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AMCTO 2014 POST-ELECTION SURVEY

Background:

119 respondent municipalities from across the province.

Administered in January 2015.

Full data (without respondent IDs) will be posted on the AMCTO website in later summer.

Contact Us:

For more information on this survey, or the results, please contact:

Eric Muller
Coordinator, Legislative Services
emuller@amcto.com

Rick Johal,
Director, Member and Sector Relations
rjohal@amcto.com
RESPONDENT MUNICIPALITIES, by population size

- Fewer than 10,000, 45%
- 10,000 - 50,000, 31%
- 100,000 - 500,000, 12%
- 50,000 - 100,000, 5%
- 500,000+, 5%
- N/A, 2%
VOTER TURNOUT, BY POPULATION: Voter turnout remained consistent with 2010 in respondent municipalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Range</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 300,000</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 - 300,000</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 - 100,000</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000 - 50,000</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 - 25,000</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000 - 10,000</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer than 10,000</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VOTER TURNOUT, BY POPULATION: In comparison to the federal and provincial level, voter turnout amongst municipal respondents remains low.

- 2014 ON Mun (<10,000): 47%
- 2014 ON Mun (10,000 - 50,000): 40%
- 2014 ON Mun (50,000 - 100,000): 36%
- 2014 ON Mun (100,000 - 500,000): 36%
- 2014 ON Mun (500,000+): 44%
- 2014 ON Mun (Average): 43%
- 2014 ON Provincial (Average): 52%
- 2011 Federal (Average): 61%
VOTING METHODS: Paper ballots still popular, but use of voting by phone and Internet popular as well

Which voting methods did you use during the 2014 election? (n=119)

- Paper ballot: 57% (Election Day), 50% (Advance Voting)
- Vote by Internet: 26% (Election Day), 29% (Advance Voting)
- Vote by phone: 26% (Election Day), 24% (Advance Voting)
- Mail-in ballot: 22% (Election Day), 16% (Advance Voting)
- Touch screen: 3% (Election Day), 4% (Advance Voting)
- N/A: 4% (Election Day), 4% (Advance Voting)
VOTING METHODS: Most voters in respondent municipalities used paper ballots

How many votes were cast by the following methods in 2014? (n=119)

- Telephone, 1%
- Mail, 4%
- Internet, 8%
- Paper Ballot, 87%

**Respondents also used touch screens, but below 1%, due to rounding.
INTERNET VOTING: Respondent municipalities generally satisfied with Internet voting, and likely to recommend it for 2018

How satisfied were you with Internet voting in 2014? (n=119)

- Satisfied, 86%
- N/A, 12%
- Dissatisfied, 2%

What is your position on using Internet voting in the 2018 election? (n=119)

- Definitely will recommend it, 36%
- Probably will recommend it, 20%
- Probably won’t recommend it, 8%
- Don’t know, 18%
- Definitely won’t recommend it, 11%
- N/A, 12%
INTERNET VOTING: Most respondent municipalities did not require registration for Internet voting, used a variety of credentials to cast a ballot.

If you used Internet voting in 2014 did you require registration prior to voting? (n=38)

- Yes, 24%
- No, 76%

If you used Internet voting in 2014, which credentials did you require voters to complete to cast a ballot? (n=38)

- Pin: 92%
- Birthday: 42%
- Security Question: 16%
- Password: 5%
- Captcha Challenge: 5%
- Declaration: 3%
- Elector ID: 3%
INTERNET VOTING: Majority of respondent municipalities who used Internet voting in 2014 did not incur additional costs

If you offered Internet voting, how much additional money did you allocate to provide this service? (n=28)

- Nothing: 39%
- $50,000+: 21%
- $10,000 - $50,000: 14%
- $0 - $10,000: 11%
- Saved money: 7%

**Care should be taken when generalizing these results, as they originate from a small number of responses.**
VOTERS’ LIST: Respondent municipalities generally dissatisfied with MPAC data, view it as worse than 2010

Overall how satisfied were you with MPAC’s service during the 2014 election? (n=119)

- Very satisfied, 5%
- Somewhat satisfied, 33%
- Neither satisfied, nor dissatisfied, 16%
- Somewhat dissatisfied, 25%
- Very dissatisfied, 15%
- Very dissatisfied, 15%

Compared to 2010, how would you rate the accuracy of MPAC’s data in 2010? (n=119)

- Better or Much Better, 19%
- About the same, 41%
- Worse or Much Worse, 36%
- Very dissatisfied, 5%
- Somewhat satisfied, 33%
- Very satisfied, 5%
- Somewhat dissatisfied, 25%
- Neither satisfied, nor dissatisfied, 16%
- Very dissatisfied, 15%
**TABULATORS:** Most respondent municipalities satisfied with tabulators, and many will recommend their use in 2018

**How satisfied were you with your use of tabulators in 2014? (n=56)**

- Very dissatisfied, 1%
- Somewhat dissatisfied, 2%
- Somewhat satisfied, 10%
- Very satisfied, 42%

**What is your position on using tabulators voting in the 2018 election? (n=119)**

- Definitely will recommend it, 32%
- Probably will recommend it, 11%
- Don’t know, 18%
- N/A, 11%
- Probably won’t recommend it, 16%
- Definitely won’t recommend it, 12%
TABULATORS: Most respondent municipalities rent tabulators, few own them

