Elmsley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind River</td>
<td>Dubreuilville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluewater</td>
<td>Dysart et al</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonfield</td>
<td>Ear Falls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnechere Valley</td>
<td>East Gwillimbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brant</td>
<td>East Zorra-Tavistock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brethour</td>
<td>Edwardsburgh/Cardinal*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>Englehart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brockton</td>
<td>Enniskillen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooke-Alvinston</td>
<td>Espanola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Mines</td>
<td>Essa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burk's Falls</td>
<td>Essex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faraday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fauquier-Strickland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>French River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Front of Yonge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frontenac Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Galway-Cavendish &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harvey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gauthier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Georgian Bluffs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Georgina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gillies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goderich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gordon &amp; Allan West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gore Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greater Madawaska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greenstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grey Highlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Halton Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hamilton (Twp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hastings Highlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Head, Clara &amp; Maria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hearst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Howick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hudson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Huron East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Huron Shores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Huron-Kinloss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ignace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ingersoll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jocelyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kearney</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Manual Count (cont.)

Kerns
Killaloe, Hagarty and Richards
Killarney
Laird
Lake of the Woods
Lambton Shores
Lanark Highlands
Laurentian Hills
Laurentian Valley
Limerick
Lucan Biddulph
Machar
Machin
Madawaska Valley
Magnetawan
Malahide
Marathon
Matachewan
Mattawa
McGarry
McKellar
McMurrough/Monteith
McNab/Braeside
Meaford
Melancthon
Merrickville-Wolford
Middlesex Centre
Mindon Hills
Minto
Mississippi Mills
Montague
Moosonee
Morley
Morris-Turnberry
Mulmur
Nairn and Hyman
Neebing
Newbury
Nipigon
North Algona
Wilberforce
North Frontenac
North Grenville
North Huron
North Middlesex
Northeastern Manitoulin and the Islands
Norwich
O’Connor
Oliver Paipoonge
Opasatika
Oro-Medonte
Otonabee-South
Monaghan
Owen Sound
Papineau-Cameron
Parry Sound
Pelee
Perry
Perth East
Perth South
Petawawa
Petrolia
Point Edward
Powassan
Prescott
Prince
Puslinch
Rainy River
Ramara
Red Lake
Red Rock
Renfrew
Rideau Lakes
Ryerson
Sables-Spanish Rivers
Sault Ste. Marie
Schreiber
Shelburne
Shuniah
Sioux Narrows-Nestor Falls
Smiths Falls*
South Bruce
South Huron
Southgate
Southwest Middlesex
South-West Oxford
Southwold
Spanish
St. Marys
Stone Mills
Strathroy-Caradoc
Tarbutt & Tarbutt
Additional
Terrace Bay
Thames Centre
The North Shore
Thessalon
Thornloe
Trent Hills
Tweed
Val Rita-Harty
Wainfleet
Warwick
Wellesley
Wellington North
West Elgin
West Grey
West Nipissing
West Perth
Westport
Whitchurch-Stouffville
Whitestone
Whitewater Region
Wilmot
Zorra

Central Tabulator

Bracebridge
Brantford
Brock
Cambridge
Centre Wellington
Clarington
Cochrane
Collingwood
Douro-Dummer
Elliot Lake
## Central Tab. (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Erin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgian Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravenhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grimsby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guelph/Eramosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havelock-Belmont-Methuen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlands East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innisfil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iroquois Falls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapuskasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawartha Lakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kincardine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muskoka Lakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Kawartha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Bruce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orillia*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penetanguishene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saugeen Shores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scugog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux Lookout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith-Ennismore-Lakefield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smiths Falls*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tecumseh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Blue Mountains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timmins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uxbridge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Bradford-West
- Gwillimbury
- Brampton
- Brockville
- Burlington
- Caledon
- Central Elgin
- Cobourg*
- Cornwall
- Dryden
- Elizabethtown-Kitley
- Fort Erie
- Fort Frances
- Greater Napanee
- Greater Sudbury
- Guelph
- Haldimand
- Hamilton (City)
- Huntsville
- King
- Kingston*
- Kirkland Lake
- Lake of Bays
- LaSalle
- Leeds and the Thousand Islands
- Lincoln
- Markham
- Milton
- Newmarket
- Niagara Falls
- Niagara-on-the-Lake
- Norfolk
- North Bay
- Oakville
- Orangeville
- Orillia*
- Oshawa
- Ottawa
- Pelham
- Peterborough*
- Pickering
- Port Colborne
- Port Hope

## Prince Edward
- Quinte West
- Richmond Hill
- Sarnia
- Seguin
- Springwater
- St. Clair
- St. Thomas
- Stratford*
- Tay
- Temiskaming Shores
- Thorold
- Thunder Bay
- Tillsonburg
- Toronto
- Vaughan
- Waterloo
- Welland*
- West Lincoln
- Whitby
- Windsor*
- Woodstock*
- Woolwich

## Touch Screen System
- Barrie
- Kingston*
- Stratford*
- Wasaga Beach
- Welland*
- Windsor*
- Woodstock*

## Telephone System
- Addington Highlands*
- Champlain*
- Clarence-Rockland*
- Cobourg*
- East Hawkesbury*
- Edwardsburgh/Cardinal*
- North Dundas*
- North Stormont*
**Telephone Sys. (cont.)**
- Perth*
- South Dundas*
- South Frontenac*
- South Glengarry*
- South Stormont*
- Tay Valley*
- The Archipelago*
- The Nation*

