

347L

RECORD OF VOTES CAST IN THE VARIOUS PRECINCTS OF THE CITY OF SOMERVILLE

	Ward One			Total	Ward Two			Total	Ward Three			Total
	1	2	3		1	2	3		1	2	3	
TOTAL NUMBER OF VOTES CAST	1127	1318	1187	3632	1236	1508	1486	4230	1588	1424	1573	4585
QUESTION NO. 2-LAW PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION												
<p>QUESTION 2 Law Proposed by Initiative Petition</p> <p>Do you approve of a law summarized below, on which no vote was taken by the Senate or the House of Representatives before May 6, 1992? YES</p> <p style="text-align: right;">NO</p> <p style="text-align: center;">SUMMARY</p> <p>This proposed law would require certain banks, insurance companies and publicly-traded corporations to file annual reports with the Massachusetts Secretary of State listing information from their state tax returns, including profit, income, corporate income tax due, deductions, exemptions and credits. These reports would be made public. This provision would apply only to those banks, insurance companies and publicly-traded corporations required by federal and other Massachusetts laws to disclose information concerning their federal tax payments.</p> <p>The proposed law would also require the annual release by state officials of a detailed analysis of certain tax expenditures enacted or changed after January 1, 1988. State law defines a tax expenditure as an exemption, exclusion, deduction, or credit that results in less corporate, sales, or income tax revenue for the state. This analysis would be required only for tax expenditures with an annual revenue impact of \$1,000,000 or more. The analysis would include information on the actual revenue loss, as well as the number and proportion of taxpayers or taxpaying entities benefiting from the tax expenditure, according to income, profit, receipts or sales.</p>												
YES	493	675	603	1771	708	860	842	2410	844	818	863	2525
NO	467	508	450	1425	367	458	428	1253	522	430	500	1452
BLANKS	165	135	134	434	161	190	215	566	222	175	209	606
QUESTION NO.3-LAW PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION												
<p>QUESTION 3 Law Proposed by Initiative Petition</p> <p>Do you approve of a law summarized below, on which no vote was taken by the Senate or the House of Representatives before May 6, 1992? YES</p> <p style="text-align: right;">NO</p> <p style="text-align: center;">SUMMARY</p> <p>This proposed law would require all packaging used in Massachusetts on or after July 1, 1996 to be reduced in size, reusable, or made of materials that have been or could be recycled. The proposed law would provide for exemptions for health, safety, and other reasons and would establish penalties for violations.</p> <p>Packaging would have to be either reduced in size by at least 25% every five years, or designed to be reusable at least five times, with at least 50% of such packaging actually being reused; or recycled at a 50% rate; or composed of 25% or more of recycled materials (increasing to 35% on July 1, 1999 and 50% on July 1, 2002); or composed of materials being recycled at an annual rate of 25% (increasing to 35% in 1999 and 50% in 2002). The requirements would apply to any packaging or containers used to protect, store, handle, transport, display, or sell products.</p> <p>These requirements would not be applicable to tamper-resistant or tamper-evident seals; packaging for medication or medical devices; packaging merely being shipped through the state; packaging required by federal or state health or safety laws or regulations; or flexible film packaging necessary to prevent food from spoiling.</p> <p>The state Department of Environmental Protection could also grant exemptions for packaging that represents an innovative approach for which additional time is needed to meet the requirements of the law; or packaging made of material that cannot be reused or recycled, and cannot be made of recycled material, but is being composted at a significant rate; or products for which there is no complying packaging and for which compliance with the law would impose undue hardship (other than increased cost) on Massachusetts residents. A person applying for an exemption would pay a fee to be used, subject to legislative appropriation, to pay the cost of administering the proposed law.</p> <p>The Department would be required to issue regulations to carry out the proposed law and would be required to investigate suspected violations. After issuing a warning, the Department could assess administrative penalties of up to \$100 for each offense and up to \$10,000 for any single shipment or single continuing act of non-compliance. The state Attorney General could also file court actions for civil penalties of up to \$500 for each offense and up to \$25,000 for any single shipment or continuing act of non-compliance, and could seek a court order requiring compliance. Each non-complying piece of packaging would be considered a separate offense or act of non-compliance.</p> <p>The proposed law states that if any of its provisions were declared invalid, the other provisions would remain in effect.</p>												
YES	367	480	437	1284	637	840	859	2336	781	709	837	2327
NO	662	771	661	2094	524	587	544	1655	697	640	652	1989
BLANKS	96	67	89	252	75	81	82	238	110	74	83	267

Ward Four			Total	Ward Five			Total	Ward Six			Total	Ward Seven			Total			TOTAL
1	2	3		1	2	3		1	2	3		1	2	3				
945	1272	1306	3523	1366	1432	1631	4429	1952	1875	1553	5380	1728	1550	1711	4989	Overseas & Partial Ballots	30,768	30,713
440	611	705	1756	689	737	953	2379	1201	1082	852	3135	935	774	853	2562	Overseas Ballots	16,538	16,516
410	487	439	1336	534	532	467	1533	494	543	413	1450	534	541	611	1686	Overseas Ballots	10,135	10,126
95	174	162	431	143	163	207	513	257	249	283	789	255	235	247	737	Overseas Ballots	4,076	4,071
301	456	636	1393	525	617	896	2038	1243	1125	966	3334	937	727	768	2432	Overseas Ballots	15,144	15,113
590	705	594	1889	769	731	646	2146	635	673	520	1828	710	699	853	2262	Overseas Ballots	13,863	13,862
54	111	76	241	72	84	85	241	74	76	62	212	77	124	90	291	Overseas Ballots	1,742	1,738

