

446L

RECORD OF THE 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	684	853	631	2168	1048	1120	1223	3391	1212	1176	1294	3682
Sheriff - Middlesex County												
James V DiPaola 181 Kimball St, Malden	520	625	481	1626	830	893	946	2669	974	889	952	2815
Michael S Tranchita, Sr 69 Harvard St, Winchester	73	114	75	262	82	98	123	303	104	114	147	365
Write-Ins	3	7	8	18	3	6	5	14	1	6	7	14
Blanks	88	107	67	262	133	123	149	405	133	167	188	488

Question 1 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, 2010?

SUMMARY

This proposed law would remove the Massachusetts sales tax on alcoholic beverages and alcohol, where the sale of such beverages and alcohol or their importation into the state is already subject to a separate excise tax under state law. The proposed law would take effect on January 1, 2011.

A YES VOTE would remove the state sales tax on alcoholic beverages and alcohol where their sale or importation into the state is subject to an excise tax under state law.

A NO VOTE would make no change in the state sales tax on alcoholic beverages and alcohol.

YES	231	341	229	801	277	312	315	904	337	384	391	1112
NO	366	421	329	1116	695	756	859	2310	788	713	829	2330
BLANKS	87	91	73	251	76	52	49	177	87	79	74	240

Question 2 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, 2010?

SUMMARY

This proposed law would repeal an existing state law that allows a qualified organization wishing to build government-subsidized housing that includes low- or moderate-income units to apply for a single comprehensive permit from a city or town's zoning board of appeals (ZBA), instead of separate permits from each local agency or official having jurisdiction over any aspect of the proposed housing. The repeal would take effect on January 1, 2011, but would not stop or otherwise affect any proposed housing that had already received both a comprehensive permit and a building permit for at least one unit.

Under the existing law, the ZBA holds a public hearing on the application and considers the recommendations of local agencies and officials. The ZBA may grant a comprehensive permit that may include conditions or requirements concerning the height, site plan, size, shape, or building materials of the housing. Persons aggrieved by the ZBA's decision to grant a permit may appeal it to a court. If the ZBA denies the permit or grants it with conditions or requirements that make the housing uneconomic to build or to operate, the applicant may appeal to the state Housing Appeals Committee (HAC).

After a hearing, if the HAC rules that the ZBA's denial of a comprehensive permit was unreasonable and not consistent with local needs, the HAC orders the ZBA to issue the permit. If the HAC rules that the ZBA's decision issuing a comprehensive permit with conditions or requirements made the housing uneconomic to build or operate and was not consistent with local needs, the HAC orders the ZBA to modify or remove any such condition or requirement so as to make the proposal no longer uneconomic. The HAC cannot order the ZBA to issue any permit that would allow the housing to fall below minimum safety standards or site plan requirements. If the HAC rules that the ZBA's action was consistent with local needs, the HAC must uphold it even if it made the housing uneconomic. The HAC's decision is subject to review in the courts.

A condition or requirement makes housing "uneconomic" if it would prevent a public agency or non-profit organization from building or operating the housing except at a financial loss, or it would prevent a limited dividend organization from building or operating the housing without a reasonable return on its investment.

A ZBA's decision is "consistent with local needs" if it applies requirements that are reasonable in view of the regional need for low- and moderate-income housing and the number of low-income persons in the city or town, as well as the need to protect health and safety, promote better site and building design, and preserve open space, if those requirements are applied as equally as possible to both subsidized and unsubsidized housing. Requirements are considered "consistent with local needs" if more than 10% of the city or town's housing units are low- or moderate-income units or if such units are on sites making up at least 1.5% of the total private land zoned for residential, commercial, or industrial use in the city or town. Requirements are also considered "consistent with local needs" if the application would result, in any one calendar year, in beginning construction of low- or moderate-income housing on sites making up more than 0.3% of the total private land zoned for residential, commercial, or industrial use in the city or town, or on ten acres, whichever is larger.

The proposed law states that if any of its parts were declared invalid, the other parts would stay in effect.

A YES VOTE would repeal the state law allowing the issuance of a single comprehensive permit to build housing that includes low- or moderate-income units.

A NO VOTE would make no change in the state law allowing issuance of such a comprehensive permit.

YES	170	231	184	585	225	228	247	700	228	276	300	804
NO	434	517	387	1338	713	794	880	2387	904	794	892	2590
BLANKS	80	105	60	245	110	98	96	304	80	106	102	288

AT THE STATE ELECTION HELD THEREIN, NOVEMBER 2, 2010

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		
793	804	929	2526	1262	1218	1359	3839	1455	1437	827	3719	1403	1125	1158	3686	23,011
577	603	663	1843	980	918	1051	2949	1141	1105	611	2857	1072	882	871	2825	17,584
88	87	133	308	134	133	130	397	126	150	95	371	146	104	138	388	2,394
2	3	7	12	6	6	5	17	7	3	0	10	4	4	5	13	98
126	111	126	363	142	161	173	476	181	179	121	481	181	135	144	460	2,935
293	243	356	892	440	367	352	1159	362	405	229	996	403	336	411	1150	7,014
353	440	474	1267	745	771	932	2448	1041	969	567	2577	905	657	651	2213	14,261
147	121	99	367	77	80	75	232	52	63	31	146	95	132	96	323	1,736
245	225	261	731	336	293	264	893	292	282	151	725	297	278	328	903	5,341
474	527	584	1585	832	842	992	2666	1054	1052	608	2714	1022	756	747	2525	15,805
74	52	84	210	94	83	103	280	109	103	68	280	84	91	83	258	1,865

2492

RECORD OF THE 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	684	853	631	2168	1048	1120	1223	3391	1212	1176	1294	3682

Question 3 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, 2010?

