

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	2063 2063	751	741	563	2055	640	583	714	1937	12,612 12,615 12,614
							515	516	396	1427							1427
							20	12	10	42							42
							216	213	157	586							586
													389	266	315	970	970
													203	268	352	823	823
													2	9	6	17	17
													46	40	41	127	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 LAROCHE 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

AT THE STATE ELECTION HELD THEREIN, NOVEMBER 8, 1994

11-18-94

Total Includes 7 Overseas ballots received by

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
782	862	910	1100	1035	841	999	871	979	17,246
43	46	39	57	49	38	33	38	36	755
200	213	208	264	227	229	231	219	244	4,288
724	777	833	1016	940	787	914	773	853	15,640
205	230	192	249	201	176	192	191	254	4,074
5	1	3	3	2	0	3	2	3	47
91	113	129	153	168	145	154	162	149	2,528
									1,080
									34
									432
638	632	589	611	665	521	595	613	673	10,650
299	371	410	603	447	431	495	354	430	7,460
3	3	7	8	7	2	3	9	4	79
85	115	151	199	192	154	170	152	152	2,554
									3,934
									79
									1,173
645	761	816	1043	945	777				7,947
315	278	251	283	266	248				2,744
1	3	0	4	3	1				22
64	79	90	91	97	82				845
						947	824	958	4,186
						15	25	20	87
						301	279	281	1,272
760	837	875	978	939	775	886	826	920	16,193
11	16	19	21	21	7	14	13	13	315
254	268	263	422	351	326	363	289	326	5,781

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>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, 1994?</p> <p>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

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. 7 Law Proposed by Initiative Petition

**QUESTION 7
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 change the state personal income tax laws if a proposed amendment to the Massachusetts Constitution requiring income tax rates to be graduated is approved at the 1994 state election. This proposed law would (1) set graduated income tax rates to replace the existing tax rate structure, (2) change exemptions and deductions relating to dependents, child care expenses, head of household status and personal exemptions, (3) establish a property tax and water rate credit of up to \$200 for taxpayers below certain income levels, (4) increase the maximum income levels for no-tax status and the limited income credit, (5) establish a "capital formation incentive" to replace the existing capital gains exclusion, and (6) provide that taxpayers will not pay more Massachusetts income tax for 1995 than they would have paid under 1992 law, if their 1995 adjusted gross income is below certain levels (for instance, \$60,000 for single filers and \$100,000 for married couples filing jointly).

(1) PROPOSED GRADUATED INCOME TAX RATES WOULD:

Set the following state tax rates for all Massachusetts taxable income (after subtracting applicable deductions and exemptions):

Tax Rate	single	married filing jointly	married filing separately	head of household
5.5%	up to \$50,200	up to \$81,000	up to \$40,500	up to \$60,100
8.8%	over \$50,200	over \$81,000	over \$40,500	over \$60,100
9.8%	up to \$90,000	up to \$150,000	up to \$75,000	up to \$120,000
	over \$90,000	over \$150,000	over \$75,000	over \$120,000

A taxpayer whose total taxable income exceeded the upper limit for the 5.5% or 8.8% income bracket would still be taxed at the lower rate for income within that bracket. For example, a single person with \$100,000 in taxable income would be taxed at 5.5% on \$50,200 of that income, at 8.8% on the next \$39,800, and at 9.8% on the remaining \$10,000 of that income. The income brackets would be increased annually, starting in 1996, to account for changes in the cost of living.

- Eliminate the existing division of Massachusetts income into Part A income (generally, dividends, capital gains, and certain interest), currently taxed at 12 percent, and Part B income (all other income), currently taxed at 5.95 percent.
- Create a "head of household" filing status for single persons who have dependents and who file federal returns as heads of households.
- Prevent any gain from the sale of a taxpayer's principal residence from being taxed by the state at a rate higher than 6%.
- Provide that non-residents would pay tax on their Massachusetts income based on the income rate brackets applicable to their total income (including Massachusetts and other income).

(2) PROPOSED CHANGES IN EXEMPTIONS, DEDUCTIONS AND CREDITS WOULD:

Replace the child and dependent care expense deduction with a child and dependent care tax credit equal to 60% of the federal child and dependent care tax credit.

- Increase the existing exemption for each claimed dependent from \$1,000 to \$2,000.
- Allow heads of households a personal exemption of \$3,400, plus \$2,200 if blind and \$700 if 65 years of age or over.
- Reduce personal exemptions gradually for taxpayers whose adjusted gross income exceeded \$60,000 for single filers, \$100,000 for married persons filing jointly, \$50,000 for married persons filing separately and \$80,000 for heads of households. The personal exemption would be eliminated entirely for filers whose adjusted gross incomes exceeded these amounts by more than \$50,000 (\$25,000 for married persons filing separately). These amounts would be increased annually, starting in 1996, to account for changes in the cost of living.
- Allow interest and dividends from deposits in all banks and institutions to qualify for the \$100 deduction (\$200 for married couples) currently applicable only to Massachusetts bank interest and dividends.
- Allow the \$1000 net capital loss deduction to be taken against all income, not just against Part A income as current law provides.

