



**COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
AGENDA REPORT**

TO: Mayor Harding and Members of Committee of the Whole

MEETING DATE: April 11, 2019

SUBJECT: POST ELECTION REPORT ON THE 2018 MUNICIPAL ELECTION

| | | |
|--|-----------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u>RECOMMENDATION:</u> That Committee of the Whole recommend to Township Council that the Muskoka Clerks' Post Election Report on the 2018 Municipal Election be received for information purposes. | | |
| <u>APPROVALS:</u> | Date | Signature |
| Submitted By: C. Mortimer, Clerk | <u>08/04/19</u> | <u>Original signed by C. Mortimer</u> |
| Acknowledged: S. McDonald, CAO | <u>08/04/19</u> | <u>Original signed by S. McDonald</u> |

SUMMARY: This report has been presented for information purposes.

ORIGIN: Muskoka Clerks.

BACKGROUND: The Muskoka Clerks have worked collaboratively throughout the 2018 Municipal Election. Each of the Muskoka Clerks will be sharing the attached report with their respective Councils for information purposes.

FINANCIAL: N/A



Muskoka Clerks 2018 Post-Election Report

TO: Muskoka Area Councils

FROM: Muskoka Clerks

SUBJECT: Post-Election Report on the 2018 Municipal Election

RECOMMENDATION

1. THAT the Muskoka Clerks Post Election Report on the 2018 Municipal Election be received for information purposes.

ORIGIN

2. For more than a decade, the Muskoka Clerks have met on a regular basis to discuss existing and emerging issues and information in an effort to work collaboratively wherever possible to address areas of mutual interest. Representatives from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH) and the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC) regularly attend meetings with the Muskoka Clerks. Among the topics of discussion over the past several years are:

- | | |
|--|---|
| • Accessibility | • General Municipal Matters |
| • Accountability and Transparency | • Information Technology |
| • Best Practices | • Ward Boundaries |
| • Civil Marriages | • Legislative Change |
| • Council Matters (Code of Conduct, remuneration, procedural, etc.) | • Policies, Procedures, Workflow Process |
| • Freedom of Information | • Records Management |
| • Elections | • Service Delivery |
| • Emergency Management | • Training |
| • Communications (notice requirements, social media, websites, etc.) | • Legal Matters (Agreements, Commissioning, Land Disposition Matters, etc.) |

3. In particular, over the course of the past three municipal elections the Muskoka Clerks have worked very closely to share best practices, resources, advertising, training, educational outreach to the public to provide efficiencies and development of common Election Procedures where possible, to ensure consistency and reduce voter confusion.
4. In 2018, all Muskoka municipalities worked collaboratively to provide Internet/Telephone voting as the exclusive voting method. The Muskoka Clerks issued a Request for Information (RFI) in the Fall of 2016 and participated in demonstrations of four different vendors to gain an understanding of the internet/telephone voting programs, services and security being offered. On April 20, 2017 the contract for Internet Voting Systems was awarded to Dominion Voting.



Muskoka Clerks 2018 Post-Election Report

5. As an outflow of the 2018 Municipal Election which occurred on October 22/23, 2018, the Muskoka Clerks prepared a post-election report with summary information as well as areas identified for future review and consideration in planning for 2022.