SUMMARY

This proposed law would reduce the state sales and use tax rates (which were 6.25% as of September 2009) to 3% as of January 1, 2011. It would make the same reduction in the rate used to determine the amount to be deposited with the state Commissioner of Revenue by non-resident building contractors as security for the payment of sales and use tax on tangible personal property used in carrying out their contracts.

The proposed law provides that if the 3% rates would not produce enough revenues to satisfy any lawful pledge of sales and use tax revenues in connection with any bond, note, or other contractual obligation, then the rates would instead be reduced to the lowest level allowed by law.

The proposed law would not affect the collection of moneys due the Commonwealth for sales, storage, use or other consumption of tangible personal property or services occurring before January 1, 2011.

The proposed law states that if any of its parts were declared invalid, the other parts would stay in effect.

A YES VOTE would reduce the state sales and use tax rates to 3%.

A NO VOTE would make no change in the state sales and use tax rates.

YES	222	275	209	706	220	225	253	698	276	294	292	862
NO	404	503	372	1279	771	853	932	2556	902	830	973	2705
BLANKS	58	75	50	183	57	42	38	137	34	52	29	115

Question 4 This Question is not Binding

**QUESTION 4
THIS QUESTION IS NOT BINDING**

Shall the state representative from this district be instructed to vote in favor of a non-binding resolution calling on the federal government to support the right of all people, including non-Jewish Palestinian citizens of Israel, to live free from laws that give more rights to people of one religion than another?

YES
NO
BLANKS

AT THE STATE ELECTION HELD THEREIN, NOVEMBER 2, 2010

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		
793	804	929	2526	1262	1218	1359	3839	1455	1437	827	3719	1403	1125	1158	3686	23,011
278	248	300	826	353	274	277	904	256	302	169	727	330	280	337	947	5,670
458	518	585	1561	875	922	1034	2831	1166	1092	637	2895	1046	808	784	2638	16,465
57	38	44	139	34	22	48	104	33	43	21	97	27	37	37	101	876
262	360		622									679	501	539	1719	2,341
332	292		624									448	391	386	1225	1,849
199	152		351									276	233	233	742	1,093

A TRUE COPY ATTEST:

Richard P. Salen
CHAIRMAN

RECORD OF ABSENT VOTERS (849)

REGISTERED VOTERS

Tabulated from the Tally Sheets of the State Election held November 2, 2010

Ward	Precinct	Ballots Mailed	Ballots Cast	Not Returned	Defective	Returned Too Late	Voted In Person	Health Care Facility	Partial Ballots
1	1	33	25	5	3		2		
1	2	17	14	2	1		8		
1	3	21	17	4			2		
2	1	21	15	6			6		
2	2	29	25	1	2	1	13		
2	3	34	29	3		2	10		
3	1	53	44	7	2		12		
3	2	31	25	4	2		14	19	
3	3	31	29	2			11	43	
4	1	14	13		1		3		
4	2	13	12	1			6		
4	3	24	19	2	2	1	7		
5	1	27	25	1		1	15	28	
5	2	34	28	4	1	1	13		
5	3	36	31	5			14		
6	1	33	25	7		1	20		
6	2	43	36	7			17		
6	3	30	26	3		1	17		
7	1	42	35	5	1	1	16		
7	2	30	29	1			8		
7	3	26	18	6	1	1	15	10	
TOTALS:		622	520	76	16	10	229	100	

RECORD OF ABSENT VOTERS (38)

NON-REGISTERED VOTERS

Ward	Pct	Ballots Mailed	Ballots Cast	Not Returned	Defective	Returned Too Late	Partial Ballots
1	1						
1	2						
1	3						
2	1	3	3				
2	2	6	4	2			
2	3	4	2	2			
3	1	3	3				
3	2	1	1				
3	3	4	4				
4	1						
4	2	1		1			
4	3						
5	1	3	3				
5	2	4	3	1			1
5	3	3	2	1			
6	1	4	3	1			
6	2	4	4				
6	3	1	1				
7	1	4	2	2			
7	2	2	1	1			
7	3	1	1				
TOTALS:		48	37	11			1

AT THE CITY ELECTION HELD THEREIN, NOVEMBER 8, 2011

Ward Four			Total Ward Five			Total Ward Six			Total Ward Seven			Total				
1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3					
477	459	578	1514	464	408	420	1292	453	514	289	1256	707	666	764	2137	9073
								361	402	230	993					993
								11	21	4	36					36
								81	91	55	227					227
												296	406	366	1068	1,068
												398	246	384	1028	1,028
												2	0	3	5	5
												11	14	11	36	36
																639
																14
																204
																584
																13
																176
																872
																18
																354
301	318	410	1029													1,029
16	6	7	29													29
160	135	161	456													456
				304	284	299	887									887
				18	8	16	42									42
				142	116	105	363									363
								317	375	219	911					911
								10	7	1	18					18
								126	132	69	327					327
												560	478	547	1585	1,585
												7	5	8	20	20
												140	183	209	532	532