(3) PROPOSED PROPERTY TAX AND WATER RATE CREDIT WOULD:

- Create a property tax and water rate credit of up to \$200 for eligible homeowners and renters who have total incomes less than: \$30,000 for married couples, \$25,000 for head of household filers and \$20,000 for single filers. The amount of the credit would depend on the amount by which the taxpayers' real estate property tax and water charges exceeded 10% of their income. 20% of tenants' rent would be treated as a property tax payment for these purposes. If the taxpayer had no income tax due, the amount of any credit due would be paid to the taxpayer, as long as the state Legislature made any appropriation necessary to pay such refunds.

(4) PROPOSED \$2000 INCREASE IN THE EXISTING INCOME THRESHOLDS FOR NO-TAX STATUS WOULD:

- Exempt taxpayers at or below the following levels of adjusted gross income from paying income tax: \$14,000 for married couples filing jointly, \$12,000 for head of household filers, and \$10,000 for single filers. These levels would be adjusted annually, starting in 1996, to account for changes in the cost of living. The new levels also would apply to the limited income credit which is available to taxpayers with adjusted gross income up to 175 percent of these levels.

(5) PROPOSED CAPITAL FORMATION INCENTIVE WOULD:

- Replace the current 50% capital gains deduction with a "capital formation incentive" deduction, which would allow partial deductions for gains from the sale or exchange of qualified stock issued by certain corporations that employ 50% or more of their employees in Massachusetts.
- Only gains on original stock purchased on or after January 1, 1995 from certain corporations engaged in active business, and held for required periods of time, would qualify for the deduction. The amount of the deduction would be 30% of the gain on stock held at least 3 years; 50% for stock held at least five years; and 70% for stock held at least seven years. Detailed provisions would restrict the benefit of this deduction to stock issuances which reflect new investments in businesses, and would disqualify stock in certain types of corporations that receive special tax treatment under existing law.

(6) PROPOSED CAP ON TAX LIABILITY FOR CERTAIN TAXPAYERS IN 1995 WOULD:

- Excuse taxpayers at or below the following levels of adjusted gross income, as determined under the proposed law, from owing more Massachusetts income tax in 1995 than they would have owed under 1992 law: \$100,000 for married couples filing jointly, \$80,000 for heads of household, \$60,000 for single filers, and \$50,000 for married persons filing separately.

(7) EFFECTIVE DATE:

If the State Constitution is amended at the 1994 election to require graduated income tax rates, the proposed law would be effective beginning in tax year 1995. The proposed law states that if any of its provisions were found invalid, the other provisions would remain in effect.

Note: Wherever this summary refers to current or existing law, the reference is to the law in effect in August 1993, when this summary was prepared.

Yes	204	262	472	299	444	461	447	428	471	249	301	336
No	458	556	217	439	487	522	589	507	641	590	586	595
Blanks	76	88	68	70	87	70	107	63	109	76	72	49

AT THE STATE ELECTION HELD THEREIN, NOVEMBER 8, 1994

Total includes 7 Overseas ballots 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
335	397	472	659	571	482	539	395	420	8,644
636	662	610	695	656	562	648	632	758	12,046
54	62	75	67	84	64	76	101	81	1,599

3614

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. 8 Law Proposed by Initiative Petition

QUESTION 8
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 increase the portion of gasoline tax revenue that would be credited to the state Highway Fund; prohibit the transfer of money from the Highway Fund to other state funds for other purposes; declare that citizens have a right to a safe and efficient public highway, road and bridge system and require the state to develop a comprehensive seven-year state transportation plan; and make certain other changes in state finance laws relating to the Highway Fund.

The proposed law would require that the small portion of state gasoline tax revenues that is deposited in funds relating to the use of watercraft be deposited instead in the Highway Fund. No revenue deposited in the Highway Fund could be transferred to any other state fund for any purpose other than one for which the Highway Fund may be used.

The proposed law would declare that the citizens of Massachusetts have a right to a safe and efficient public highway, road and bridge system, constructed and maintained by the state and its counties, cities and towns. The state Secretary of Transportation and Construction would be required to prepare a comprehensive state transportation plan for the period July 1, 1995 through June 30, 2002, to be updated every three years. The plan would provide for the repair or reconstruction of at least five percent of public highways and bridges every year, and it would establish priorities for highway, road and bridge projects based on condition and safety factors. The plan would be designed to promote economic development and employment by meeting the various transportation needs of residents throughout the state. The plan would be prepared after a public hearing and after consultation with the state Secretaries of Environmental Affairs and Economic Affairs.