RECORD OF VOTES CAST IN THE VARIOUS PRECINCTS OF THE CITY OF SOMERVILLE

	Ward One			Total	Ward Two			Total	Ward Three			Total
	1	2	3		1	2	3		1	2	3	
TOTAL NUMBER OF VOTES CAST	1127	1318	1187	3632	1236	1508	1486	4230	1588	1424	1573	4585
QUESTION NO. 4-LAW PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION												
<p>QUESTION 4 Law Proposed by Initiative Petition</p> <p>Do you approve of a law summarized below, on which no vote was taken by the Senate or the House of Representatives before May 6, 1992?</p> <p>YES NO</p> <p>SUMMARY</p> <p>This proposed law would impose an excise tax on oil, toxic chemicals, and other hazardous substances, and would direct that the money raised, along with the fees paid by hazardous waste transporters and specific revenues under other state laws, be deposited in the state Environmental Challenge Fund. Money in the Fund would be used, subject to legislative appropriation, to assess and clean up sites that have been or may be contaminated by oil or hazardous materials, and to carry out and enforce the excise.</p> <p>As of July 1, 1993, the excise would apply to persons, businesses, and other entities possessing 50,000 pounds or more of oil and toxic chemicals covered by the proposed law. Toxic chemicals would be covered if classified as toxic by the federal Environmental Protection Administration (EPA) under federal law. As of July 1, 1994, substances listed as hazardous by the EPA under federal law would also become subject to the excise. Until June 30, 1995, the excise would be two-tenths of one cent (\$0.002) per pound. In later years, the state Commissioner of Revenue would set the excise rate at a level, not to exceed two-tenths of one cent per pound, sufficient to yield \$35 million annually in 1995 dollars.</p> <p>The excise would not apply to gasoline or other special engine fuels, jet fuel taxed under other state law, numbers 1 or 2 fuel oil, kerosene, animal or vegetable oil, or waste oil classified as hazardous waste under other state law. Nor would the excise apply to oils, toxic chemicals, or hazardous substances merely being shipped through Massachusetts; or contained in a consumer product intended for retail sale; or present in a mixture at a concentration of less than one percent; or present in hazardous waste being transported by a licensed hazardous waste transporter who had paid or will pay a transporter fee under state law; or for which the excise tax has already been paid under the proposed law and which have not been reprocessed or recycled since payment of the excise.</p> <p>The excise also would not apply to oils, toxic chemicals, or hazardous substances that are possessed by individuals for personal, non-business purposes; or are contained in vehicles or vessels intended to be used for normal purposes; or are produced in Massachusetts as a by-product of pollution control equipment or the clean-up of hazardous materials and are handled in compliance with federal and state environmental laws. Finally, the excise would not apply to toxic chemicals or hazardous substances in a manufactured product the use of which requires a specific shape or design and which does not release toxic substances under normal use.</p> <p>Under the proposed law, the excise would ordinarily be collected from the first person or business within Massachusetts to come into possession of materials subject to the tax. If that person or business had not paid the excise a later possessor could be required to pay the excise and could then recover a corresponding amount from the first possessor. The proposed law would provide credits for excises paid on materials that become ingredients in the manufacture of other materials subject to the tax, and it would provide credits for similar excises or taxes paid to other states.</p> <p>Persons possessing more than 25,000 pounds of materials subject to the excise in any six-month period would be required to obtain a license from the Commissioner of Revenue. The Commissioner could issue regulations establishing record-keeping and reporting requirements for persons possessing such materials. The Commissioner would collect the excise through procedures similar to those for other state taxes and could issue regulations to implement the proposed law.</p> <p>The proposed law states that if any of its provisions were declared invalid, the other provisions would remain in effect.</p>												
YES	402	487	476	1365	600	747	795	2142	722	702	779	2203
NO	553	692	604	1849	493	589	544	1626	648	577	643	1868
BLANKS	170	139	107	416	143	172	146	461	218	144	150	512
QUESTION NO. 5 THIS QUESTION IS NOT BINDING												
29TH DISTRICT ONLY												
<p>QUESTION 5 THIS QUESTION IS NOT BINDING.</p> <p>Shall the representative from this district be instructed to vote, each time such a bill is presented, for legislation setting up a single payer health care system in Massachusetts? Such a system shall: provide the same comprehensive health coverage to all residents, with consumer choice of health care provider; increase efficiency by eliminating the overhead and profits associated with private health insurance; fund health care by payroll taxes and income taxes based on ability to pay; and limit the increase in total cost of health care in Massachusetts to the rate of growth of the economy?</p> <p>YES NO</p>												
YES	577	704	663	1944	702	835						
NO	294	354	323	971	254	319						
BLANKS	254	260	201	715	280	354						