A TRUE COPY ATTEST:

Michael P. Salemi
CHAIRMAN

4514

Record of Absent Voters (273)

REGISTERED VOTERS

Tabulated from the Tally Sheets of the City Election held November 8, 2011

Ward	Precinct	Ballots Mailed	Ballots Cast	Not Returned	Defective	Returned Too Late	Voted In Person	Health Care Facility
1	1	2	2				2	
1	2	7	6	1			3	
1	3	9	7	2				
2	1	3	3				5	
2	2	4	4				3	
2	3	7	3	2		2	4	
3	1	23	21	1	1		9	
3	2	7	6		1		5	10
3	3	4	3		1		1	20
4	1	11	11				2	
4	2	6	1	3	2		2	
4	3	11	9	2			1	
5	1	5	4	1			1	18
5	2	7	5	1	1		2	
5	3	9	6	3			2	
6	1	4	4				3	
6	2	7	4	3			4	
6	3	5	4	1			7	
7	1	19	15	3		1	8	
7	2	21	15	5	1		2	
7	3	19	18	1			8	
TOTALS:		190	151	29	7	3	74	48

RECORD OF THE 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>	1121	1251	1095	3467	1573	2005	1812	5390	1657	1800	1946	5403
<u>ELECTORS OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT</u>												
Johnson and Gray Libertarian	19	19	11	49	26	32	29	87	24	21	43	88
Obama and Biden Democratic	896	940	858	2694	1352	1679	1518	4549	1392	1468	1560	4420
Romney and Ryan Republican	179	250	181	610	133	195	215	543	175	257	270	702
Stein and Honkala Green-Rainbow	12	22	14	48	46	69	35	150	40	41	55	136
Write-Ins	3	4	3	10	4	7	5	16	6	1	5	12
Blanks	12	16	28	56	12	23	10	45	20	12	13	45
<u>SENATOR IN CONGRESS</u>												
Scott P Brown 70 Hayden Woods, Wrentham Republican	254	331	256	841	228	290	292	810	271	348	390	1009
Elizabeth A Warren 24 Linnean St, Cambridge Democratic	836	896	798	2530	1328	1689	1488	4505	1346	1427	1522	4295
Write-Ins	4	1	1	6	1	1	5	7	1	0	3	4
Blanks	27	23	40	90	16	25	27	68	39	25	31	95
<u>REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS</u> Seventh District												
Michael E Capuano 172 Central St, Somerville Democratic	913	979	889	2781	1356	1658	1483	4497	1396	1516	1622	4534
Karla Romero 725 Tremont St, Boston Independent	118	177	117	412	132	213	200	545	141	174	197	512
Write-Ins	6	2	2	10	1	11	3	15	4	2	3	9
Blanks	84	93	87	264	84	123	126	333	116	108	124	348
<u>COUNCILLOR</u> Sixth District												
Terrence W Kennedy 3 Stafford Rd, Lynnfield Democratic	870	973	880	2723	1258	1626	1435	4319	1285	1422	1506	4213
Write-Ins	15	21	17	53	9	24	27	60	22	14	19	55
Blanks	236	257	198	691	306	355	350	1011	350	364	421	1135
<u>SENATOR IN GENERAL COURT</u> District Second Middlesex												
Patricia D Jehlen 67 Dane St, Somerville Democratic	862	958	866	2686	1292	1651	1486	4429	1341	1461	1551	4353
Write-Ins	17	23	13	53	8	21	25	54	24	21	23	68
Blanks	242	270	216	728	273	333	301	907	292	318	372	982
<u>REPRESENTATIVE IN GENERAL COURT</u> Middlesex District 26th												
Timothy J Toomey, Jr 88 6th St, Cambridge Democratic	675	756	708	2139	901			901				
Thomas Michael Vasconcelos 63 Oak St, Somerville Republican	97	121	99	317	97			97				
Mike Connolly 20 Harding St, Cambridge Progressive Independent	234	262	179	675	448			448				
Write-Ins	7	3	5	15	1			1				
Blanks	108	109	104	321	126			126				
<u>REPRESENTATIVE IN GENERAL COURT</u> Middlesex District 27th												
Denise Provost 20 Albion St, Somerville Democratic					1638	1484		3122	1340	1479	1556	4375
Write-Ins					22	26		48	23	20	24	67
Blanks					345	302		647	294	301	366	961