Under the proposed law, money in the Highway Fund would no longer be considered in determining whether the state government has sufficient money on hand to set some aside for use in future fiscal years or to deposit some in the state tax reduction fund. The proposed law would declare that no more than 15% of gasoline tax revenues could be used for mass transportation purposes, but it would not prevent the state Legislature from appropriating additional gasoline tax revenues for such purposes.

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

Yes	407	542	389	489	620	641	660	635	735	557	605	649
No	230	260	309	216	300	307	365	281	348	270	260	262
Blanks	101	104	59	103	98	105	118	82	138	88	94	69

Question No. 9 Law Proposed by Initiative Petition

QUESTION 9
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 prohibit rent control for most privately owned housing units in Massachusetts, and would nullify certain existing rent control laws, except that cities and towns would be authorized to adopt a restricted form of rent control for a six month period, after which compliance by property owners would be voluntary.

The proposed law would prohibit any city or town from enacting, maintaining or enforcing any law that requires below-market rents for residential properties. It would also prohibit the regulation of occupancy, services, evictions, condominium conversion, or the removal of the unit from rent control, if such regulation was part of a system requiring below-market rents. Existing state and local rent control laws would be nullified. The proposed law would not affect publicly owned or subsidized housing, federally assisted housing, or mobile homes.

Cities and towns would be authorized to adopt rent control for a six-month period on housing units that have a fair market rent of \$400 or less and that are owned by a person or entity owning ten or more rental units. Such rent control could not include the regulation of occupancy, services, evictions, condominium conversion, or the removal of the unit from rent control. The city or town would have to pay the owners of rent-controlled units the difference between the controlled rent and the fair market rent. After six months, owners of rent-controlled units would not be required to comply with the rent control regulation or with any other such regulation that the city or town might adopt in the future.

The proposed law would take effect on January 1, 1995. The proposed law states that if any of its provisions were declared invalid, the other provisions would remain in effect.

Yes	358	442	388	491	440	464	480	471	558	479	464	474
No	304	386	311	215	510	529	569	471	574	357	424	464
Blanks	76	78	58	102	68	60	94	56	89	79	71	42

AT THE STATE ELECTION HELD THEREIN, NOVEMBER 8, 1994

Total Includes 7 Overseas ballots 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
663	716	747	938	799	697	814	708	850	13,861
294	327	308	397	384	324	344	316	320	6,422
68	78	102	86	128	87	105	104	89	2,006
551	576	513	644	557	519	593	483	688	10,633
431	491	594	735	682	553	622	579	503	10,304
43	54	50	42	72	36	48	66	68	1,352

325 L

RECORD OF ABSENT VOTERS (625) Total Votes Cast

TABULATED FROM THE TALLY SHEETS OF THE STATE ELECTION , HELD NOVEMBER 8, 1994

REGISTERED VOTERS

Ward	Prec	Ballots Mailed	Ballots Cast	Not Returned	Returned Too Late	Defec-tive	Voted in Person	Health Care Facility
1	1	26	15	4	1	6	6	0
1	2	25	17	5	0	3	5	0
1	3	14	10	3	0	1	6	0
2	1	14	10	1	1	2	4	0
2	2	27	19	5	1	2	11	0
2	3	22	18	1	2	1	15	0
3	1	25	20	2	2	1	13	0
3	2	28	21	3	2	2	13	20
3	3	31	24	3	1	3	13	47
4	1	15	9	4	0	2	6	0
4	2	18	13	2	0	3	9	0
4	3	20	15	3	1	1	8	0
5	1	20	14	3	0	3	10	6
5	2	14	9	3	0	2	10	0
5	3	15	14	0	0	1	13	0
6	1	19	16	2	0	1	18	0
6	2	22	15	4	1	2	24	0
6	3	20	15	1	1	3	17	0
7	1	28	13	9	1	5	7	0
7	2	28	26	2	0	0	4	0
7	3	15	12	1	0	2	15	0
TOTAL:		446	325	61	14	46	227	73

303F

RECORD OF ABSENT VOTERS (13) Total Votes Cast

TABULATED FROM THE TALLY SHEETS OF THE STATE ELECTION, HELD NOVEMBER 8, 1994

NON-REGISTERED VOTERS

Wd	Pct	Ballots Mailed	Ballots Cast	Not Returned	Returned Too Late	Defec-tive	Voted in Person	Health Care Facility
1	1							
1	2							
1	3	1	1					
2	1	1		1				
2	2	1	1					
2	3							
3	1	2	2					
3	2	3	1		1	1		
3	3	1	1					
4	1							
4	2	2	2					
4	3	1	1					
5	1							
5	2							
5	3							
6	1							
6	2	1	1					
6	3	3	2	1				
7	1							
7	2							
7	3	3	1			2		
TOTALS:		19	13	2	1	3	0	0

