

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>	646	799	693	2138	701	923	899	2523	1046	943	1112	3103
<u>COUNCILLOR - Sixth District</u>												
Michael J Callahan - 500 Salem St, Medford Dem	509	607	555	1671	524	703	672	1899	786	719	820	2325
Write-Ins	7	7	6	20	2	15	11	28	18	5	14	37
Blanks	130	185	132	447	175	205	216	596	242	219	278	739
<u>Essex District</u>												
<u>SENATOR IN GENERAL COURT- Middlesex, Suffolk, &</u>												
Thomas F Birmingham - 9 Nichols St, Chelsea Dem	510			510	531			531				
Write-Ins	9			9	7			7				
Blanks	127			127	163			163				
<u>SENATOR IN GENERAL COURT - Second Middlesex District</u>												
Charles E Shannon, Jr - 17 Robinson Pk, Winchester Dem		632	562	1194		716	669	1385	811	741	860	2412
Write-Ins		10	12	22		15	14	29	18	6	11	35
Blanks		157	119	276		192	216	408	217	196	241	654
<u>District</u>												
<u>REPRESENTATIVE IN GENERAL COURT - 29th Middlesex</u>												
Timothy J Toomey, Jr - 88th Sixth St, Cambridge Dem	519	622	560	1701	545	720		1265				
Write-Ins	6	6	9	21	4	15		19				
Blanks	121	171	124	416	152	188		340				
<u>District</u>												
<u>REPRESENTATIVE IN GENERAL COURT - 30th Middlesex</u>												
Patricia D Jehlen - 67 Dane St, Somerville Dem							705	705	849	766	829	2444
Ronald A Bargoot - 16 Wallace St, Somerville Lib							96	96	99	87	156	342
Write-Ins							8	8	6	0	4	10
Blanks							90	90	92	90	123	305
<u>District</u>												
<u>REPRESENTATIVE IN GENERAL COURT - 37th Middlesex</u>												
Vincent Paul Ciampa - 64 Ossipee Rd, Somerville Dem												
Write-Ins												
Blanks												
<u>DISTRICT ATTORNEY Northern District</u>												
Martha Coakley - 68 Rawson Rd, Arlington Dem	457	558	493	1508	541	713	679	1933	785	718	825	2328
Lee Johnson - 28 Ninth St, Medford Rep	118	159	127	404	92	119	138	349	173	144	182	499
Write-Ins	0	1	2	3	0	3	3	6	7	2	3	12
Blanks	71	81	71	223	68	88	79	235	81	79	102	262
<u>SHERIFF Middlesex County</u>												
James V DiPaola - 27 Pagum St, Malden Dem	520	617	559	1696	533	703	688	1924	797	734	832	2363
Write-Ins	8	9	6	23	5	14	10	29	15	4	8	27
Blanks	118	173	128	419	163	206	201	570	234	205	272	711

AT THE STATE ELECTION HELD THEREIN, NOVEMBER 3, 1998

WARD FOUR				TOTAL WARD FIVE				TOTAL WARD SIX				TOTAL WARD SEVEN				TOTAL				TOTALS:			
1	2	3		1	2	3		1	2	3		1	2	3									
850	888	938	2676	965	1009	1034	3008	1261	1217	912	3390	1156	1044	1140	3340								20,176
656	664	708	2028	746	767	739	2252	915	881	642	2438	827	784	847	2458								15,071
5	11	13	29	10	8	14	32	11	17	9	37	14	5	9	28								211
189	213	217	619	209	234	281	724	335	319	261	915	315	255	284	854								4,894
																							1,041
																							16
																							290
681	682	729	2092	775	786	765	2326	939	910	651	2500	875	819	872	2566								14,475
3	13	14	30	11	11	17	39	12	16	9	37	8	10	13	31								223
166	193	195	554	179	212	252	643	310	291	252	853	273	215	255	743								4,131
	670		670																				3,636
	10		10																				50
	208		208																				964
				730	792	816	2338	1015	966	695	2676												8,163
				141	122	115	378	121	141	98	360												1,176
				2	4	0	6	4	3	9	16												40
				92	91	103	286	121	107	110	338												1,019
660		704	1364									846	771	851	2468								3,832
13		28	41									28	27	33	88								129
177		206	383									282	246	256	784								1,167
582	628	684	1894	714	732	771	2217	962	947	678	2587	858	788	834	2480								14,947
182	162	188	532	169	198	145	512	185	177	131	493	188	160	205	553								3,342
4	3	2	9	2	2	2	6	2	1	6	9	2	2	2	6								51
82	95	64	241	80	77	116	273	112	92	97	301	108	94	99	301								1,836
677	671	725	2073	771	769	775	2315	898	886	657	2441	850	803	870	2523								15,335
8	14	12	34	5	10	8	23	15	13	6	34	14	9	10	33								203
165	203	201	569	189	230	251	670	348	318	249	915	292	232	260	784								4,638

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	646	799	693	2138	701	923	899	2523	1046	943	1112	3101

Question #1 Proposed Amendment to the Constitution

**QUESTION 1
PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO
THE CONSTITUTION**

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 two houses on July 29, 1996 (yeas 127 - nays 65); and again on June 9, 1998 (yeas 149 - nays 41)?