Ward Four			Total	Ward Five			Total	Ward Six			Total	Ward Seven			Total			TOTAL
1	2	3		1	2	3		1	2	3		1	2	3				
945	1272	1306	3523	1366	1432	1631	4429	1952	1875	1553	5380	1728	1550	1711	4989	Overseas & Partial Ballots		30,768 30,713
350	464	594	1408	534	593	857	1984	1098	1042	898	3038	874	662	707	2243	Overseas Ballots		14,383 14,350
510	628	586	1724	673	687	608	1968	693	667	520	1880	658	654	811	2123	Overseas Ballots		13,038 3,328
85	180	126	391	159	152	162	473	161	165	130	456	192	234	193	619	Overseas Ballots		3,325 1,621
			727													Overseas Ballots		4,208 4,204
			304													Overseas Ballots		1,848 1,847
			275													Overseas Ballots		1,624 1,621

A TRUE COPY ATTEST:

CHAIRMAN *Mary Walker*

RECORD OF ABSENT VOTERS (1110) Total Votes Cast

TABULATED FROM THE TALLY SHEETS OF THE STATE ELECTION, held November 3, 1992

REGISTERED VOTERS

Ward	Prec.	Ballots Mailed	Ballots Cast	Not Returned	Defective	Returned Too Late	Voted in Person	Hlth. Care Facility	Partial Ballots
1	1	41	34	3	4		6		
1	2	21	18	1		2	12		
1	3	28	17	4	7		6		
2	1	45	32	5	5	3	11		
2	2	61	45	5	10	1	18	1	
2	3	53	45	1	6	1	19		
3	1	49	38	4	6	1	16	8	
3	2	67	50	11	6		23		
3	3	49	39	5	5		20	59	
4	1	12	7	3	2		11	1	
4	2	33	31		2		13		
4	3	34	30	2	2		10		
5	1	23	20	1	2		10	8	
5	2	21	17	2	1	1	14		
5	3	37	30	5	2		27	1	3
6	1	42	35	4	3		37		
6	2	49	42	5	2		22		1
6	3	51	38	1	9	3	12		
7	1	54	41	10	2	1	19		2
7	2	52	38	8	6		17	6	
7	3	38	36	1	1		14		
TOTALS:		860	683	81	83	13	337	84	6

RECORD OF ABSENT VOTERS (106) Total Votes Cast

TABULATED FROM THE TALLY SHEETS OF THE STATE ELECTION, held November 3, 1992

NON-REGISTERED VOTERS

Wd.	Pct.	Ballots Mailed	Ballots Cast	Not Returned	Defective	Returned too late	Partial Ballots
1	1	6	6				2
1	2	1	1				
1	3	5	3	1	1		
2	1	4	1	3			
2	2	4	4				
2	3	27	24	2	1		1
3	1	3	2	1			
3	2	3	3				1
3	3	7	3	1	1	2	1
4	1	1		1			
4	2	6	2	1	3		
4	3	6	3	2	1		
5	1	5	5				
5	2	6	3	3			
5	3	6	3	1	2		1
6	1	7	5	2			
6	2	11	7	2	1	1	
6	3	13	7	6			5
7	1	8	5	2	1		2
7	2	4	2	2			
7	3	7	4	3			
TOTALS:		140	93	33	11	3	13

AT THE CITY ELECTION HELD THEREIN, NOVEMBER 2, 1993

WARD FOUR			TOTAL WARD FIVE			TOTAL WARD SIX			TOTAL WARD SEVEN			TOTAL			GRAND TOTAL		
1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3			
597	574	542	1713	696 696	753 753	615	2063 2063	2064 2064	751	741	563	2055	640	583	714	1937	12,612 12,614
383	366	349	1098	437	455	391	1283	442	461	362	1265	379	404	434	1217	7898	
140	106	113	359	141	174	104	419	139	144	94	377	165	103	175	443	2658	
0	14	4	18	28	0	24	52	27	0	19	46	2	0	0	2	142	
74	88	76	238	90	122 124	96	308 310	143	136	88	367	94	76	105	275	1914 1916	
339	318	287	944	394	439	349	1182	441	415	332	1188	382	331	364	1077	7412	
379	358	345	1082	381	362	353	1096	412	407	302	1121	315	301	355	971	6971	
358	346	334	1038	434	467	355	1256	410	404	323	1137	466	390	498	1354	7571	
272	265	255	792	332	402	310	1044	490	451	328	1269	377	358	368	1103	6683	
138	141	107	386	148	160	155	463	189	168	125	482	221	186	214	621	2971	
266	253	211	730	327	322	276	925	290	306	199	795	239	234	267	740	5663	
6	3	3	12	12	10	7	29	11	8	12	31	2	6	13	21	152	
630	612	626	1868	756	842 850	655	2253 2261	761	805	631	2197	558	526	777	1861	13025 13033	
																1247	
																399	
																16	
																64	
																894	
																25	
																250	
																1181	
																676	
																5	
																88	
482	399	389	1270													1270	
96	145	125	366													366	
1	6	0	7													7	
18	24	28	70													70	
				357 358	395 397	284 282	1036 1039										1036 1039
				355 355	394 394	282 282	1031 1031										980 966
				330 327	328 319	322 320	980 966										0
				0	0	0	0										0
				9 14	28 40	9 13	46 67										46 67