**Internet System**
- Addington Highlands*

*Users of Multiple Counting Methods on Voting Day*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Man. Count</th>
<th>Centr. Tab</th>
<th>Poll Tab.</th>
<th>Touch Screen</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Intern.</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addington Highlands</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champlain</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence-Rockland</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobourg</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Hawkesbury</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwardsburgh/Cardinal</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dundas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Stormont</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orillia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterborough</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smiths Falls</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dundas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Frontenac</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Glengarry</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Stormont</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratford</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tay Valley</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Archipelago</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Nation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welland</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodstock</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

Municipalities with Recounts

Tied-Vote
East Zorra-Tavistock

By Council Resolution
Amprior
Ashfield-Colborne-Wawanosh
Brant
Brooke-Alvinston
Carleton Place
Chisholm
Coleman
East Zorra-Tavistock
Front of Yonge
Gillies (2)
Greater Sudbury
Greenstone
Grimsby
Guelph (2)
Hudson
Killaloe
Hagarty and Richards
Leamington
Lincoln (2)
Melancthon
Midland
Minden Hills
Mulmur
Oro-Medonte
Ramara
Sault Ste. Marie
The North Shore
Vaughan
Waterloo
Whitestone

By Court Order
Bancroft
Leeds/1,000 Islands
Lincoln
Minden Hills
Appendix G

Suggestions for MPAC Data Improvements

Answers given to the question, “Putting aside the issue of unconfirmed citizenship, what suggestions do you have for improvements to MPAC’s data for 2010?”

- Ensuring that they update their database incorporating the completed Applications to Amend the Voters’ List Forms.
- the removal of deceased persons
- just continue to try an improve on updating of the list
- None at this time
- need to work closer with local municipalities and recording the changes submitted by municipality to MPAC
- Some improvements could be having a compatible database with federal and provincial governments to properly compile Voter information. MPAC could send out more property notification forms that had been sent out randomly to property owners and make the instructions and information on it clear and compile important information regarding number, name, age of residents etc.
- a more thorough enumeration process to capture more of the population
- MPAC needs to make a commitment to using the data that we send back to them; we found that in some instances data we sent them in 2003 had been ignored/overlooked
- Get a handle on people that move or improve the voter notification system to get better results.
- Incorporate the changes we send. Advice us if the format of these changes is incompatible and can't be integrated. I agree that MGS should provide the birth and death information to MPAC - I don't think it should be prohibited under FOI.
- Remove deceased people, add new residents including tenants, remove people that have moved. There must be a way to get more accuracy on these lists.
- Remove the deceased. Include tenants and remove old tenants.
- We would like to see all of the changes (especially voters added to the list) remain in place for the next election.
- Is there any way to link the information on the assessment role to the voters list? It seems that the voters list database was not even as current as changes we get in the roll.
- Some form of enumeration is necessary, specifically to target households with eligible voters listed as boarders/other between ages 18-30. The use of vote by mail uncovered volumes of outdated records in this area. Voter kits were mailed to households where grown children of the property owners no longer resided at that address.
- No comment.
- It would seem to me if they used the base information that they have on ownership in the municipality, they would have a better product.
- Enumeration!!!!!!!

• the majority of our list problems were in regard to tenants; there must a a "better" means to capture them
• MPAC should have access to list owned by other governmental departments to update the list of electors such as death certificates, persons in receipt of old age, ... Also, MPAC should revise the list to include the changes made by the municipality as previous election. Not done in 2003.
• Elimination of the U category on the voter notification file. AMCTO should not ask MPAC to indicate unconfirmed citizenship as it is MPAC's responsibility to provide the Clerk of every municipality in the Province with the list of eligible electors. 2. Ensure that MPAC complies with their statutory obligations in the Municipal Elections Act 3. Lobby the Provincial Government, Elections Ontario and Elections Canada to ensure that MPAC is providing access to the information required for the voters' list.