ANALYSIS

Alternative Voting Methods

6. In 1996, the *Municipal Elections Act* was amended to permit the use of alternative voting methods and tabulation equipment in lieu of, or in addition to, the traditional ballot system of voting. This change was viewed by many Ontario municipalities as a positive change to enable greater opportunity and access for both resident and non-resident electors.
7. Alternative voting methods can include: internet voting, mail-in voting, telephone voting and touch screen voting.
8. Some of the benefits to alternative methods of voting can include: increased accessibility, increased voter participation, voter convenience, elimination of proxy voting and advance polls, greater accuracy and prompt election results.
9. For Muskoka electors that are non-resident, together with those with diminished mobility and accessibility constraints (e.g. transportation, persons with disabilities, time limitations), alternative voting has provided better opportunity for all electors to exercise their right to vote and participate in the democratic process.
10. The requirement of municipalities to ensure that voting locations are accessible can be costly, particularly in rural areas. Given that the use of alternative voting methodologies requires fewer voting locations, capital expenditures to address accessibility issues can be better planned over the long term by municipalities. In addition to improved convenience, alternative voting options are a less costly alternative to traditional polls in terms of human and other resources for municipalities of similar size to the Muskoka municipalities. Management of large numbers of poll staff together with facility and transportation logistics can be a barrier on voting day.
11. 2014 Survey data from the Association of Municipal Managers, Clerks and Treasurers of Ontario (AMCTO) indicates that the use of alternative voting methods by municipalities is growing with the most popular alternative method reported by respondents being internet voting, phone voting followed by mail-in ballot respectively. 2018 survey data was not available at the time this report was prepared.
12. The Association of Municipalities Ontario (AMO) reported in their 2018 Ontario Municipal Elections Results Website¹ that 417 out of 444 municipalities held elections in 2018. Of those municipalities, 178 municipalities (42.3%) used internet/telephone voting and that the use of mail-in ballots dropped by 46%. This reduction likely reflects a move to a method that is safe from a postal strike. Mail-in ballot represented 13.3% and paper ballot represented 26.6%.
13. In 2018, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing prepared a post-Election summary report, which provides, among other data, information on the utilization of alternative voting methods throughout the province. The District of Muskoka falls within the Central Region data set.
14. Information in the summary report indicates that, of the alternative voting methods used, Internet/Telephone voting is the most popular method with Vote by Mail (VBM) following closely

¹ 2018 Ontario Elections Results Website, Association of Municipalities Ontario <https://elections.amo.on.ca/web/en/home>



Muskoka Clerks 2018 Post-Election Report

behind. A copy of the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing post-Election summary report is attached hereto as Appendix "A".

15. The following provides an overview of the utilization of alternative voting methods in Muskoka since the changes to the *Municipal Elections Act* occurred in 1997:

| | 1997 | 2000 | 2003 | 2006 | 2010 | 2014 | 2018 |
|----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Bracebridge | VBM with Manual Count | VBM with Manual Count | VBM with Manual Count | VBM with Optical Scan Tabulators | VBM with Optical Scan Tabulators | VBM with Optical Scan Tabulators | Internet & Telephone |
| Georgian Bay | VBM with Manual Count | VBM with Manual Count | VBM with Manual Count | VBM with Optical Scan Tabulators | VBM with Optical Scan Tabulators | VBM with Optical Scan Tabulators | Internet & Telephone |
| Gravenhurst | Vote by Telephone | Vote by Telephone | VBM with Optical Scan Tabulators | VBM with Optical Scan Tabulators | VBM with Optical Scan Tabulators | VBM with Optical Scan Tabulators | Internet & Telephone |
| Huntsville | Traditional with Vote Tabulators | Traditional with Vote Tabulators | Traditional with VBM by written request with Vote Tabulators | Traditional with VBM by written request with Vote Tabulators | Internet and Telephone | VBM with Optical Scan Tabulators | Internet & Telephone |
| Lake of Bays | | VBM with Manual Count | VBM with Manual Count | VBM with Optical Scan Tabulators | VBM with Optical Scan Tabulators | VBM with Optical Scan Tabulators | Internet & Telephone |
| Muskoka Lakes | VBM with Manual Count | VBM with Manual Count | VBM with Manual Count | VBM with Optical Scan Tabulators | VBM with Optical Scan Tabulators | VBM with Optical Scan Tabulators | Internet & Telephone |