RECORD OF VOTES CAST IN THE VARIOUS PRECINCTS OF THE CITY OF SOMERVILLE

	WARD ONE			TOTAL	WARD TWO			TOTAL	WARD THREE			TOTAL
	1	2	3		1	2	3		1	2	3	
<u>TOTAL NUMBER OF VOTES CAST</u>	499	706	521	1726	323	446	400	1169	688	555	707	1950
<u>FOR SCHOOL COMMITTEE - WARD SIX</u>												
Julie Anne DiPasquale	59 Irving Street											
Write-Ins												
Blanks												
<u>FOR SCHOOL COMMITTEE - WARD SEVEN</u>												
Anita L. Harris	12 Harrison Road											
Rosanne Hudgins	39 Russell Road											
Write-Ins												
Blanks												

AT THE CITY ELECTION HELD THEREIN, NOVEMBER 2, 1993

WARD FOUR			TOTAL WARD FIVE			TOTAL WARD SIX			TOTAL WARD SEVEN			GRAND TOTAL				
1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3					
597	574	542	1713	696 696	751 751	615	2062 2062	751	741	563	2055	640	583	714	1937	12,614
									515	516	396	1427				1427
									20	12	10	42				42
									216	213	157	586				586
													389	266	315	970
													203	268	352	823
													2	9	6	17
													46	40	41	127

A TRUE COPY ATTEST:

CHAIRMAN *Mary Walker*

3534

RECORD OF ABSENT VOTERS

TABULATED FROM THE TALLY SHEETS OF THE CITY ELECTION HELD NOVEMBER 2, 1993

REGISTERED VOTERS

WARD	PRECINCT	BALLOTS MAILED	BALLOTS CAST	NOT RETURNED	DEFECTIVE	RETURNED TOO LATE	VOTED IN PERSON	HEALTH CARE FACILITY
1	1	13	9		4		3	
1	2	18	13	2	3		6	
1	3	8	7		1			
2	1	12	6	3	2	1	3	
2	2	7	7				2	
2	3	5	5				3	
3	1	20	12	5	3		5	3
3	2	19	14	3	2		1	
3	3	10	8		1	1	1	48
4	1	8	5	1	1	1	1	
4	2	3	2			1	2	
4	3	19	11	4	4		4	
5	1	4	2		1	1	5	5
5	2	5	5				4	
5	3	6	4			2	2	
6	1	6	5	1			5	
6	2	7	4	2	1		3	
6	3	7	6	1			3	
7	1	5	5				1	
7	2	7	5	2				
7	3	2	2				1	
TOTALS:		191	137	24	23	7	55	56

TOTAL VOTE CAST: 248

RECORD OF ABSENT VOTERS

TABULATED FROM THE TALLY SHEETS OF THE CITY ELECTION HELD NOVEMBER 2, 1993

NON-REGISTERED VOTERS

Ward	Pct	Ballots Mailed	Ballots Cast	Not Returned	Returned Too Late	Voted In Person	Health Care Facility
1	1						
1	2						
1	3	1		1			
2	1						
2	2	1		1			
2	3	1	1				
3	1						
3	2						
3	3						
4	1						
4	2						
4	3						
5	1						
5	2						
5	3						
6	1						
6	2						
6	3						
7	1						
7	2						
7	3						
TOTALS:		3	1	2			

TOTAL BALLOTS CAST: 1

3546

RECORD OF VOTES CAST IN THE VARIOUS PRECINCTS OF WARD FOUR OF THE CITY OF SOMERVILLE

	WARD FOUR			TOTAL
	1	2	3	
<u>TOTAL VOTES CAST - SCHOOL COMMITTEE</u>	179	193	145	517
James A. Norton	89	85	94	268
Paul A. Romeo	89	107	48	244
Write-Ins	1	1	3	5
Blanks	0	0	0	0

AT THE SPECIAL ELECTION HELD JUNE 21, 1994 FOR WARD FOUR SCHOOL COMMITTEE

ABSENT VOTERS

Ward	Pct	Ballots Mailed	Ballots Cast	Not Returned	Defec-Tive	Returned Too Late	Voted In Person	Health Care Facility
4	1	8	2	2	3	1		
4	2	1	1				1	
4	3	9	6	1		2		
Total		18	9	3	3	3	1	TOTAL VOTES CAST: 10

A TRUE COPY ATTEST:

Mary Walker
CHAIRMAN:

RECORD OF VOTES CAST IN THE VARIOUS PRECINCTS OF THE CITY OF SOMERVILLE

	WARD ONE			WARD TWO			WARD THREE			WARD FOUR		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
<u>TOTAL NUMBER OF VOTES CAST</u>	738	906	757	808	1018	1053	1143	998	1221	915	959	980
<u>SENATOR IN CONGRESS</u>												
Edward M. Kennedy - Marchant Ave., Barnstable DEM.	540	632	536	586	769	809	836	716	830	618	659	701
W. Mitt Romney - 171 Marsh St., Belmont REP.	161	243	190	188	215	207	263	248	351	272	273	252
Lauraleigh Dozier - 31 Jones Ter., Stoughton LIB.	6	6	5	11	10	5	5	5	9	4	7	6
William A. Ferguson, Jr. - 135 Quincy Ave., Quincy LAROUCHE WAS RIGHT	1	0	1	3	3	2	1	3	5	1	3	1
Write-Ins	1	1	1	0	0	2	0	1	2	0	2	1
Blanks	29	24	24	20	21	28	38	25	24	20	15	19
<u>GOVERNOR/LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR</u>												
Weld & Cellucci Republican	406	493	436	380	488	460	570	502	611	582	516	550
Roosevelt & Massie Democrat	300	371	288	372	477	533	499	455	541	305	399	390
Cook & Crawford Libertarian	3	6	6	10	8	9	7	8	14	2	7	5
Rebello & Giske LaRouche Was Right	3	1	2	0	4	2	2	2	3	2	1	3
Write-Ins	1	2	1	3	4	6	4	3	2	1	3	5
Blanks	25	33	24	43	37	43	61	28	50	23	33	27
<u>ATTORNEY GENERAL</u>												
L. Scott Harshbarger-439 Sandy Valley Rd., Westwood DEM.	548	674	564	605	799	837	847	746	924	667	714	751
Janis M. Berry-49 Vine St., Saugus REP.	142	167	151	136	160	144	195	193	219	187	189	185
Write-Ins	1	2	1	2	0	5	0	2	1	1	2	1
Blanks	47	63	41	65	59	67	101	57	77	60	54	43
<u>SECRETARY OF STATE</u>												
Arthur E. Chase-14 Kenilworth Rd., Worcester REP.	144	158	143	156	158	198	225	193	242	208	219	201
William Francis Galvin-46 Lake St., Boston DEM.	499	607	495	502	681	676	713	631	771	566	595	654
Peter C. Everett-35 Winter St., Hanover LIB.	20	27	27	42	44	32	43	33	50	34	34	32
Write-Ins	5	3	4	0	0	5	2	3	3	1	2	0
Blanks	70	111	88	108	135	142	160	138	155	106	109	93
<u>TREASURER</u>												
Joseph Daniel Malone-271 Florence Rd., Waltham REP.	357	465	406	376	389	413	514	452	540	539	497	499
Shannon Patricia O'Brien-90 Park St., Easthampton DEM.	294	323	259	319	475	497	461	414	522	285	333	376
Susan B. Poulin-11 Independence Dr., Woburn LIB.	18	18	24	28	26	21	28	22	32	15	27	23
Thomas P. Tierney-7 Lomas Dr., Framingham UNENROLLED	29	27	20	17	45	28	26	37	40	27	40	35
Write-Ins	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	2
Blanks	39	72	48	67	83	93	113	71	86	49	62	45
<u>AUDITOR</u>												
A. Joseph DeNucci-119 Warwick Rd., Newton DEM.	579	725	590	605	746	776	834	737	952	728	731	777
Forrester A. "Tim" Clark, Jr.-308 Sagamore St., Hamilton REP.	73	78	78	75	111	111	134	117	120	98	125	107
Geoff M. Weil-468 East Eighth St., Boston LIB.	24	15	27	31	29	26	26	22	27	20	23	21
Write-Ins	2	1	1	0	4	2	3	2	1	0	0	1
Blanks	60	87	61	97	128	138	146	120	121	69	80	74

RECORD OF VOTES CAST IN THE VARIOUS PRECINCTS OF THE CITY OF SOMERVILLE

56

	WARD ONE			WARD TWO			WARD THREE			WARD FOUR		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
TOTAL NUMBER OF VOTES CAST	738	906	757	808	1018	1053	1143	998	1221	915	959	980
REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS-EIGHTH DISTRICT												
Joseph P. Kennedy, II-73 Bigelow St., Boston DEM.	600	689	609	624	802	839	858	745	914	705	729	753
Write-Ins	24	26	17	27	31	42	37	33	50	27	34	28
Blanks	114	191	131	157	185	172	248	220	257	183	196	199
COUNCILLOR-SIXTH DISTRICT												
Dorothy A. Kelly Gay-1 Avon St., Somerville DEM.	541	649	510	578	723	764	772	746	825	593	614	708
Virgil J. Aiello-56 River St., Boston REP.	115	147	172	127	150	155	240	152	267	230	242	187
Write-Ins	4	3	3	0	0	5	3	3	2	0	1	1
Blanks	78	107	72	103	145	129	128	97	127	92	102	84
SENATOR IN GENERAL COURT-MIDDLESEX, SUFFOLK & ESSEX DISTRICT												
Thomas F. Birmingham-9 Nichols St., Chelsea DEM.	538			542								
Write-Ins	17			17								
Blanks	183			249								
SENATOR IN GENERAL COURT - SECOND MIDDLESEX DISTRICT												
Charles(Charlie) E. Shannon, Jr.-17 Winchester Robinson Pk., REP.	522	434		438	425	560	480	603	587	519	545	
Leo A. McHugh-10 Jackson Rd., Medford DEM.	288	252		429	456	411	392	467	244	340	341	
Write-Ins		1	0	3	8	3	3	5	2	3	5	
Blanks		95	71	148	164	169	123	146	82	97	89	
REPRESENTATIVE IN GENERAL COURT-29TH MIDDLESEX DISTRICT												
Timothy J. Toomey, Jr.-88 Sixth St., Cambridge DEM.	570	718	594	582	768						702	
Write-Ins	14	7	10	14	17						17	
Blanks	154	181	153	212	233						240	
REPRESENTATIVE IN GENERAL COURT-30TH MIDDLESEX DISTRICT												
Patricia D.(Pat)Jehlen-67 Dane St., Somerville DEM.						727	766	664	803			
Isaac M. Machado-18 Granite St., Somerville REP.						247	284	263	309			
Write-Ins						3	2	1	4			
Blanks						76	91	70	105			
REPRESENTATIVE IN GENERAL COURT-37TH MIDDLESEX DISTRICT												
Vincent Paul Ciampa-64 Ossipee Rd., Somerville DEM.										716	741	
Write-Ins										13	14	
Blanks										186	225	
DISTRICT ATTORNEY-NORTHERN DISTRICT												
Thomas F. Reilly-60 Palfrey St., Watertown DEM.	546	680	585	557	734	756	802	723	908	680	710	716
Write-Ins	14	10	10	16	20	13	21	16	15	18	16	11
Blanks	178	216	162	235	264	284	320	259	298	217	233	253