• Street names do not match, and there are duplicates; Some addresses were in the wrong Polls; Some roll numbers came in VNF file without street name, number, property location data; Queen's U. residences contained names from at least 12 years ago;
• MORE ACCURATE INFORMATION MAILING ADDRESSES AND OWNERSHIP CHANGES.
• no comment at this time
• use one central census data system for all three levels of government that is municipal, provincial and federal
• No suggestions - it isn't a big problem in a small rural community. Unless someone comes up with a way of getting owners etc. to report or complete enumeration forms correctly, there will never be a real accurate list.
• For some reason the majority of electors left off our PLE are longtime residents. There appears to be absolutely no comparison to the Assessement Roll.
• Door to door enumeration
• If the electronic data is merged properly with MPAC's data, it should prove a better result for 2010; however, it is a suggestion that if a consolidated electors list is not possible and the Province cannot secure access to Vital STatics for this purpose, it may be of benefit for municipalities to use their own tax roll instead of MPAC data.
• More care should be taken in inputing information. Some of the changes reported in 44. were made as a result of downloads of the Sept 22 supp. The bulk of our changes (other than the downloads) were made by election staff on election day. This is problematic as, in spite of training, the incidence of errors is high.
• I feel they have done very well based on the fact that over 50% of the population does not update information. It is impossible to keep tabs on people moving and deceased, therefore we continue to update as we go through the process.
• MPAC needs to input changes sent to MPAC from Municipalities re 2006 and use that as a base to update the list for 2010. A comparison report should be run to detect discrepancies. List must be checked for accuracy regarding spelling of names to avoid errors and duplication. Follow up by MPAC with Nursing Homes to ensure that they have received the information.
• We provided a complete data file of the voters list with all of the changes that we made so that MPAC could just incorporate the changes.
• The issue of residential tenants must be resolved so that they are included on the PLE.
• To maintain the voter's list from 2006 would be beneficial. MPAC has been very helpful to our municipality.
• no idea
• They have to address tenant issue - people who haven't lived in an apartment in 10 years were on the list. Some people on 3 or 4 times. Very concerning with alternate voting methods.
• Establish some system where if Data Fix is being used that any information the municipality inputs there be a mechanism to choose which data is used once MPAC information is downloaded
• The list was one of the major concerns for the election and we believe that legislated changes are required on how the lists are compiled and how the final list can be developed. MPAC needs to remove the tie to the assessment record in other words, have the voters' list as a separate list and only based on the assessment records.
• Enumerate and communicate with Federal and Provincial levels of Government
• Accuracy of birth dates.
• See response in # 42. Perhaps the control and changes to the voters list should reside with the municipality.
• At least accept and process the corrections we made throughout the election period
• Hire enumerators.
• NATIONAL REGISTER!!!!!!
• There should be a way of ensuring deceased persons are off the list and stay off - revisions sent in should be inputted into the database - Nursing homes and apartments should be updated
• Our municipality had a lot of difficulty with rental properties. Very few tenants were on the voters list which incurred a lot of revisions/additions. MPAC needs to ensure that the information is collected in a timely manner from owners of rental properties/apartments.
• MPAC needs to firstly do a full enumeration to establish accuracy to its population report and voter's list. If they are not going to do then they should remove themselves from providing this service and let it go to private enterprise. I'm sure someone like [specific vendor] or a comparable company would love the opportunity. Need to give MPAC full cooperation on births and deaths. It is ridiculous to hide behind Freedom of Information & Protection of Privacy Acts for not producing this information. We either are going to look at working together to provide the best possible list or give it to private enterprise, enough is enough. I have been in the business for 33 years and voter's list keep getting worse except for the excuses they're getting better.
• Time needs to be taken to double and triple check that amendments MPAC have been notified of (i.e., ownership changes/name change/address changes)(those they have control over) are reflected on what they send out as their Preliminary List and in the same respect what they receive from Municipalities as amendments to the Preliminary
List are so reflected in their Supplementary List. We realize this should be the norm however it would appear this did not happen.

- We should use our own tax roll which we can update daily. MPAC information is too old and often inaccurate.
- Ensure all changes received from municipalities are updated prior to PLE in July, leaving only the difference for the supplementary run(s) - ensure all addresses are according to Canada Post's required format.
- Enumerate. Share information from federal/provincial on Canadian citizenship, deaths, etc.
- Need to get caught up. Too many mistakes, deaths not deleted.
- MPAC needs to address issue of outdated business tenancy info. * residential tenancy info very out of date - an enhanced method of enumeration would be helpful. * deceased residents need to be removed in more timely manner.
- -the revisions for this election if they could carry over to the next election's voters list that would be very helpful
- Use more data sources from other government agencies to confirm accuracy of list.
- Removal of duplicated names prior to provision of Preliminary List. During enumeration process, need to educate parents to remove children that are no longer residing at home. I had individuals listed twice (at parent's residence and under married name at current residence).
- Door to door visits
- In my opinion, rather than attempt to maintain an almost impossible list of ongoing revisions (i.e. tenants, boarders, etc.) AMCTO should lobby the government to move towards a voter registration system, similar to what I believe is used in the U.S. This would ensure that anyone really wanting to exercise their privilege of voting would make a point of registering themselves as an eligible elector. This should apply to federal, provincial and municipal elections.
- Make sure that the updates provided now are made to the list.
- Implement standard data cleanse / data washing initiatives prior to release of PLE. Anomalies in data entries. Same name/similar name search. No address listing.
- Can census information be used to be consistent? Educate the public that if they move it is important update your infromation.
- Hopefully the issue of confirming deaths can be resolved. Can obviously wrong data be caught? - i.e. voters listed with numerics instead of names! i.e. "Smith 1; Smith 2; Smith 3.
- Tenant information needs improvement
- Corrections should be made immediately and a confirmation of the corrected list sent back to municipal clerks to check for verification.
- MANY ON LIST NO LONGER ALIVE OR HAVEN'T LIVED HERE IN YEARS
- I personally feel the only way to improve Voters' list is to require voters to register, in order to vote, keeping a permanent voters list at the local level.
- MPAC should utilize all resources to keep the list current and fully understand voter eligibility. For example: MPAC removed property owners in North Kawartha that lived
elsewhere in Peterborough County. They still have a vote for North Kawartha Council Members as owners of property in the municipality.