SUMMARY

This proposed constitutional amendment would prohibit the state Legislature from changing the base compensation received by members of the Legislature as of January 1, 1996. As of the first Wednesday in January of 2001, and every second year thereafter, the base compensation would be increased or decreased at the same rate as increases or decreases in the median household income for the Commonwealth for the preceding two-year period, as ascertained by the Governor.

A YES VOTE would prohibit state legislators from changing their base pay and instead would adjust that pay according to changes in median household income.

A NO VOTE would make no change in the method for setting legislators' base pay.

Yes	379	458	402	1239	373	566	564	1503	619	560	666	1845
No	118	193	170	481	198	219	237	654	268	249	298	815
Blanks	149	148	121	418	130	138	98	366	159	134	148	441

Question #2 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 before May 6, 1998?

SUMMARY

This proposed law would create a new voluntary system allowing candidates for state office who agree to campaign spending limits and \$100 contribution limits to receive a set amount of public funds for their campaigns, starting with the 2002 election. The proposed law would also limit transfers of money from national political parties to state political parties for administrative, overhead, or party-building activities. It would also require candidates for state office who had raised or spent at least a set minimum amount in an election cycle to file their required campaign finance reports with the state electronically, and the public would have prompt electronic access to such reports.

The new funding system would replace the existing system of limited public financing of campaigns for statewide office. To participate in the new system, a candidate would have to raise a minimum number of contributions from

registered voters in the relevant district, as follows: Governor, 6000; Lt. Governor, Attorney General, or Treasurer, 3000; Secretary of State or Auditor, 2000; Executive Councillor, 400; State Senator, 450; State Representative, 200. Such contributions would have to be between \$5 and \$100 and be collected during a limited period: for statewide candidates beginning on August 1 of the year before the election, for other candidates beginning on January 1 of the election year, and for all candidates ending on the last day to file nomination papers with the Secretary of State.

For any election, a participating candidate could not accept contributions of more than \$100 from any person or political committee and could not raise or spend any money other than these contributions and public funds.

Candidates meeting all of these requirements would, subject to appropriation by the Legislature, receive public funding in the primary and general elections. This would come from a new state Clean Elections Fund, consisting of amounts voluntarily contributed through the checkoff on the state income tax return, any amounts appropriated by the Legislature, and any money in the existing state election campaign fund.

The chart below shows the amounts of public funds a candidate could receive in the primary and general elections. A candidate could raise and spend private contributions in order to bring his or her spending up to the spending limit shown below.

Office	Primary Election: Public Funds	Primary Election: Spending Limit	General Election: Public Funds	General Election: Spending Limit
Governor	\$1,500,000	\$1,800,000	\$1,050,000	\$1,200,000
Lt. Governor	\$383,000	\$450,000	\$255,000	\$300,000
Attorney General or Treasurer	\$360,000	\$450,000	\$240,000	\$300,000
Secretary of State or Auditor	\$120,000	\$150,000	\$80,000	\$100,000
Councillor	\$19,000	\$24,000	\$13,000	\$16,000
Senator	\$43,000	\$54,000	\$29,000	\$36,000
Representative	\$15,000	\$18,000	\$9,000	\$12,000

A participating candidate running unopposed would receive only half the listed amount of public funds and could spend correspondingly less than a candidate with an opponent. All funds could be spent only for campaign purposes. Any unspent public funds from a primary or general election would have to be returned after that election. A participating candidate who violated the contribution or spending limits would have to return all public funds, become ineligible for further funds, and in some cases pay fines.

Candidates who do not accept public funds would have to report any spending in excess of the limit shown above and could be fined for failing to do so. If such a non-participating candidate spent more than the limit, participating candidates in that race would immediately receive, and could spend, public "matching funds" equal to the amount of the excess spending. The total amount of public funding (including matching funds) a candidate could receive would be limited to twice the spending limit for that race. During the general election campaign, running mates for Governor and Lt. Governor would be treated as teams in order to determine the distribution of any matching funds.

An individual or political committee's total in-kind contributions (such as goods and some services) to a participating candidate would be limited to \$500 per election. Higher limits would govern political parties' in-kind contributions. Participating candidates could not accept more than a set amount in such contributions, ranging from \$3,000 per election for Representative up to \$35,000 for Governor.

The expenditure, contribution, and public funding limits would be adjusted every two years for inflation. A special commission (including elected officials and private citizens) would be set up to meet every two years to review the system and recommend any needed changes. The state Director of Campaign Finance could issue regulations to interpret and enforce the proposed law.

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

A YES VOTE would change the laws governing public financing of campaigns.

A NO VOTE would make no change in the laws governing public financing of campaigns.