If your municipality used electronic tabulators in 2014, were they rented or owned? (n=56)

- Rented: 75%
- Owned: 14%
- Leased: 9%
- Other: 2%
ACCESSIBILITY: Respondent municipalities using a range of methods to ensure accessibility, magnifying sheets the most popular

Which of the following methods did you use to ensure accessibility? (n=119)

- Traditional paper ballot with magnifying sheets available: 53%
- Audio ballots: 30%
- Other assistive devices (sip and puff, paddles, etc.): 26%
- Vote by mail: 24%
- Internet voting accessibility upgrades: 19%
- Combined telephone-internet voting: 17%
- Touch screen voting: 15%
- Magnifying sheets available: 13%
- Telephone voting—without TTY: 9%
- Large text ballots available: 8%
- Free transportation to and from voting place: 7%
- Telephone voting with TTY phones available: 6%
- Internet voting—without accessibility updates: 4%
- Screen reader: 3%
- Braille ballots available: 2%
- Sign language interpreter: 2%
- N/A: 7%
ACCESSIBILITY: Most respondent municipalities used marketing to communicate accessible voting, with website and print media the most popular.

Did your municipality do any marketing to communicate about accessible voting methods or locations? (n=119)

- Yes, 71%
- No, 22%
- N/A, 8%

If so, how did you market this information? (n=83)

- Website: 54%
- Print media: 51%
- Mailing/Newsletter: 30%
- Radio: 22%
- Community Outreach: 19%
- Social Media: 19%
- Accessibility Committee: 11%
- Voter Notification Cards: 11%
- General Advertising: 8%
- Property Tax Notice: 6%
- Press Release: 4%
- Email: 1%
- TV: 1%
ACCESSIBILITY: Few respondent municipalities provided election materials in a language other than English or French, those that did used a wide range of languages. Did you provide election materials or forms in any language(s) other than English or French? (n=119)

- Yes, 4%
- No, 90%
- N/A, 6%

If so, what languages?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Punjabi</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Serbian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>Somali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarati</td>
<td>Bengali</td>
<td>Tibetan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>Urdu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>Farsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMPLIANCE AUDIT COMMITTEES: Most respondent municipalities did not have trouble forming compliance audit committees, many worked with another municipality.

Did your municipality have difficulty finding members for its compliance audit committee? (n=119)

- Yes, 20%
- No, 76%
- N/A, 4%

Did you work with another municipality to recruit your compliance audit committee, or share a committee with another municipality? (n=119)

- Yes, worked together, 11%
- Yes, shared a committee, 60%
- No, 25%
- N/A, 4%
STAFFING: Most respondent municipalities had fewer than five permanent staff dedicated to the management of the 2014 election.

How many permanent staff did you have dedicated to the management of the election process in 2014? (n=119)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Staff</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 5</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 20</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of these permanent staff how many worked exclusively on the management of the election? (n=92)

- Less than 4 months:
  - 0: 19%
  - 1: 27%
  - 2: 18%
  - 3 to 4: 22%
  - 5 to 9: 14%
  - 10+:

- For 4-6 months:
  - 0: 12%
  - 1: 25%
  - 2: 19%
  - 3 to 4: 23%
  - 5 to 9: 17%
  - 10+:

- For at least 6 months:
  - 0: 12%
  - 1: 25%
  - 2: 19%
  - 3 to 4: 23%
  - 5 to 9: 17%
  - 10+:

- For the election:
  - 0: 13%
  - 1: 25%
  - 2: 19%
  - 3 to 4: 23%
  - 5 to 9: 17%
  - 10+:

- All of the time:
  - 0: 13%
  - 1: 25%
  - 2: 19%
  - 3 to 4: 23%
  - 5 to 9: 17%
  - 10+:
STAFFING: Most respondent municipalities did not hire contract staff to work on their election

Did you hire contract staff to work at the municipal office to help deliver the election (apart from temporary staff hired for voting day only)? (n=119)

- Yes, 28%
- No, 67%
- N/A, 5%
STAFFING: Most respondent municipalities hired fewer than 100 temporary election staff and used traditional hiring techniques

How many temporary staff did you hire for election only? (n=119)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Staff</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-50</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-100</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-200</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which of the following techniques did you use to hire election staff? (n=119)

- Traditional application: 39%
- Oral Interview: 18%
- Written test: 12%
- Hired staff from previous election: 9%
- Used internal staff: 4%
- Did not hire temporary staff: 4%
- Online application: 4%
- Graded application form: 2%
- Word of mouth: 2%
- Group Interviews: 1%
- Letter of interest: 1%
- N/A: 4%
**COSTS, total and per eligible voter**

How much money was allocated to run the election in your municipality? (n=119)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Allocations for 2014 Election</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>2%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,000,000+</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500,00 - $1,000,000</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 - $500,000</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $100,000</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 - $50,000</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 - $30,000</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $10,000</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What was the cost to run your election, per eligible voter? (n=119)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost of the 2014 Election, per eligible voter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lowest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>15%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$10+</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5 - $10</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3 - $5</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 - $3</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $1.00</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>