- to remove any Deceased individuals off the list.
- better enumeration - not one in five but everyone
- undertake a census
- Tenants continue to be a problem. Deceased people continue to be a problem
- local enumeration is definitely required prior to the next election
- MPAC should not be collecting the data if they cannot get access to the Province's vital statistics information. Further MPAC should not collect the information if residents are not legally required to respond.
- They need to get better information for rental units. this information was not corrected from the prior election. They also had adult children remaining on the list who had moved away several years prior.
- Too many duplicate of the same name on PLE
- Election list more accurate
- They need to do more enumeration. They could also perhaps also expand on the working relationship with [specific vendor].
- Had residents who have resided in our community for 30 plus years or more that were on the 2003 list but for some reason not on the 2006 list.
- Better records management system that would incorporate personal information (i.e. citizenship, birth date, etc.) when residents move within the municipality
- information not up to date - timing
- Take into account the changes the municipalities ask for.
- Verifying addressing for rural properties needs to be improved
- More up-to-date data - many electors hadn't live in the city for decades or at all.
- This was my second election so I do not feel that I have enough background to comment here.
- use municipal forms to update electors list
- Do a person-to-person, door-to-door enumeration. People don't mail in forms.
- Found MPAC data not as up to date as what is on the Municipal files. Many taxpayers addresses indicated on the voters list were incorrect, not as up to date as our info. Many candidates had their campaign materials returned.
- we had people who were back on the list that have been removed years ago. We have numerous errors on our listing ... to man to list
- MPAC should enter the information we sent to them after the Election.
- Update tenant information Address information was an issue - the qualifying address was used as the mailing address resulting in a number of ballots being returned as undeliverable
- enumeration the old fashioned way.
- Appears that there are duplications where the first name and initial of the first name are listed for the same person at the same address
• MPAC definitely needs to improve upon its data input and not rely on summer students to do this work for them. There appears to be no specific business rules when entering data.

• Utilization of all other election agencies (Elections Canada, Elections Ontario), utilization of the Vital Stats, Revenue Canada and even Canada Post. To this a physical door-to-door campaign beginning in January of any election year.

• Get the data from a collective source where the Federal government derives there data.

• Better coordination with the Registrar General regarding deceased ratepayers would be beneficial

• If the Registrar's Office could provide MPAC with information relating to deaths and marriages. Only the necessary information that MPAC needs to add/change/delete a person's name on the Voter's List.

• reestablish enumeration with legislation making it mandatory to return the forms or an offence census information could have been extremely useful if timing of information was shared and accurate

• Quit changing it back from the information I provided.

• Better addresses for multiple ownerships Spouses of non resideent owner's missing
  - ensure all changes received from municipalities are updated prior to PLE in July, leaving only the difference for the supplementary run(s) - ensure all addresses are according to Canada Post's required format

• The AMCTO Election Project Team has already made a number of short and long-term recommendations for improvements to the voters' list.

• ensure the changes are inputted on the system for the next election

• The list should generated from the internal tax system of the municipality. Then additions, etc can be made from that point.

• Double name entries for registered owners with more than one property should be eliminated - tenant info - tenants have not lived in home for up to 15 years - should be updated

• no suggestions

• The list was out of date. Many people were on the list (at old addresses) who weren't on the list 3 years ago. At least these were complaints that we received.

• Early, clear communication, well in advance, to update the voters list data. (media, general mail out, etc...) This information should explain to all that the information held by MPAC is the information used for elections, and should be confirmed for accuracy by ADVISING AND CONFIRMING with MPAC directly. The information should then address citizenship at that time.

• Review and improve the enumeration process so that information about ratepayers is current. Schol support and residency i.e. resident vs. non-resident electors data is currently very inaccurate & needs to be improved. Tie voters to a property roll number on the preliminary list

• Have to find a way to improve the accuracy of the list by accessing data from provincial and federal elections as well as other data bases such as Registrar Geneneral, MTO, M of Health etc
• Remove people from the list that are deceased based on what municipalities tell you.
• Accept the changes that we as Clerk's and working with the people in our municipality are aware of.
• Find a way to use the assessment data, it seems to be much more current and accurate.
• Tenants are always going to be a problem, but some tenants added in 2003 and didn't moved were not of the 2006 list.
• ENSURE REVISION FORMS ARE INPUTTED AND QUALITY CONTROL SYSTEM IN PLACE TO ENSURE CHANGES WERE CAPTURED FOR THE NEXT ELECTION LIST. IMPROVE PROGRAM TO INTEGRATE CHANGES MORE ACCURATELY WHEN WARD/POLL SUBD. CHANGES.
• Current enumeration information should be mandatory for property owners, like a census.
• Door to door enumeration of tenants. Back to the old system wherein the municipality had an MPAC representative that knew the Town.
• To many deceased residence on the voters List.
• Early In the year of the election they should send out notice to all tenants to confirm residency.
• The majority of the additions were tenants. Enumeration might avoid time spent on additions, changes etc. on election day.
• Improvements to be made with respect to corrections to the list, were numerous changes and also deaths needed to be verified. Is there any ability to utilize federal and provincial enumeration documents to bring municipal voters lists as current as possible?
• be able to update owners and addresses contained in the assessment roll to the voters list - apparently this was not something their system can do
• They should simply cause the changes we submit to be ENTERED into their data base. They never do!
• need the supplementary list earlier MPAC needs access to all information Provincially and Federally that would help with the intergrety of the list
• To verify more accuratly for duplicates, we have a ward system and voters appeared often in different wards.
• Municipalities need to assist MPAC to access records from Statistics Canada re deaths, births. MPAC needs legislation that require everyone who receives notice of enumeration that they must complete form and return it to MPAC. MPAC also need to make is very clear to Electors on enumeration form if not returned will mean their name is not on voter's list.
• Process the changes we send in
• Greater attention must be paid to ensuring that the addendum information (EL15's) provided by the municipality is included in the database for subsequent elections.
• Create some municipal system of capturing and updating information in non-election years (i.e., through tax system). Continue to use a product such as MVV with features such as data cleansing. Data sharing and capturing information at key points (including
municipality) and ongoing resources applied to updating the List is only means of improving accuracy, apart from loosing the List altogether in favor of a registry process such as ones used in Alberta, etc.