16. Voter turnout is affected by many factors including, but not limited to: high profile issues, demographics, human interest, high profile mayoral race, acclamations, voting methods and general voter apathy. The average voter turnout for 2018 reported on The AMO 2018 Ontario Municipal Elections Results Website² was 38.31% which was down from 43% in 2014. Voter turnout for each of these Elections is as follows:

| | 1997 | 2000 | 2003 | 2006 | 2010 | 2014 | 2018 |
|----------------------|-------|-------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Bracebridge | 43% | 39% | 39% | 37.45% | 43.75% | 42.14% | 39.40% |
| Georgian Bay | 23% | 30% | 42% | 35.58% | 44.9% | 44.7% | 38.10% |
| Gravenhurst | N/A | N/A | 36% | 44.5% | 46% | 36.5% | 30.34% |
| Huntsville | N/A | N/A | 20.72% | 31.59% | 46.4% | 46.33% | 35.15% |
| Lake of Bays | N/A | 43% | 46.36% | 34.9% | 45.83% | 39.58% | 37.80% |
| Muskoka Lakes | 24.9% | 25.2% | 34% | 37.9% | 40.3% | 44% | 40.83% |

17. As with any method of voting, Internet/Telephone voting can pose some challenges for election officials. In 2018, technical issues were present during the voting period with the unauthorized cap on the bandwidth from a third party internet colocation company hired by Dominion Voting

² 2018 Ontario Elections Results Website, Association of Municipalities Ontario <https://elections.amo.on.ca/web/en/home>



Muskoka Clerks 2018 Post-Election Report

resulting in only 1/10 of the promised bandwidth being available. By the time Dominion Voting was able to have the cap removed over 90 minutes had passed. Dominion Voting issued a Media Release on October 22, 2018 with respect to the slowdown affecting Internet Voting Services for the impacted municipalities and confirmed that at no time was the integrity of the system at risk of compromise or in any way insecure. Dominion Voting assured Ontario voters that they would work to ensure that this problem does not occur in future elections. Forty-nine (49) municipalities were affected.

18. Collectively, our municipalities decided to extend the voting period for an additional 24 hours to 8:00 p.m. on October 23, 2018. There were no other issues in the internet voting services up to the close of voting.
19. After the election, the forty-nine (49) municipalities negotiated with John Poulos, the President and CEO of Dominion Voting through jointly appointed groups to receive compensation for costs associated with the delayed election (i.e. staffing, rentals, resources, etc.)
20. The use of Internet/Telephone voting eliminated voter kits being rejected. In 2006, many municipalities using VBM experienced a number of rejected ballots partially due the composition of the voter kit. In 2010, the ballot kits were improved and the number of rejected ballots decreased. As rejected kits may be intentional (i.e. spoiled ballots) the 2010 and 2014 number of rejected kits is considered within an acceptable range. Kits may be rejected for the following reasons because the voter declaration is not signed, there are identifiable marks on the ballot or secrecy envelope, there are different numbers of declarations to secrecy envelopes and/or the elector has already been struck off the voters list as having voted.
21. Rejected kit/VIL statistics over the past four Elections are as follows:

| | 2006 | 2010 | 2014 | 2018 |
|---------------|--------|-------|-------|------|
| Bracebridge | 15.47% | 2.12% | 1.51% | 0% |
| Georgian Bay | N/A | N/A | 3.01% | 0% |
| Gravenhurst | 7.4% | 3.6% | 1.4% | 0% |
| Huntsville | N/A | N/A | 0.63% | 0% |
| Lake of Bays | 15% | 1.87% | 0.6% | 0% |
| Muskoka Lakes | 3.04% | 3.81% | 1.52% | 0% |

22. The Internet/Telephone voting system was designed to fully verify voter intent by disallowing unintentional spoiled ballots by providing warning prompts in relation to offices which may be under-voted or left blank. Upon completion, and prior to casting the ballot, voters were provided an opportunity to review his/her selections and make changes.
23. As mentioned previously, due to the large number of non-resident electors, alternative voting methods are ideal in ensuring that this segment of electors has the opportunity to vote. The following provides an overview of the resident and non-resident voting activity in 2018:

| | Resident Electors | | Non-Resident Electors | |
|---------------|-------------------|-------|-----------------------|-------|
| | Eligible | Voted | Eligible | Voted |
| Bracebridge | 10,615 | 5,051 | 4,315 | 849 |
| Georgian Bay | 2,043 | 984 | 7,482 | 2,648 |
| Gravenhurst | 7,784 | 2,828 | 6,120 | 1,461 |
| Huntsville | 13,399 | 5,670 | 5,299 | 902 |
| Lake of Bays | 2,320 | 1,242 | 5,759 | 1,812 |
| Muskoka Lakes | 5,187 | 2,491 | 11,819 | 4,452 |