AT THE STATE ELECTION HELD THEREIN, NOVEMBER 6, 2012

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	1	2	3			
1247	1297	1490	4034	1794	1805	2080	5679	2227	2096	1563	5886	2069	1752	1810	5631		35,490
11	20	27	58	34	24	35	93	31	42	20	93	35	22	22	79		547
947	1043	1165	3155	1418	1477	1725	4620	1874	1731	1276	4881	1701	1456	1377	4534		28,853
265	193	250	708	292	231	263	786	240	242	200	682	288	215	351	854		4,885
8	20	22	50	29	42	32	103	60	58	48	166	35	37	36	108		761
2	3	8	13	5	12	10	27	5	3	6	14	6	5	7	18		110
14	18	18	50	16	19	15	50	17	20	13	50	4	17	17	38		334
344	291	398	1033	415	333	373	1121	363	379	293	1035	423	323	476	1222		7,071
879	979	1067	2925	1345	1438	1664	4447	1830	1684	1246	4760	1624	1399	1297	4320		27,782
1	1	3	5	0	2	8	10	3	2	1	6	4	0	3	7		45
23	26	22	71	34	32	35	101	31	31	23	85	18	30	34	82		592
1019	1050	1221	3290	1499	1513	1738	4750	1857	1736	1264	4857	1730	1487	1460	4677		29,386
147	146	176	469	178	175	211	564	225	223	162	610	218	149	215	582		3,694
1	1	5	7	4	3	3	10	1	1	6	8	3	3	3	9		68
80	100	88	268	113	114	128	355	144	136	131	411	118	113	132	363		2,342
982	1006	1131	3119	1399	1392	1659	4450	1740	1641	1200	4581	1633	1420	1407	4460		27,865
21	11	20	52	23	28	21	72	20	11	14	45	17	15	23	55		392
244	280	339	863	372	385	400	1157	467	444	349	1260	419	317	380	1116		7,233
944	1033	1130	3107	1434	1427	1716	4577	1819	1692	1234	4745	1672	1447	1402	4521		28,418
26	15	22	63	29	30	19	78	20	13	19	52	22	15	30	67		435
277	249	338	864	331	348	345	1024	388	391	310	1089	375	290	378	1043		6,637
																	3,040
																	414
																	1,123
																	16
																	447
				1438	1423	1716	4577	1821	1699	1249	4769						16,843
				25	30	21	76	20	10	14	44						235
				331	352	343	1026	386	387	300	1073						3707

Record of the 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	1121	1251	1095	3467	1573	2005	1812	5390	1657	1800	1946	5403
REPRESENTATIVE IN GENERAL COURT District 34th Middlesex												
Democratic Carl M Sciortino, Jr 17 Orchard St, Medford												
Republican David M Rajczewski 149 George St, Medford												
Write-Ins												
Blanks												
CLERK OF COURTS Middlesex County												
Democratic Michael A Sullivan 42 Huron Ave, Cambridge	874	989	873	2736	1256	1612	1420	4288	1288	1427	1527	4242
Write-Ins	14	14	12	40	5	17	20	42	18	14	14	46
Blanks	233	248	210	691	312	376	372	1060	351	359	405	1115
REGISTER OF DEEDS Middlesex Southern District												
Democratic Maria C Curtatone 37 Munroe St, Somerville	848	947	860	2655	1234	1565	1379	4178	1266	1355	1477	4098
Write-Ins	21	34	19	74	18	34	40	92	36	40	34	110
Blanks	252	270	216	738	321	406	393	1120	355	405	435	1195
SHERIFF Middlesex County (to fill a vacancy)												
Democratic Peter J Koutoujian 33 Harris St, Waltham	708	784	705	2197	1093	1354	1229	3676	1088	1209	1305	3602
Unenrolled Ernesto M Petrone 19 Waverly St, Everett	176	228	169	573	171	241	220	632	215	228	245	688
Write-Ins	8	5	4	17	9	10	16	35	13	7	8	28
Blanks	229	234	217	680	300	400	347	1047	341	356	388	1085

QUESTION ONE: LAW PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION

**QUESTION 1
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 on or before May 1, 2012?

SUMMARY

This proposed law would prohibit any motor vehicle manufacturer, starting with model year 2015, from selling or leasing, either directly or through a dealer, a new motor vehicle without allowing the owner to have access to the same diagnostic and repair information made available to the manufacturer's dealers and in-state authorized repair facilities.

The manufacturer would have to allow the owner, or the owner's designated in-state independent repair facility (one not affiliated with a manufacturer or its authorized dealers), to obtain diagnostic and repair information electronically, on an hourly, daily, monthly, or yearly subscription basis, for no more than fair market value and on terms that do not unfairly favor dealers and authorized repair facilities.

The manufacturer would have to provide access to the information through a non-proprietary vehicle interface, using a standard applied in federal emissions-control regulations. Such information would have to include the same content, and be in the same form and accessible in the same manner, as is provided to the manufacturer's dealers and authorized repair facilities.

For vehicles manufactured from 2002 through model year 2014, the proposed law would require a manufacturer of motor vehicles sold in Massachusetts to make available for purchase, by vehicle owners and in-state independent repair facilities, the same diagnostic and repair information that the manufacturer makes available through an electronic system to its dealers and in-state authorized repair facilities. Manufacturers would have to make such information available in the same form and manner, and to the same extent, as they do for dealers and authorized repair facilities. The information would be available for purchase on an hourly, daily, monthly, or yearly subscription basis, for no more than fair market value and on terms that do not unfairly favor dealers and authorized repair facilities.