• to ensure that all changes submitted by the municipality do actually get onto the revised list

• When we forward the duplicate applications to amend the Voters' List, we also include a "List of Issues". It would be nice to see these looked at and implemented when and where possible (eg. incorrect street names, duplicate street names) so that the same issues are no recurring each election.

• I know that the issue of removing deceased persons is being reviewed with Registrar General's office. Sufficient data must be provided to enable MPAC to delete deceased persons. When municipalities provided death information directly to the local office, we did not experience this problem. Deceased persons on the voters list, particularly when they have been deceased for a number of years, is totally unacceptable to the electorate and makes the municipality appear incompetent since most people think we prepare the list.

• Use [specific vendor]

• Share information with federal and provincial governments

• many addresses requiring changes were from Senior Citizen Housing, Old Age Home (Au Chateau), Housing Geared to Income, Previous/new Hospital residents, new property owners. It might seem that maybe some of this information was not obtained previous to printing out the Preliminary Voter's list.

• Better communication/information with regard to tenant information and vital statistic information with regards to deceased persons.

• Use other data bases such as Provincial and Federal as well as conduct door to door enumeration as opposed to depending on mail.

• Many changes that were made to the assessment roll were not reflected on the voters lists. There were people who had moved or were deceased and this information was not changed. It would be much more beneficial to have the voters list up to date.

• They need to do an enumeration by going to door to door. I realize this is a great expense. The Federal government should share the electors information with MPAC.

• Unite municipal, provincial and federal to create one list.

• A door to door enumeration could be done during the election year, just prior to the PLE. MPAC could work with the different service providers, i.e. (Canada Post) to have the ability to merge any supplementary voters list with the PLE.

• It simply must be more accurate. We must find a way to remove the deceased, keep deleted voters from reappearing, and do a better census prior to the election. Our multi residence owners must be encouraged to provide accurate and timely information to MPAC.

• there is always the Vital Stats problem that doesn't seem to be resolvable. I believe a door to door enumeration would be faster and more accurate for a place our size

• Present it in a format that is easier to manipulate.
Have MPAC offer an Excel Spread Sheet for VNF. Also a legend of what the various columns mean. Problems with the trailer parks and where there are multiple addresses for properties within the parks. A great deal of the mail was returned. (Post office needed further information on the card and we did not give all three addresses on the voter notification cards. Complaint that it was the responsibility of MPAC to change, Post Office to change or local Municipality.)

Improve system of keeping tenant and occupancy information up to date.

the answer lays in a better enumeration process, the mail out and return process clearly not working.

We are maintaining our own list using the municipal voter view software. That combined with the continued efforts of MPAC should continue to improve the list.

Make it easier to remove names of deceased, people who have moved, etc. Also, provision for contact address for multi-owners.

Dedicate the required internal resources to elections such that a separate election database is create and implement internal processes for updating the data on an ongoing basis (consult municipalities on this process). Obtain the required resources to do this via additional cost recovery from municipalities if neccessary. If not, extract MPAC from the local electoral process.

once MPAC gets to work more directly with the Registrar and other agencies it should help a lot more. We found out a lot through using voter notifications cards this time and forwarded this information to MPAC. We feel the next election will be a lot better in this regard.

MPAC and other government ministries should be working more closely together to exchange information to maintain the voter's list on an ongoing basis. Also, a more thorough and ongoing enumeration program should be undertaken to improve accuracy of the list (deaths, tenants, unconfirmed citizens, etc.)

Nil

I think MPAC should invest more time and effort in the preparation and maintenance of the list. They (MPAC) have the data base from which to prepare a reliable list. MPAC has to get past their belief that they are just in the business of doing property assessments. I'm sure we as municipalities are paying a reasonable fee for service to MPAC. Having said that, if there is no way that MPAC will be required by the province to step to the plate and deliver a high quality service then an alternative source for the preparation of the list must be found. Another factor in the poor quality of the list is the lack of interest in responding to the request for checking and revising the list. There should be a penalty for failing to respond to the opportunity to check the voter information on record and make revision by mail or otherwise. Possibly a voter registration system would work better such that only registered voters would be eligible to vote.