Muskoka Clerks 2018 Post-Election Report

24. Although Election costs in each municipality vary depending on the needs of each community, Internet/Telephone has proven to be an efficient use of municipal funds³. Some expenses may include but are not limited to hardware/software, service contracts, training, materials & supplies, legal, advertising, staffing, inaugural, postage, printing, etc. The following provides a breakdown of the 2018 election expenditures and the cost per elector:

| | Total 2018 Election Expenditures | Total # of Electors on Voting Day | Cost Per Elector |
|---------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|
| Bracebridge | \$78,500.00 | 14,930 | \$5.26 |
| Georgian Bay | \$40,000.00 | 9,525 | \$4.20 |
| Gravenhurst | \$60,685.64 | 13,904 | \$4.36 |
| Huntsville | \$95,019.00 | 18,698 | \$5.08 |
| Lake of Bays | \$33,893.85 | 8,079 | \$4.20 |
| Muskoka Lakes | \$71,590.15 | 17,006 | \$4.21 |

Enumeration – Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC)

25. It is the responsibility of MPAC to provide municipalities with a preliminary list of electors prior to each Election. Although MPAC launched a new enumeration tool in 2014 (voterlookup.ca) and continued in 2018, accuracy of the voters list continues to be a challenge. Upon receipt of the preliminary list of electors, it is typical for municipalities to spend hours “cleaning-up” the data received by removing duplicates, fixing addressing issues, editing partial data, etc.⁴
26. Returned mail (i.e. moved, not at this address, deceased) and the issuance of replacement Voter Information Letters (VIL) have a direct correlation to the quality of the voters list. The following represents 2014 and 2018 data collected in this area:

| | 2014 | | 2018 | |
|---------------|---------------|-------------------------|---------------|------------------------|
| | Returned Mail | Replacement Kits Issued | Returned Mail | Replacement VIL Issued |
| Bracebridge | 326 | 305 | 358 | 648 |
| Georgian Bay | 323 | 272 | Did not track | Did not track |
| Gravenhurst | Did not track | 415 | 888 | 506 |
| Huntsville | 628 | 627 | 394 | 509 |
| Lake of Bays | 92 | 62 | 177 | 149 |
| Muskoka Lakes | 477 | 264 | 656 | 232 |

27. MPAC no longer completes a full enumeration for municipal elections however source data utilized by MPAC to develop the 2018 preliminary list of electors includes:
- 27.1. All changes that occurred on their systems since the 2010 election, (i.e. sales affidavits, school support changes, roll number creations, etc.);
 - 27.2. voterlookup.ca;
 - 27.3. National Register of Electors (NROE) (contains Elections Canada and Elections Ontario elector information); and,

³ Some municipalities include various costs as part of their election expenses while others do not. Where possible, figures have been adjusted to ensure the best comparison data.

⁴ In 2010, MPAC implemented a policy change whereby property owners with “unconfirmed citizenship” were omitted from the preliminary list of electors.