For vehicles manufactured from 2002 through model year 2014, the proposed law would also require manufacturers to make available for purchase, by vehicle owners and in-state independent repair facilities, all diagnostic repair tools, incorporating the same diagnostic, repair and wireless capabilities as those available to dealers and authorized repair facilities. Such tools would have to be made available for no more than fair market value and on terms that do not unfairly favor dealers and authorized repair facilities.

For all years covered by the proposed law, the required diagnostic and repair information would not include the information necessary to reset a vehicle immobilizer, an anti-theft device that prevents a vehicle from being started unless the correct key code is

present. Such information would have to be made available to dealers, repair facilities, and owners through a separate, secure data release system.

The proposed law would not require a manufacturer to reveal a trade secret and would not interfere with any agreement made by a manufacturer, dealer, or authorized repair facility that is in force on the effective date of the proposed law. Starting January 1, 2013, the proposed law would prohibit any agreement that waives or limits a manufacturer's compliance with the proposed law.

Any violation of the proposed law would be treated as a violation of existing state consumer protection and unfair trade-practices laws.

A YES VOTE would enact the proposed law requiring motor vehicle manufacturers to allow vehicle owners and independent repair facilities in Massachusetts to have access to the same vehicle diagnostic and repair information made available to the manufacturer's Massachusetts dealers and authorized repair facilities.

A NO VOTE would make no change in existing laws.

YES ←
NO ←

YES	771	902	761	2434	1228	1650	1427	4305	1270	1377	1562	4209
NO	169	163	168	500	175	191	191	557	184	207	199	590
BLANKS	181	186	166	533	170	164	194	528	203	216	185	604

At the State Election held therein, November 6, 2012

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				
1247	1297	1490	4034	1794	1805	2080	5679	2227	2096	1563	5886	2069	1752	1810	5631			35,490
873	967	1067	2907									1596	1376	1323	4295			7,202
181	145	189	515									250	161	238	649			1,164
7	3	10	20									7	7	5	19			39
186	182	224	592									216	208	244	668			1,260
960	1008	1143	3111	1389	1404	1668	4461	1752	1641	1207	4600	1623	1417	1394	4434			27,872
14	10	14	38	17	19	16	52	15	3	9	27	16	12	17	45			290
273	279	333	885	388	382	396	1166	460	452	347	1259	430	323	399	1152			7,328
949	974	1113	3036	1343	1355	1591	4289	1687	1556	1159	4402	1585	1389	1346	4320			26,978
28	21	32	81	29	35	37	101	33	19	23	75	36	22	32	90			623
270	302	345	917	422	415	452	1289	507	521	381	1409	448	341	432	1221			7,889
794	809	961	2564	1185	1188	1455	3828	1529	1422	1033	3984	1398	1205	1150	3753			23,604
213	215	241	669	265	239	235	739	238	219	181	638	281	234	311	826			4,765
8	11	6	25	11	16	10	37	7	4	13	24	10	6	11	27			193
232	262	282	776	333	362	380	1075	453	451	336	1240	380	307	338	1025			6,928
844	928	798	2570	1387	1427	1664	4478	1794	1635	1255	4684	1656	1307	1418	4381			27,061
210	199	600	1009	211	196	207	614	213	254	142	609	226	227	173	626			4,505
193	170	92	455	196	182	209	587	220	207	166	593	187	218	219	624			3,924

RECORD OF THE 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>	1121	1251	1095	3467	1573	2005	1812	5390	1657	1800	1946	5403

QUESTION TWO: LAW PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION

QUESTION 2: 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 on or before May 1, 2012?

SUMMARY

This proposed law would allow a physician licensed in Massachusetts to prescribe medication, at a terminally ill patient's request, to end that patient's life. To qualify, a patient would have to be an adult resident who (1) is medically determined to be mentally capable of making and communicating health care decisions; (2) has been diagnosed by attending and consulting physicians as having an incurable, irreversible disease that will, within reasonable medical judgment, cause death within six months; and (3) voluntarily expresses a wish to die and has made an informed decision. The proposed law states that the patient would ingest the medicine in order to cause death in a humane and dignified manner.

The proposed law would require the patient, directly or through a person familiar with the patient's manner of communicating, to orally communicate to a physician on two occasions, 15 days apart, the patient's request for the medication. At the time of the second request, the physician would have to offer the patient an opportunity to rescind the request. The patient would also have to sign a standard form, in the presence of two witnesses, one of whom is not a relative, a beneficiary of the patient's estate, or an owner, operator, or employee of a health care facility where the patient receives treatment or lives.

The proposed law would require the attending physician to: (1) determine if the patient is qualified; (2) inform the patient of his or her medical diagnosis and prognosis, the potential risks and probable result of ingesting the medication, and the feasible alternatives, including comfort care, hospice care and pain control; (3) refer the patient to a consulting physician for a diagnosis and prognosis regarding the patient's disease, and confirmation in writing that the patient is capable, acting voluntarily, and making an informed decision; (4) refer the patient for psychiatric or psychological consultation if the physician believes the patient may have a disorder causing impaired judgment; (5) recommend that the patient notify next of kin of the patient's intention; (6) recommend that the patient have another person present when the patient ingests the medicine and to not take it in a public place; (7) inform the patient that he or she may rescind the request at any time; (8) write the prescription when the requirements of the law are met, including verifying that the patient is making an informed decision; and (9) arrange for the medicine to be dispensed directly to the patient, or the patient's agent, but not by mail or courier.