RECORD OF THE VOTES CAST IN THE VARIOUS PRECINCTS OF THE CITY OF SOMERVILLE

	WARD ONE			WARD TWO			WARD THREE			WARD FOUR		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
TOTAL NUMBER OF VOTES CAST	738	906	757	808	1018	1053	1143	998	1221	915	959	980
CLERK OF COURTS-MIDDLESEX COUNTY												
Edward J. Sullivan-10 Rogers St., Cambridge DEM.	560	666	586	568	732	734	782	715	881	683	679	703
Write-Ins	13	9	11	11	18	15	15	14	16	15	17	13
Blanks	165	231	160	229	268	304	346	269	324	217	263	264
REGISTER OF DEEDS-MIDDLESEX SOUTHERN DISTRICT												
Eugene C. Brune-79 Wallace St., Somerville DEM.	548	672	574	582	708	724	826	732	900	681	691	713
Jane Sullivan Savery-177 Charles St., Cambridge REP.	129	152	121	140	190	180	183	176	193	162	176	198
Write-Ins	1	3	3	0	1	2	0	0	1	1	6	0
Blanks	60	79	59	86	119	147	134	90	127	71	86	69
COUNTY COMMISSIONER-MIDDLESEX COUNTY												
Francis X. Flaherty-149 Woodside Ln., Arlington DEM.	477	574	471	482	598	628	651	606	754	567	609	616
Barbara J. Collins-32 Vernal St., Everett IND.	149	185	178	172	220	194	260	224	240	209	198	202
Write-Ins	4	3	4	4	4	5	8	2	3	1	2	4
Blanks	108	144	104	150	196	226	224	166	224	138	150	158
Question No. 1 Law Proposed by Initiative Petition												
<p style="text-align: center;">QUESTION 1 LAW PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION</p> <p>Do you approve of a law summarized below, on which no vote was taken by the Senate or the House of Representatives before May 4, 1994?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">SUMMARY</p> <p>This proposed law would limit the way in which business and certain nonprofit corporations could contribute to and spend money on campaigns involving an initiative, referendum or other question submitted to the voters at a state or local election. The proposed law would require ballot committees organized to support or oppose any question submitted to the voters to disclose promptly certain contributions made late in the campaign; would establish procedures that business and certain nonprofit corporations would have to follow in order to spend money on ballot question campaigns; and would establish voluntary spending limits for ballot committees.</p> <p>The proposed law would require a ballot committee to report to the state Office of Campaign and Political Finance, within one business day of receipt, the name, address, occupation and employer of any person or organization making a contribution of \$1,000 or more, if the contribution was made before the date of the election but after the closing date of the last official campaign contribution report.</p> <p>Under the proposed law, business and certain nonprofit corporations would be prohibited from making contributions or expenditures to support or oppose a ballot question, but would be permitted to create and solicit contributions to a separate fund to be used to support or oppose a ballot question. A separate fund would be required for each ballot question on which the corporation intended to solicit contributions. The corporation would be required to report all amounts spent to establish and administer the fund to the Office of Campaign and Political Finance, and to a city or town if the fund were established to influence the vote on a local ballot question.</p> <p>Contributions to the separate fund could be solicited only from members or stockholders, officers and directors, and employees at a policymaking, managerial or professional level. Coercion, job discrimination and financial reprisals as methods of soliciting contributions would be prohibited. Nonprofit corporations that are formed for the purpose of promoting political ideas, do not engage in business activities, have no shareholders, and do not have business corporations as members or accept more than one percent of their revenues from such corporations would be exempt from these provisions. A business organization that violated these requirements could be fined up to \$50,000, and any director or agent of a business organization who violates or authorizes the violation of these requirements could be fined up to \$10,000 and/or imprisoned for up to one year.</p> <p>The proposed law would establish voluntary spending limits for ballot committees at \$1,000,000 in the year of an election, and \$250,000 in the years immediately before and after an election. Ballot committees agreeing to observe these voluntary limits would be permitted to announce their compliance on advertisements and campaign materials. Ballot committees that agreed to observe the spending limits and later exceeded the limits could be fined up to \$10,000.</p> <p>The proposed law states that if any of its provisions were declared invalid, the other provisions would remain in effect.</p>												
Yes	289	355	328	352	484	513	467	441	528	341	395	414
No	376	465	358	386	439	471	564	482	596	490	495	509
Blanks	73	86	71	70	95	69	112	75	97	84	69	57

RECORD OF VOTES CAST IN THE VARIOUS PRECINCTS OF THE CITY OF SOMERVILLE

3582

	WARD ONE			WARD TWO			WARD THREE			WARD FOUR		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
TOTAL NUMBERS OF VOTES CAST	738	906	757	808	1018	1053	1143	998	1221	915	959	980

Question No. 2 Referendum on an Existing Law

**QUESTION 2
REFERENDUM ON AN EXISTING LAW**

Do you approve of a law summarized below, which was approved by the House of Representatives on January 4, 1994, by a vote of 105 to 49, and approved by the Senate on January 4, 1994, by a vote of 26 to 11?