Muskoka Clerks 2018 Post-Election Report

- 27.4. Ministry of Government Services (MGS) (deceased persons).
28. Although tenant information is collected by MPAC annually, this segment of the preliminary list of electors is typically the most problematic, partially due to the fact that responses are voluntary.
29. MPAC has acknowledged a number of anomalies that occurred on the preliminary list of electors in 2018 (i.e. electors left off the list who have been long-standing residents, children on the list but not the parents, deceased persons, etc.). In most circumstances, MPAC believes that the quality of the data is sound and that further review with the list management vendor is necessary.
30. MPAC also acknowledges that there are opportunities to improve communications to help the public use voterlookup.ca appropriately and understand the move from a paper-based data collection enumeration process. In 2014 and 2018, MPAC relied heavily on municipalities to market their online product. In addition, there appeared to be some confusion among voters regarding the use of it for enumeration as opposed to the online voter lookup tool used on municipal websites that linked directly to the final voters list.
31. In 2012, the AMCTO published a Voters List Position Paper advocating for transformational changes to the way that Ontario creates and maintains the voters' list for municipal elections.
32. Since the 2018 election, a number of municipalities have supported by resolution the re-establishment of the multi-stakeholder working group between the Ministry of Municipal Affairs, Ministry of Finance, AMCTO, MPAC and Elections Ontario in exploring and identifying ways to create and maintain the voters' list for municipal elections.
33. On March 11, 2019, AMCTO issued an email seeking expressions of interest from members to participate on a Voters' List Working Group that will provide input and guidance to the association and its ongoing advocacy on the voters' list.

Third Party Advertising

34. In 2018, the *Municipal Elections Act* was amended to permit third party advertising. Individuals, corporations and unions could register as Third Party Advertisers with every municipality they wanted to advertise in. Third party advertising had to be done independently of election candidates. Third Party Advertisers were provided maximum campaign spending limits and must file a financial statement with the Clerk in the municipality where they registered, where they incurred expenses and the advertisement appeared. The following represents how many third party advertisers registered in the Muskoka municipalities.

| | Registered Third Party Advertisers |
|---------------|------------------------------------|
| Bracebridge | 2 |
| Georgian Bay | 1 |
| Gravenhurst | 2 |
| Huntsville | 1 |
| Lake of Bays | 0 |
| Muskoka Lakes | 2 |



Muskoka Clerks 2018 Post-Election Report

Accessibility and Communications

35. The Muskoka municipalities are committed to providing exceptional and accessible service for its customers. All services are to be provided in a manner that is based upon the principles of dignity, independence, integration and equal opportunity to all. As noted previously, Internet/Telephone voting is one of the most accessible voting methods available.
36. Each municipality provides its election officials with training in the area of customer service with a focus on accessibility. In addition, leading up to Voting Day, key election officials attended numerous training sessions provided by both the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing and the AMCTO. All of the sessions contained segments relating to accessibility.
37. Comprehensive Election webpages were included on each municipality's website with information and links to numerous documents and external websites, including information related to accessibility. Media Releases and newspaper advertising were also utilized to ensure the conveyance of messaging reached broad circulation.
38. Joint radio advertising over three stations was initiated by the six area municipalities in Muskoka to raise awareness and convey key and consistent messages. Bulk mailings, social media, banners, extended hours, information sessions and presentations were some of the tools used to varying degrees by the Muskoka municipalities in promoting awareness and informing electors about the 2018 Election.
39. Each of the municipalities worked cooperatively with Hospitals, Nursing Home/Long Term Care Facilities, and Seniors Residences to ensure the needs of their electors were met.
40. Candidates were provided access to a portal linked real-time to the voter database. This eliminated the requirement to produce voters' lists and strike-off data.

Muskoka Compliance Audit Committee

41. As previously reported, pursuant to amendments to the *Municipal Elections Act* in 2010, prior to October 1st in the Election Year, all municipalities are required to appoint a Compliance Audit Committee for the purpose of conducting compliance audits of candidate's election campaign finances. Previously the appointment of a Compliance Audit Committee has been optional to municipalities.
42. The purpose of the Compliance Audit Committee is to deal with applications that may be received from eligible electors in the municipality for a compliance audit of a candidate's election campaign finances. Compliance Audit Committees are quasi-judicial bodies and do not report through Council or its Committees (similar to Committee(s) of Adjustment)
43. Additionally, as part of the recent amendments to the *Municipal Elections Act* in 2017, the Clerk is now required to review the contributions reported on the financial statements submitted by a Candidate or Registered Third Party Advertiser to determine and report on whether any contributor appears to have exceeded any of the contribution limits. These reports must be forwarded to the Compliance Audit Committee.
44. Since 2010, through a collaborative effort, the Muskoka Clerks, as authorized by each of their respective Councils, developed and updated a Terms of Reference for a Muskoka-wide



Muskoka Clerks 2018 Post-Election Report

Committee and have appointed the committee members through an open call for applications each term of council.