The proposed law would make it punishable by imprisonment and/or fines, for anyone to (1) coerce a patient to request medication, (2) forge a request, or (3) conceal a rescission of a request. The proposed law would not authorize ending a patient's life by lethal injection, active euthanasia, or mercy killing. The death certificate would list the underlying terminal disease as the cause of death.

Participation under the proposed law would be voluntary. An unwilling health care provider could prohibit or sanction another health care provider for participating while on the premises of, or while acting as an employee of or contractor for, the unwilling provider.

The proposed law states that no person would be civilly or criminally liable or subject to professional discipline for actions that comply with the law, including actions taken in good faith that substantially comply. It also states that it should not be interpreted to lower the applicable standard of care for any health care provider.

A person's decision to make or rescind a request could not be restricted by will or contract made on or after January 1, 2013, and could not be considered in issuing, or setting the rates for, insurance policies or annuities. Also, the proposed law would require the attending physician to report each case in which life-ending medication is dispensed to the state Department of Public Health. The Department would provide public access to statistical data compiled from the reports.

The proposed law states that if any of its parts was held invalid, the other parts would stay in effect.

A YES VOTE would enact the proposed law allowing a physician licensed in Massachusetts to prescribe medication, at the request of a terminally-ill patient meeting certain conditions, to end that person's life.

A NO VOTE would make no change in existing laws.

YES	520	618	470	1608	982	1341	1213	3536	1037	1040	1256	3333
NO	500	528	536	1564	494	574	504	1572	519	659	601	1779
BLANKS	101	105	89	295	97	90	95	282	101	101	89	291

RECORD OF THE 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	1121	1251	1095	3467	1573	2005	1812	5390	1657	1800	1946	5403

QUESTION THREE: LAW PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION

**QUESTION 3
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 on or before May 1, 2012?

SUMMARY

This proposed law would eliminate state criminal and civil penalties for the medical use of marijuana by qualifying patients. To qualify, a patient must have been diagnosed with a debilitating medical condition, such as cancer, glaucoma, HIV-positive status or AIDS, hepatitis C, Crohn's disease, Parkinson's disease, ALS, or multiple sclerosis. The patient would also have to obtain a written certification, from a physician with whom the patient has a bona fide physician-patient relationship, that the patient has a specific debilitating medical condition and would likely obtain a net benefit from medical use of marijuana.

The proposed law would allow patients to possess up to a 60-day supply of marijuana for their personal medical use. The state Department of Public Health (DPH) would decide what amount would be a 60-day supply. A patient could designate a personal caregiver, at least 21 years old, who could assist with the patient's medical use of marijuana but would be prohibited from consuming that marijuana. Patients and caregivers would have to register with DPH by submitting the physician's certification.

The proposed law would allow for non-profit medical marijuana treatment centers to grow, process and provide marijuana to patients or their caregivers. A treatment center would have to apply for a DPH registration by (1) paying a fee to offset DPH's administrative costs; (2) identifying its location and one additional location, if any, where marijuana would be grown; and (3) submitting operating procedures, consistent with rules to be issued by DPH, including cultivation and storage of marijuana only in enclosed, locked facilities.

A treatment center's personnel would have to register with DPH before working or volunteering at the center, be at least 21 years old, and have no felony drug convictions. In 2013, there could be no more than 35 treatment centers, with at least one but not more than five centers in each county. In later years, DPH could modify the number of centers.

The proposed law would require DPH to issue a cultivation registration to a qualifying patient whose access to a treatment center is limited by financial hardship, physical inability to access reasonable transportation, or distance. This would allow the patient or caregiver to grow only enough plants, in a closed, locked facility, for a 60-day supply of marijuana for the patient's own use.

DPH could revoke any registration for a willful violation of the proposed law. Fraudulent use of a DPH registration could be punished by up to six months in a house of correction or a fine of up to \$500, and fraudulent use of a registration for the sale, distribution, or trafficking of marijuana for non-medical use for profit could be punished by up to five years in state prison or by two and one-half years in a house of correction.

The proposed law would (1) not give immunity under federal law or obstruct federal enforcement of federal law; (2) not supersede Massachusetts laws prohibiting possession, cultivation, or sale of marijuana for nonmedical purposes; (3) not allow the operation of a motor vehicle, boat, or aircraft while under the influence of marijuana; (4) not require any health insurer or government entity to reimburse for the costs of the medical use of marijuana; (5) not require any health care professional to authorize the medical use of marijuana; (6) not require any accommodation of the medical use of marijuana in any workplace, school bus or grounds, youth center, or correctional facility; and (7) not require any accommodation of smoking marijuana in any public place.

The proposed law would take effect January 1, 2013, and states that if any of its parts were declared invalid, the other parts would stay in effect.

A YES VOTE would enact the proposed law eliminating state criminal and civil penalties related to the medical use of marijuana, allowing patients meeting certain conditions to obtain marijuana produced and distributed by new state-regulated centers or, in specific hardship cases, to grow marijuana for their own use.