SUMMARY

This law requires drivers and passengers in certain motor vehicles on public ways to wear properly adjusted and fastened safety belts. The law applies to persons driving or riding in private passenger motor vehicles or riding in vanpool vehicles or trucks under 18,000 pounds. It also applies to employees of cities, towns, counties, and districts. The law does not apply to: (1) children under twelve years old who are required by another state law to use safety belts or other child passenger restraints; (2) vehicles manufactured before July 1, 1966; (3) persons certified by a physician as physically unable to use safety belts; (4) U.S. Postal Service rural carriers while performing their duties; (5) persons involved in operating taxies, liveries, tractors, trucks of 18,000 pounds or more, buses; or (6) passengers in authorized emergency vehicles.

The law is enforced by law enforcement agencies only when a driver has been stopped for a motor vehicle violation or some other offense. A driver and each passenger 16 years old or older may be fined \$25 for not using a safety belt when required. A driver may also be fined \$25 for each passenger between 12 and 16 years old who is not using a safety belt when required. A person who receives a citation for violating the law may challenge it using the same procedure that applies to most other automobile law violations. A violation is not considered a moving violation for motor vehicle insurance surcharge purposes.

The law directs the state Registrar of Motor Vehicles to require police officers, when reporting automobile accidents, to record whether safety belts were used. The law directs the Governor's Highway Safety Bureau to (1) conduct a public information and education program on motor vehicle occupant protection; (2) evaluate and report to the Legislature, by June 1, 1995, on the effectiveness of and degree of compliance with the law; and (3) make annual surveys of safety belt use.

The law requires the state Commissioner of Insurance to evaluate, report, and make recommendations to the Legislature concerning the effectiveness of the law and the frequency of bodily injury claims during the law's first year of operation. The Commissioner must also require at least a 5% reduction in bodily injury insurance premiums if the observed safety belt use rate among all vehicle occupants is 50% or more after the law's first year of operation. The Commissioner is required to take into account the annual safety belt use survey results in future decisions setting bodily injury premiums, and the Commissioner must further reduce those premiums if the safety belt use rate in Massachusetts exceeds the national average.

The law provides that failure to wear a properly fastened safety belt may not be considered as contributory negligence or used as evidence in any civil lawsuit. It also states that no insurance company may either (1) deny coverage to a person who failed to wear a safety belt during an accident that led to bodily injury, or (2) refuse to issue a motor vehicle liability policy based on a violation of this law.

Yes	328	425	319	454	596	645	641	567	679	433	455	519
No	345	410	379	303	361	349	424	380	466	422	446	419
Blanks	65	71	59	51	61	59	78	51	76	60	58	42

Question No. 3 Referendum on an Existing Law

**QUESTION 3
REFERENDUM ON AN EXISTING LAW**

Do you approve of a law summarized below, which was approved by the House of Representatives on May 28, 1993 by a vote of 112 to 39, and approved by the Senate on June 23, 1993 by a vote of 20 to 19?

SUMMARY

This law eliminates one of the two ways in which students may authorize fees to be assessed on tuition bills at state-operated colleges and universities to support nonpartisan student organizations that attempt to influence state legislation.

The law applies to community and state colleges and the University of Massachusetts. The law takes the place of previous law that allowed a student body, by a majority vote in an official student body referendum, to authorize a "waivable fee," or (at state colleges and the University) an "optional fee," to be collected for such nonpartisan student organizations. Under this law, the boards of trustees at community and state colleges and the University are prohibited from collecting waivable fees and may only collect optional fees for such organizations.

A "waivable fee" is collected when authorized by a majority of those students voting in an official student body referendum. A waivable fee is an amount payable on a tuition bill, appearing as a separately assessed item and accompanied by a statement that the fee is not a charge required to be paid by the student but rather that the student may deduct the charge from the total amount due. The tuition bill also explains the nature of the fee and states that the fee appears on the bill at the request of the student body and does not necessarily reflect the endorsement of the board of trustees.

An "optional fee" is collected when authorized by a majority of those students voting in an official student body referendum. An optional fee is an amount payable on a tuition bill, appearing as a separately assessed item and accompanied by a statement that the fee is not a charge required to be paid by the student but rather that the student may add the charge to the total amount due. The tuition bill also explains the nature of the fee and states that the fee appears on the bill at the request of the student body and does not necessarily reflect the endorsement of the board of trustees.