unit numbers for retirement/nursing home/hospital facilities

They need to have their records updated using the Census Canada data

Use the Voters' List at the end of the election 2006 and only update it with property owner changes they know exist and inserting any new properties created since the 2006 election.
• A more current PLE
• Remove deceased persons. Make corrections submitted from this election.
• Ensure deceased persons are removed from the voters list
• MPAC must pursue an agreement with the fed's and the province to produce a unified list to take advantage of the revisions at each level.
• To take our list from [specific vendor] and merge it with MPAC
• Information being sent to MPAC is not being changed for the election lists.
• Old method of enumeration gave a more accurate list of qualified voters
• we did have some problems with a lot of tenants not being on the list
• Municipalities take control of their lists - MPAC get out of the business and we either do our own list or partner with someone that knows something about the list and its purpose. The expense to correct would go a long way to pay for it. As well the negative public view has no price tag.
• May have met with MPAC to discuss Tenant update sessions locally Elector ID cards
  Annual update re deaths,, births, tenants, citsenship
• The Township will be maintaining its own voters list from now to the next election and will not be relying on MPAC
• Apply some resources to it
• With more and more municipalities going to vote by mail, they need to review their process for attaching properties to a voter. Where property owners own more than one property or own various properties in common ownership, MPAC would randomly select a property to attach a voter to.
• Use the data received back from the municipalities as confirmed and the most accurate for their files to implement. Some feel that MPAC does not use the final voters list from the municipalities for integration.
• Earlier with regular updates, allowing us more time to verify the list.
• We had trouble understanding many of the reports provided - either not user friendly design or not enough explanation of how to use the data.
• Hopefully they will be able to remove the deceased residents on the next list.
• They could actually do the work for the enumeration and make the changes that have been submitted.
• The only suggestion I have is why could MPAC not have come up with a [SPECIFIC VENDOR] type program years ago. As we now have to pay an additional fee to [specific vendor] for their service. It provides the most up to date information, allows muns to make changes automatically and print out a new updated list, customize as necessary etc. For years we have sent changes after the election to MPAC and for whatever reason the information is never updated which in turn upsets the rate payer.
• Update their data..
• Don't use MPAC - use municipal tax rolls
• -how will we deal with people who have died -must find a way to deal with tenants
• ensure changes to the list from the previous election are entered for the next election
• Found information was not current - tenants needed to be added; residents who had been dead for several years or moved were still on the voter's list
- Enumeration should be conducted closer to the election. April is too early particularly for municipalities experiencing growth, and municipalities with universities. A full enumeration should be conducted, and not just where a data match cannot be achieved. Obvious data cleansing should be conducted by MPAC before the list is delivered, and not left to the Clerk during what is a very busy time.
- Would prefer to use owners only and have the tenants apply. Use the same list as the Provincial and Federal Levels of Government. Better communication and coordination with other levels of government and within the Provincial Government Ministries with the sharing of information to get a better list.
- There needs to be a way to acquire the appropriate information at time of sale (ie DOB and citizenship). MPAC needs to be able to cross reference information for owners with multiple properties. MPAC needs to consult with municipalities about the errors that reoccur between elections. MPAC needs to provide information in more user friendly electronic format (ie excel or similar).
- If MPAC will be utilizing the information input by PIR office to update the records, then we should have substantially improved information for the next election. MPAC needs to be able to differentiate at seniors buildings the difference between long-term care residents and those in their own apartments, so that we can provide a "roving" DRO to attend only the long-term care residents, and not everyone.
- Greater integration with provincial death registrations. 2) more rigid enforcement of tenant records held by landlords.
- A lot of data cleanup could be better handled through the local office - more familiar with the data.
- Enumerate all Voters or at least those that cannot be confirmed as Canadians. Run multiple queries on data identifying problems, ie: no postal code, no first name, duplications. If in doubt enumerate. Put Canadian Citizenship box on Assessment notice.
Appendix H
Content of Candidate Information Sessions

Comments from Respondents Who Answered “Yes” to Question 80, “Did you hold INFORMATION SESSIONS for candidates?” and then provided information in response to the prompt, “If yes, please briefly describe what information was conveyed at these sessions”