A NO VOTE would make no change in existing laws.

YES

NO

Yes	667	775	636	2078	1219	1611	1404	4234	1218	1295	1517	4030
No	333	370	351	1054	275	303	328	906	330	383	339	1052
Blanks	121	106	108	335	79	91	80	250	109	122	90	321

QUESTION FOUR: Shall the City of Somerville accept Sections 3 to 7 inclusive of Chapter 44B of the General Laws, as approved by its legislative body, a summary of which appears below?

QUESTION 4

Shall the City of Somerville accept Sections 3 to 7, inclusive, of Chapter 44B of the General Laws, as approved by its legislative body, a summary of which appears below?

SUMMARY

The Community Preservation Act (hereinafter "the Act") establishes a dedicated funding source to enable cities and towns to: (1) acquire, create and preserve open space, including land for parks, recreational uses and conservation areas; (2) acquire, preserve, rehabilitate, and restore historic resources, such as historic community buildings and artifacts; (3) acquire, create, preserve, rehabilitate and restore land for recreational use, including parks, playgrounds and athletic fields; (4) acquire, create, preserve and support community housing to help meet local families' housing needs; and (5) rehabilitate or restore open space and community housing that is acquired or created as provided in this section.

In the City of Somerville, the funding source for these community preservation purposes will be a surcharge of 1.5% on the annual property tax assessed on real property beginning in Fiscal Year 2014, other local funds committed by the Board of Aldermen for community preservation purposes subject to the limitations in Section 3(b)(1)(2) of Chapter 44B, and annual distributions made by the state from a trust fund created by the Act. The Commonwealth provides these funds only to communities adopting the Act. If approved, the following will be exempt from the surcharge: (1) property owned and occupied as a domicile by any person who qualifies for low income housing or low or moderate income senior housing in Somerville as defined in Section 2 of the Act; (2) \$100,000 of the value of each taxable parcel of residential real property; and (3) \$100,000 of the value of each taxable parcel of class 3, commercial property and class 4, industrial property as defined in Section 2A of Chapter 59. A taxpayer receiving a regular property tax abatement or exemption will also receive a pro rata reduction in the surcharge.

Upon acceptance of the Act by the voters, a Community Preservation Committee will be established by ordinance to study community preservation needs, possibilities and resources, and to make annual recommendations to the Board of Aldermen for approval on spending the funds. At least 10% of the funds for each fiscal year will be spent or reserved for later spending on each of the Act's three community preservation purposes: (1) open space, (2) historic resources and (3) community housing.

YES

NO

Yes	693	748	627	2068	1151	1512	1330	3993	1167	1295	1426	3888
No	275	363	328	966	301	339	356	996	346	358	359	1063
Blanks	153	140	140	433	121	154	126	401	144	147	161	452

AT THE STATE ELECTION HELD THEREIN, NOVEMBER 6, 2012

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		
1247	1297	1490	4034	1794	1805	2080	5679	2227	2096	1563	5886	2069	1752	1810	5631	35,490
687	844	1030	2561	1297	1352	1637	4286	1814	1659	1220	4693	1618	1215	1298	4131	26,013
430	342	367	1139	398	363	356	1117	336	344	271	951	387	406	378	1171	7,390
130	111	93	334	99	90	87	276	77	93	72	242	64	131	134	329	2,087
711	835	960	2506	1207	1257	1536	4000	1650	1552	1141	4343	1457	1226	1135	3818	24,616
374	322	379	1075	450	396	413	1259	421	397	274	1092	468	346	477	1291	7,742
162	140	151	453	137	152	131	420	156	147	148	451	144	180	198	522	3,132

RECORD OF THE 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	1121	1251	1095	3467	1573	2005	1812	5390	1657	1800	1946	5403

QUESTION FIVE: This question is not binding

**QUESTION 5
THIS QUESTION IS NOT BINDING**
 Shall the state senator from this district be instructed to vote in favor of a resolution calling upon Congress and the President to: (1) prevent cuts to Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and Veterans benefits, or to housing, food and unemployment assistance; (2) create and protect jobs by investing in manufacturing, schools, housing, renewable energy, transportation and other public services; (3) provide new revenues for these purposes and to reduce the long-term federal deficit by closing corporate tax loopholes, ending offshore tax havens, and raising taxes on incomes over \$250,000; and (4) redirect military spending to these domestic needs by reducing the military budget, ending the war in Afghanistan and bringing U.S. troops home safely now?

YES
NO

Yes	715	824	703	2242	1167	1512	1339	4018	1190	1259	1395	3844
No	186	226	173	585	219	261	253	733	203	252	283	738
Blanks	220	201	219	640	187	232	220	639	264	289	268	821

QUESTION SIX: This question is not binding

**QUESTION 6
THIS QUESTION IS NOT BINDING**
 Shall the state senator from this district be instructed to vote in favor of legislation that would allow the state to regulate and tax marijuana in the same manner as alcohol?