Yes	281	353	311	313	380	403	454	418	482	345	343	392
No	358	433	356	391	502	529	540	484	578	454	496	507
Blanks	99	120	90	104	136	121	149	96	161	116	120	81

AT THE STATE ELECTION HELD THEREIN, NOVEMBER 8, 1994

Total includes 7 Overseas Ballot received by 11-18-94

WARD FIVE			WARD SIX			WARD SEVEN			TOTAL
1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	
1025	1121	1157	1421	1311	1108	1263	1128	1259	22,289
508	606	670	971	856	742	772	658	695	12,539
482	469	431	414	395	330	449	396	507	8,577
35	46	56	36	60	36	42	74	57	1,173
430	472	467	532	520	449	505	466	527	8,843
499	548	571	772	647	563	644	540	603	11,015
96	101	119	117	144	96	114	122	129	2,431

367L

RECORD OF THE VOTES CAST IN THE VARIOUS PRECINCTS OF THE CITY OF SOMERVILLE

	WARD ONE			WARD TWO			WARD THREE			WARD FOUR		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
TOTAL NUMBER OF VOTES CAST	738	906	757	808	1018	1053	1143	998	1221	915	959	980

Question No. 4 Law Proposed by Initiative Petition

**QUESTION 4
LAW PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION**

Do you approve of a law summarized below, on which no vote was taken by the Senate or the House of Representatives before May 4, 1994?

SUMMARY

This proposed law would prevent the name of a person from being printed on a state primary or general election ballot as a candidate for one of a number of specified state and federal public offices, if the person had already served a certain number of consecutive terms in that office within a fixed period preceding the end of the then-current term of office. If such a person were still elected by write-in vote to one of the state offices (except the office of Governor), the person would serve without a salary, and in some of the state offices, without payment for certain expenses.

Under the proposed law, the name of a person could not be printed on a primary or general election ballot as a candidate for the office of Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, State Treasurer, State Auditor, or State Attorney General, if the person had served two consecutive terms (eight years) in that office in the eleven years prior to the end of the then-current term of office. The name of a person could not be printed on a primary or general election ballot as a candidate for the office of Governor's Councilor, State Representative, State Senator, or United

States Representative from Massachusetts, if the person had served four consecutive terms (eight years) in that office in the nine years prior to the end of the then-current term of office. The name of a person could not be printed on a primary or general election ballot as a candidate for the office of United States Senator from Massachusetts, if the person had served two consecutive terms (twelve years) in that office in the seventeen years prior to the end of the then-current term of office. The proposed law would not prevent any voter from casting a write-in vote for any person as a candidate for any office.

If a person made ineligible by the proposed law to have his or her name printed on the ballot as a candidate for the office of Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, State Treasurer, State Auditor, State Attorney General, Governor's Councilor, State Representative or State Senator were still elected to that office by write-in vote, the person would serve without a salary. If such a person were elected to the office of Lieutenant Governor, Governor's Councilor, State Representative or State Senator, the person would also serve without payment for certain expenses.

The current terms of the persons serving as Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Governor's Councilor, State Representative, State Senator, United States Representative from Massachusetts, and United States Senator from Massachusetts, would not be counted for purposes of the proposed law. The terms of the persons elected in 1990 to the office of Secretary of State, State Treasurer, State Auditor, or State Attorney General would be counted.

Any person who served more than half of a term in an office would be treated as having served a full term in that office. Any person who resigned from an office would be treated as having served a full term.

The proposed law states that if any of its provisions were found invalid, the other provisions would remain in effect.

Yes	327	377	364	318	354	360	420	401	468	425	414	434
No	327	427	318	401	575	604	614	530	644	410	459	485
Blanks	84	102	75	89	89	89	109	67	109	80	86	61

Question No. 5 Law Proposed by Initiative Petition

**QUESTION 5
LAW PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION**

Do you approve of a law summarized below, on which no vote was taken by the Senate or the House of Representatives before May 4, 1994?

SUMMARY

This proposed law would allow retail stores to open at any time on Sundays and on the legal holidays of Memorial Day, July Fourth, and Labor Day. It would not affect current restrictions on the sale of alcoholic beverages on Sundays and these holidays. Stores opening under the proposed law would be required to make Sunday and holiday work voluntary and would be required to pay most employees at least one and one-half times their regular rate.

Yes	357	408	351	374	565	532	532	442	606	410	438	431
No	318	424	329	373	381	449	517	481	530	429	446	500
Blanks	63	74	77	61	72	72	94	75	85	76	75	49

Question No. 6 Constitutional Amendment Proposed

by Initiative Petition

**QUESTION 6
CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT PROPOSED
BY INITIATIVE PETITION**

Do you approve of the adoption of an amendment to the constitution, summarized below, which was approved by the General Court in joint sessions of the House of Representatives and the Senate on November 16, 1992, by a vote of 132 to 39, and on May 25, 1994, by a vote of 119 to 73?

SUMMARY

This proposed constitutional amendment would require Massachusetts income tax rates to be graduated, in order to distribute the burden of the tax fairly and equitably. The proposed amendment would require the rates for taxpayers in higher income brackets to be higher than the rates for taxpayers in lower income brackets. The proposed amendment would also allow the state Legislature to grant reasonable exemptions and abatements and establish the number and range of tax brackets. The proposed amendment would eliminate from the Massachusetts Constitution the present requirement that income taxes must be levied at a uniform rate throughout the state upon incomes derived from the same class of property.

Yes	215	275	240	327	459	495	469	459	492	270	312	357
No	451	545	447	410	485	491	568	477	631	574	569	574
Blanks	72	86	70	71	74	67	106	62	98	71	78	49