- There was an information session for Candidates held at the District Office for all of Muskoka. Notices were published in the paper, plus all Candidates that were registered; along with the Council at the time were notified. Only one Candidate from Huntsville showed up. Very Discouraging.
- VBM process - voter's list uses limited to election purposes - role of scrutineers - tabulator process - additions/deletions/amendments to Voters List - election expenses -
- *outlined Automatic Vote Tabulating Process *outlined procedure for Voting Day at Town Hall (sole Ballot Return/Counting Centre)
- A candidates night was hosted by the Chamber of Commerce. Information was conveyed; municipal staff were not in attendance. Further, staff hosted a telephone/internet demonstration (information session) for all of the candidates.
- A general overview of the vote by mail process, and more specifically, demonstration of the tabulators.
- A package was presented to them and then an information session was held to air any concerns or questions that the candidates had.
- After nomination day we met briefly with a follow up telephone call to review the Candidates guide and the voting process
- Ajax hosted a session put on by the MMAH - the only one in Durham Region - had over 100 people attend the session. Topics included: Candidate finances, nominations, filing of campaign statements, deadlines, penalties.
- An information session was held for the public to meet the candidates.
- Barrie hosted a Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing information session. The session was intended to addressed candidate requirements, with emphasis on financial requirements. The Ministry staff did not address questions from the candidates very well.
- Because we were introducing touch screen voting, we had a media, candidate night to show everyone how the equipment worked. We also reviewed the electronic optical scan vote tabulators for those candidates who were not involved in 2003.
- Bryan Searle from Municipal Affairs prepared info session: conflict of interest, roles and responsibilities, meetings, etc
- Campaign Finance, Duties, Obligations under the Municipal Act and the Elections Act campaign rules process at voting places process on election night
• Candidates guide, financial info, signs by-law requirements, tabulator procedures and demonstration
• Candidates were invited to a session to demonstrate automated vote tabulation as it was the first time. Not all candidates attended; those that did appreciated the gesture.
• Clerk provided information on mail-in ballot procedures as well as tabulator procedures.
• Conduct of the election itself, topic included, spending limits, time lines advertising, what I expect from them as candidates and what they can expect from me as Chief Returning Officer. This year we spent most of our time on the vote by mail process.
• Conducted demonstration of the tabulation system and during this session talked about other Election processes and had a Q and A period.
• Demonstration of tabulators and what over general election procedures and information
• Demonstration of tabulators for vote counting as this was the first election we utilized tabulators.
• Demonstration of vote tabulator as they were being used for the first time
• Demonstrations of vote tabulating equipment.
• Durham Region did a big information session for all municipalities.
• Election Law Municipal Election Policies Candidate Handbook
• Election process. Use of scrutineers. Job of a Council member.
• Everything was fine except for type of information provided at candidates training session was mostly on the technical issues regarding telephone and internet voting. Session was led by staff from the company providing the system.
• Finances Process and legislation Voting Equipment Scrutineers Signs Proxies
• General Election Information - dates, times, polls; proxy voting, Policies and Procedures Manual, tabulation procedures, scrutineers, financial responsibilities, procedures on election day - returns, certification of results, Q & A
• General Election Information Election Sign Regulations Contribution Rebate Program Voting Place Information
• General orientation
• Held an information session with the City of Brockville for all potential candidates and the public. Not well attended.
• Held jointly in Halton Region
• How the method of voting worked and their access to the list of those voters who have voted.
• I was involved in an Information Session put on by the local Chamber of Commerce.
• Individual sessions were held at time of nomination that covered all aspects of the election. It was planned to provide a demonstration of the vote tabulating equipment the hold a general question/answer session. As only one candidate attended it was rather brief.
• Info provided on guidelines, financial info., scrutineers etc...
• information regarding: signs, additions and changes to the voters list, processes at the polls, overview of election processes and statistics (numbers, dates, times), proxies, candidate and scrutineer conduct, financial reporting.
• joint with area municipalities - mostly financial requirement information.
• Key Dates / milestones Key (Municipal Specific) Practices/Procedures Financial Reporting Requirements New Telephone/Internet Voting Process
• long term planning for all departments policing landfill sites
• Mail In voting process. What they can expect on election day and during the daily processing. Scrutineers Problem with mail in voting system. Hands on traing with the vote tabulators.
• Meet with each candidate individually and gave them a procedural guide and other pertinent information.
• Meeting with new four new members of council. Orientation and strategic planning sessions are scheduled for February. Council will be attending AMO trailing sessions
• Met with them on individual basis as they submitted nomination papers.
• MMAH provided the information session
• MMAH Session
• No one showed up. Session would of included a demonstration with the tabulators.
• Nomination process, Election signs and canvassing, Campaign information available to them, Voter Information, Scrutineer information, Campaign finances, Contributions and fundraising, campaign expenses, Financial Reporting and Disclosure, Key Dates, where further information may be found.
• nomination process; campaign financing rules; legislation, by-laws & City policies; electronic filing; contribution rebate program; financial filing requirements
• only school board elections - the internet and telephone voting process and listening to the script for telephone voting and demo for internet voting
• Outline of Election Management personel and role; Identification of process for the addressing of complaints or problems during the election period including election day; Role and responsibilities of candidates and scrutineers on election day; the use of proxy forms; the use of poll vote tabulators
• Overall election process, Elections Act requirements, specific signage bylaws, scrutineer policies / procedures, statistical information to be provided, results format and access, voting method service provider candidate module training provided.
• Presented by Provincial Staff. Covered all relevent areas.
• provided a hard copy of procedures, review of procedures, demonstration of voting tabulators, question and answer session
• Provided Candidates package with all pertinent information.
• Provided each candidate with a candidate's package which included all relevant information relating to candidate requirements and election related information.
• Provided manual went through process/protocol for candidates. Explained mail in ballot procedures and requirements for financial reporting. Reviewed election sign by-
law, election legislation, spending limits and questions and answers prepared in advance. Provided information articles, manual and calendar as produced by Province and AMCTO