45. During the 2010-2014 term of council, one (1) Compliance Audit was held in 2011 in the Township of Georgian Bay. During the 2014-2018 term of council, eight (8) Compliance Audit requests were submitted in the Township of Muskoka Lakes. Of the eight (8) requests, two (2) were rejected and the remaining six (6) were granted with an auditor appointed. Audits were received, considered and a final determination not to commence legal proceedings in all six (6) cases was decided.
46. As the creation of a Muskoka-wide Compliance Audit Committee has proved to be effective in attracting qualified and engaged individuals for appointment, while meeting the statutory requirements for the establishment of this Committee, a joint committee was approved by all of the Muskoka municipalities for 2018-2022 consisting of:
 - 46.1. Joan A. Pajunen
 - 46.2. Bob Panizza
 - 46.3. Beverley Webb
 - 46.4. Rosemary King (Alternate)
 - 46.5. Linda Thompson (Alternate)
47. Training for the 2018-2022 Committee is scheduled to take place in April 2019.

Best Practices in Increasing Voter Participation

48. Through the wide variety of methods used by the Muskoka Clerks in communicating with electors in 2018, the Muskoka municipalities fell within the average voter turnout percentage as identified in the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing's post-Election summary. Continuing to work collaboratively to enhance voter participation will be pursued further by the group in preparation for the 2022 Election.
49. As indicated previously, additional engagement with MPAC and voters list management vendors will be pursued well in advance of receipt of the preliminary list of electors in 2022.

EXISTING POLICY

50. *Municipal Elections Act, S.O. 1996.*
51. Election Procedures

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

52. None, at this time.



Muskoka Clerks 2018 Post-Election Report

APPENDIX "A"

Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing Post-Election Summary

**2018 MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS
POST-ELECTION SUMMARY BY MSO**

Updated December 28, 2018

| STATISTICS SUMMARY | Province | Central | East | Northeast | Northwest | North | West |
|--|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------|-----------|
| Total Number of Municipalities | 444 | 69 | 114 | 110 | 34 | 144 | 117 |
| Total Number of Candidates Acclaimed | 471 | 35 | 96 | 163 | 49 | 212 | 128 |
| Number of Municipalities With All Candidates Acclaimed | 26 | 0 | 2 | 17 | 3 | 20 | 4 |
| Total Number of Electors | 10,403,647 | 5,962,016 | 1,592,673 | 432,660 | 144,500 | 577,160 | 2,271,798 |
| Total Number Who Voted | 3,983,782 | 2,198,375 | 679,750 | 189,233 | 70,628 | 259,861 | 845,796 |
| Voter Turnout Percentage | 38.29% | 36.87% | 42.68% | 43.74% | 48.88% | 45.02% | 37.23% |
| Minimum | 14.76% | 22.19% | 20.80% | 14.76% | 14.88% | 14.76% | 16.62% |
| Average | 41.62% | 36.99% | 43.81% | 42.33% | 44.40% | 39.15% | 40.87% |
| Maximum | 66.89% | 59.06% | 64.89% | 66.89% | 66.42% | 66.89% | 63.77% |
| Average Voter Turnout Percentage | | | | | | | |
| Municipalities Using Traditional Voting Methods Only | 33.85% | 34.68% | 28.52% | 37.59% | 32.01% | 36.75% | 30.64% |
| Municipalities Using Alternative Voting Methods Only | 38.14% | 32.77% | 43.32% | 44.90% | 51.05% | 47.19% | 38.41% |
| Municipalities Using Traditional and Alternative Voting Methods | 39.23% | 37.51% | 42.94% | 44.80% | 50.31% | 46.26% | 38.50% |
| Telephone Voting | 41.00% | 36.24% | 42.94% | 41.70% | 51.11% | 48.89% | 41.78% |
| Internet Voting | 40.96% | 37.25% | 43.04% | 45.95% | 51.11% | 47.97% | 40.64% |
| Voting Tabulators | 38.53% | 37.71% | 42.78% | 46.59% | 50.98% | 48.50% | 36.53% |
| Ranked Ballots | 39.46% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 39.46% |
| Vote by Mail | 39.53% | 32.11% | 47.00% | 43.20% | 46.67% | 43.25% | 41.27% |
| Touch Screen | 43.97% | 44.49% | 42.70% | 0.00% | 52.83% | 52.83% | 43.95% |
| Accessible Devices | 37.47% | 34.04% | 42.29% | 40.10% | 49.97% | 48.87% | 35.47% |
| Other | 43.10% | 42.65% | 44.03% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 41.90% |
| Number of Councils with Restricted Acts After Election Day | 325 | 52 | 86 | 70 | 25 | 95 | 92 |
| Number of Councils with Greater Than 50% Change in Members | 149 | 25 | 45 | 31 | 12 | 43 | 36 |
| Number of New Heads of Council <i>(Mayor, Reeve, Regional Chair, District Chair)</i> | 191 | 33 | 55 | 40 | 15 | 55 | 48 |
| Number of New Deputies <i>(Deputy Mayor, Vice Deputy Mayor, Deputy Reeve)</i> | 86 | 11 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 |
| Number of New Councillors <i>(Local Councillor, Local and County Councillor, Local and Regional Councillor, Local and District Councillor, County Councillor, Regional Councillor, District Councillor, Reeve (Not Head of Council))</i> | 1272 | 300 | 317 | 231 | 85 | 316 | 339 |
| Number of Incumbent Heads of Council <i>(Mayor, Reeve, Regional Chair, District Chair)</i> | 230 | 35 | 48 | 70 | 19 | 89 | 58 |
| Number of Incumbent Deputies <i>(Deputy Mayor, Vice Deputy Mayor, Deputy Reeve)</i> | 38 | 6 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Number of Incumbent Councillors <i>(Local Councillor, Local and County Councillor, Local and Regional Councillor, Local and District Councillor, County Councillor, Regional Councillor, District Councillor, Reeve (Not Head of Council))</i> | 1372 | 316 | 301 | 299 | 77 | 376 | 379 |
| Number of Seats by Office | | | | | | | |
| Mayor | 368 | 62 | 89 | 88 | 28 | 116 | 101 |
| Deputy Mayor | 111 | 17 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 |
| Vice Deputy Mayor | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Reeve | 46 | 0 | 14 | 22 | 6 | 28 | 4 |
| Deputy Reeve | 12 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Regional Chair | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| District Chair | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Councillor | 2646 | 616 | 620 | 530 | 162 | 692 | 718 |
| Number of Candidates by Office | | | | | | | |
| Mayor | 939 | 230 | 214 | 187 | 64 | 251 | 244 |
| Deputy Mayor | 229 | 40 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 116 |
| Vice Deputy Mayor | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Reeve | 78 | 0 | 33 | 25 | 13 | 38 | 7 |
| Deputy Reeve | 22 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Regional Chair | 48 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| District Chair | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Councillor | 5,304 | 1710 | 1,118 | 870 | 294 | 1164 | 1312 |
| Number of Municipalities Extending Nomination Period | 10 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 1 |
| Number of Councils With Vacant Seats | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Number of Municipalities Using Alternative Voting Methods | 316 | 55 | 93 | 41 | 25 | 66 | 102 |
| Advanced Polls Only | 5 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Election Day Only | 8 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Both | 303 | 53 | 86 | 40 | 23 | 63 | 101 |
| Number of Municipalities With a Question on the Ballot | 7 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Number of Questions on Ballots | 7 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Number of Questions With Binding Results | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Number of Third Party Advertisers Registered | 213 | 108 | 35 | 16 | 3 | 19 | 51 |
| Number of Municipalities Holding Recounts for Any Office* | 24 | 1 | 8 | 7 | 3 | 10 | 5 |

*The recount data may change if additional recounts are conducted in municipalities after January 1, 2019.