YES
NO

Yes	644	737	635	2016	1130	1452	1302	3884	1142	1173	1381	3696
No	277	315	258	850	274	318	306	898	291	357	322	970
Blanks	200	199	202	601	169	235	204	608	224	270	243	737

QUESTION SEVEN: This question is not binding

**QUESTION 7
THIS QUESTION IS NOT BINDING**
 Shall the state representative from this district be instructed to vote in favor of a resolution calling upon Congress to propose an amendment to the U.S. constitution affirming that (1) corporations are not entitled to the constitutional rights of human beings, and (2) both Congress and the states may place limits on political contributions and political spending?

YES
NO

Yes	695	793	654	2142	1152	1547	1356	4055	1184	1282	1439	3905
No	195	239	205	639	218	215	232	665	216	237	254	707
Blanks	231	219	236	686	203	243	224	670	257	281	253	791

456R

AT THE STATE ELECTION HELD THEREIN, NOVEMBER 6, 2012

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		
1247	1297	1490	4034	1794	1805	2080	5679	2227	2096	1563	5886	2069	1752	1810	5631	35,490
737	863	1007	2607	1250	1270	1539	4059	1624	1468	1129	4221	1481	1208	1217	3906	24,897
259	211	228	698	291	271	277	839	311	339	240	890	296	264	267	827	5,310
251	223	255	729	253	264	264	781	292	289	194	775	292	280	326	898	5,283
622	801	938	2361	1205	1225	1512	3942	1618	1494	1110	4222	1473	1106	1183	3762	23,883
382	297	304	983	357	345	331	1033	361	343	265	969	350	379	324	1053	6,756
243	199	248	690	232	235	237	704	248	259	188	695	246	267	303	816	4,851
713	845	992	2550	1261	1296	1610	4167	1700	1561	1156	4417	1541	1192	1227	3960	25,196
268	234	232	734	257	257	236	750	264	258	207	729	258	265	244	767	4,991
266	218	266	750	276	252	234	762	263	277	200	740	270	295	339	904	5,303

A TRUE COPY ATTEST:

Michael P. Salerno
Chairman

4576

RECORD OF ABSENT VOTERS (1844)

REGISTERED VOTERS

Tabulated from the Tally Sheets of the State Election held November 6, 2012

Ward	Precinct	Ballots Mailed	Ballots Cast	Not Returned	Defective	Returned Too Late	Voted in Person	Health Care Facility
1	1	43	33	6	4		14	
1	2	37	27	10			16	
1	3	42	37	4	1		22	
2	1	51	42	5		4	35	
2	2	75	62	10		3	44	
2	3	64	50	12		2	37	
3	1	66	59	5	1	1	40	
3	2	62	58	4			45	18
3	3	71	52	14		5	39	37
4	1	42	36	6			12	
4	2	29	21	7		1	21	
4	3	45	38	7			17	
5	1	60	52	8			29	39
5	2	90	74	11	4	1	41	
5	3	83	70	10		3	40	
6	1	106	81	21		4	43	
6	2	116	88	20		8	52	
6	3	53	41	9		3	27	
7	1	90	76	10		4	37	
7	2	71	56	13		2	22	
7	3	47	40	5		2	24	
TOTAL:		1343	1093	197	10	43	657	94

RECORD OF ABSENT VOTERS (266)

NON-REGISTERED VOTERS

Ward	Pct	Ballots Mailed	Ballots Cast	Not Returned	Defective	Returned Too Late	Voted In Person
1	1	6	5	1			
1	2	2	2				
1	3	2	2				
2	1	15	12	3			
2	2	32	31	1			
2	3	21	19	2			
3	1	15	14	1			
3	2	12	11	1			
3	3	17	16	1			
4	1	5	4	1			
4	2	5	5				
4	3	3	3				
5	1	13	10	3			
5	2	17	13	4			
5	3	28	22	6			
6	1	23	19	2		2	
6	2	30	22	8			
6	3	12	10	2			
7	1	18	14	4			
7	2	15	12	3			
7	3	26	20	3		3	
TOTAL:		317	266	46		5	

4282

RECORD OF THE 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>	412	492	379	1283	550	733	727	2010	698	724	810	2232
<u>Senator in Congress</u>												
Republican				284				229				339
Gabriel E Gomez 59 Highland Ave., Cohasset	71	131	82		38	83	108		79	116	144	
Democrat				982				1766				1873
Edward J Markey 7 Townsend St., Malden	337	355	290		510	646	610		609	602	662	
Twelve Visions Party				9				8				10
Richard A Heos 31 Robinson Rd., Woburn	3	4	2		1	1	6		4	3	3	
Write-Ins	1	2	3	6	1	3	3	7	6	2	1	9
Blanks	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1

AT THE SPECIAL STATE ELECTION HELD THEREIN, JUNE 25, 2013

	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	1	2	3			
✓	443	457	557	1457	743	778	858	2379	903	953	530	2386	853	680	708	2241		13,988
✓	113	73	125	311	140	125	127	392	120	134	83	337	131	93	165	389		2,281
✓	326	380	426	1132	596	644	723	1963	776	806	444	2026	712	579	536	1827		11,569
✓	1	0	4	5	2	7	3	12	4	5	2	11	8	2	2	12		67
✓	3	4	2	9	5	2	5	12	3	8	1	12	2	5	4	11		66
✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2		5

A TRUE COPY ATTEST:

Nicholas P. Salerno

Chairman