- Public meeting, televised, live questions to all candidates. Broken down by mayor and then council
- Responsibilities of council members; general municipal responsibilities; open question period to staff and past members of council
- Review of new processes for election (internet voting and vote anywhere technology) launch of election website.
- Service provider provided a "walk through" of the voting procedures for electronic voting.
- Session on the municipal organization and some of the big issues that were facing the municipality. Also covered some campaigning rules, i.e. signs etc. Session to demonstrate the scanning tabulators
- Tabulator demonstration was offered, candidates received election information by mail.
- The entire election process was explained, with special emphasis on the vote by mail process and the use of the electronic tabulators. The problem of large numbers of rejected ballots was clarified and the policy of the Township to deal with the problem thoroughly explained. There were no surprises during the election process.
- The Ministry of MA&H gave a presentation and distributed their candidates' guides and responded to questions
- The Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing held a session within the District of Muskoka. They provided a powerpoint presentation with was very helpful (rules, qualifications, accountability, campaign info, helpful hints, school board elections)
- The nomination/election process How to run a campaign What being a Councillor/Mayor entails Dealing with the media
- the problem with the declaration possibly in with the ballot and how we intended to deal with the problem
- The procedures for the vote by mail process were reviewed. Also, a demonstration of the vote tabulators was provided. Question and answer period followed.
- Use of electronic tabulators.
- Very helpful and informative. Helped to build a professional working relationship between staff and candidates.
- vote by mail process rights of candidates and scrutineers activities at the poll on Nov 13 including counting procedures
- Vote by Mail Process, Election day process using the counting tabulators etc.
- Vote by Mail system - how to works Election Signs Eligible/Ineligible Voters Voting Day - what to expect Candidateâ€™s Duties Scrutineers Campaign Expenses & Finances Key Dates
- Vote tabulators, scrutineers, general overview
- Voters List Info: How the list is developed, use of the list, when they would get their extracts. Voting Place Setup & Operation. Duties of each Election Staff personnel.
Candidate & Scrutineer responsibilities in the Voting Place. Proxy Voting. 

- We explained our policies and detailed our use of voterview and the electronic 
tabulators. We also explained about scrutineers, proxies, signage.
- We held a mock election prior to Nov 13. We demonstrated the opening of the 
envelopes; the scanning of the Voter Declaration Forms; the secure location where the 
secrecy envelopes and tabulators were stored; and the tabulation process. A question 
period was held. Vote By Mail Procedures were given to all registered candidates. 
All candidates were satisfied with the process.
- We held two - one the end of June to describe the process and introduce election staff 
The second was the end of August to hand out the PLE and procedures, update the 
procedures and answer questions.
- We went through the AMCTO Candidates guide
- We were using electronic vote tabulators for the first time in conjunction with vote by 
mail. This was to demonstrate how the tabulators functioned and to illustrate/prove by 
demonstration that they will generate with accuracy the same result as manual counting 
only much faster. We demonstrated how the tabulator will respond to various 
mediums used to complete the ballot, ie coloured ink, light pencil, etc. Later in the 
election process, we revisited the treatment for spoiled ballots because of failure to 
follow certain instructions. In addition to wholesale radio advertising, we invited all 
candidates to an information session in order to inform them.
- When through the Clerk's procedure manual, when and how results would be given, 
campaign signs
- Worked well for those that attending
Appendix I

Other Measures to Ensure Qualified Temporary Staff

Comments from Respondents Who Checked Off “Other” in Question 73, “What measures did you use to ensure qualified temporary election day STAFF were recruited? [Check all that apply]”

- Application process
- Application form indicating related experience
- people we knew
- local knowledge
- used qualified from past years
- application review & past experience
- Personal knowledge of them.
- written application
- N/A
- most of our staff were returning
- We only used staff
- application form
- Application form
- Same staff as used in the past.
- Training Session
- We contacted people we knew and used many from the last election.
- See comments
- written application forms
- internal & previously trained staff used
- used office staff
- application and hand delivery of same
- See Training Below
- municipal employees
- previous experience
- Reviewed past performance
- election training sessions
- questionnaire
- History
- past experience
- see comment
- test using the voter management system
- proof of experience
- previous experience
- In-person application
- n/a
- hired by staff recommendations
- used people who were there for the 2003 election
- Training
- past knowledge of experience and training
- written application
- Previous Election Experience
- election training
- application
- Had to apply in person
- election training seminar
- Used at previous election
- computer testing
- Resume
- training provided
- previous experience
- after exhausting list of workers from last election, ad was placed in local paper----- staff then screened applicants usually by phone.
- past experience
- Previous Experience
- mandatory training session attendance
- past experience
- past experience working on elections
- prior election evaluation comments
• only used our staff
• used previous experience
• Previous experience.
• previous experience
• hold a training session
• Previous election experience with Township
• Applications
• previous experience
• Recruited experienced people
• Previous experience, knowledge of individuals
• Application form
• 1/2 day training session
• We used residents who had worked at previous elections.
• training seminar
• application form
• Used EO's that have helped in previous elections.
• personal references
• mostly permanent employees who were off that day due to remembrance day
• past experience (worked elections previously)
• seasoned staff
• temporary clerical staff trained
• Training
• use staff that have worked elections before
• Worked previous elections
• references
• Used municipal staff and know of their strengths and weakness' because of being a small municipality
• Previous records & experience
• training session
• Only used experienced staff
• None
• Applications with previous experience
• Used municipal staff and other individuals used in previous elections
• Reviewed assessments of staff from 2003 election.
• telephone interview
• past experienced workers
• Previous experience on resume
• previous experience
• application
• used only 4 outside persons
• see comments
• previously used personnel
• applic form & training
• Application form
Appendix J

Survey Questionnaire