Yes	413	465	405	1283	456	628	607	1691	709	639	741	2089
No	141	215	180	536	164	193	228	585	241	208	264	713
Blanks	92	119	108	319	81	102	64	247	96	96	107	299

AT THE STATE ELECTION HELD THEREIN, NOVEMBER 3, 1998

WARD FOUR			TOTAL	WARD FIVE			TOTAL	WARD SIX			TOTAL	WARD SEVEN			TOTAL	TOTALS:	
1	2	3		1	2	3		1	2	3		1	2	3			
850	888	938	2676	965	1009	1034	3008	1261	1217	912	3390	1156	1044	1140	3340		20,176
462	524	582	1568	585	626	630	1841	745	716	565	2026	721	578	694	1993		12,015
186	219	230	635	265	261	276	802	390	352	242	984	308	256	267	831		5,202
202	145	126	473	115	122	128	365	126	149	105	380	127	210	179	516		2,959
508	568	583	1659	613	657	690	1960	874	823	618	2315	767	687	751	2205		13,202
220	238	259	717	270	263	254	787	307	269	215	791	284	245	294	823		4,952
122	82	96	300	82	89	90	261	80	125	79	284	105	112	95	312		2,022

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>	646	799	693	2138	701	923	899	2523	1046	943	1112	3101
Question #3 Law Proposed by an Initiative Petition												

**QUESTION 3
LAW PROPOSED BY AN 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 6, 1998?

SUMMARY

This proposed law would change the state income tax rate on interest and dividend income, which was 12% as of September 1997, to whatever rate applies to Part B taxable income (such as wages and salaries), which was 5.95% as of September 1997. The change would take effect starting in tax year 2000.

A YES VOTE would reduce the state tax rate for interest and dividend income.
A NO VOTE would make no change in the current state tax rate for interest and dividend income.

Yes	423	529	456	1408	427	559	575	1561	637	588	696	1921
No	124	158	128	410	186	260	252	698	302	259	301	862
Blanks	99	112	109	320	88	104	72	264	107	96	115	318
Question #4 Referendum on an Existing Law												

**QUESTION 4
REFERENDUM ON AN EXISTING LAW**

Do you approve of a law summarized below, which was approved by the House of Representatives on November 19, 1997 by a vote of 124 to 30, approved by the Senate on November 18, 1997 by a vote of 32 to 6?

SUMMARY

The law changes the state's electric utility industry. Starting in March 1998, instead of buying power from the utility that owns the power lines, customers may choose to buy power from separate generating companies competing with each other to sell power to be delivered by the existing utility. Customers not choosing a new competing generating company will be provided power by their existing utility under a transition rate for 7 years, starting from a rate 10% less than 1997 rates. By September 1999, rates for such customers must be further reduced from 1997 rates (adjusted for inflation) by 5%. Subject to restrictions in the law, rates paid by such customers may be adjusted up or down if approved by the new state Department of Telecommunications and Energy (DTE).

The law lets a utility recover, from customers, previously incurred costs related to generating plants and contracts that have become uneconomical under competition. Utilities must first reduce such "transition costs" in all reasonable ways, which may include selling non-nuclear generating plants. DTE must approve such sales and the utility's way of financing transition costs, and DTE may limit which costs may be charged to customers. Public agencies may arrange the sale of special bonds to help a utility finance transition costs to provide savings to customers.

Utilities claiming they cannot offer the required rate reductions must work with DTE to find all possible ways to do so. State tax revenues related to sales of power plants may be used, if found necessary by DTE and subject to legislative appropriation, to ensure that utilities provide the 15% rate reduction. Utilities must maintain discounts for low-income customers.

DTE must issue consumer protection and related regulations related to energy sales, and the law lets the state Attorney General enforce consumer protection laws and regulations against energy companies. To maintain reliability, DTE must set performance-based rates and service quality standards for electric and gas utilities. Utilities failing to meet the standards may be fined up to 2% of their annual revenues.

Such utilities will not be allowed to cut staff levels unless either the relevant unions agree or DTE finds that the cuts will not lead to sub-standard service. Utility employees who are laid off due to the law will, if eligible for unemployment benefits, also be eligible for reemployment assistance benefits.

If a generating plant loses value due to the law, the responsible company must pay the affected city or town until 2009 to offset lost property tax revenue. Cities and towns may set up power purchasing cooperatives for local customers. Businesses and other organizations may also set up cooperatives. A municipal lighting plant that chooses to sell power outside its own service area must compete with other generating companies within its service area.

The law requires electric utilities to continue energy efficiency and demand management programs until 2003 and directs DTE to ensure that such programs are cost effective. The law imposes a charge on electricity consumers to promote renewable energy projects and to help cities and towns pay to add pollution control equipment to existing trash-to-energy plants. By 2003, power suppliers must provide an annually increasing percentage of power from new renewable sources, and fossil-fuel power plants must start to meet efficiency standards limiting pollution. The law ends the requirement that the state find a need for a proposed power plant but preserves environmental reviews.

The law changes the State Department of Public Utilities to the new DTE, controlled by a 5-member commission with expertise on specified issues. The law gives the state Division of Energy Resources new duties related to energy restructuring, such as educating consumers and helping cities and towns.

A YES VOTE would continue the new law changing the electric utility industry.
A NO VOTE would undo these changes in the electric utility industry.

Yes	434	506	468	1408	430	583	540	1553	645	571	661	1877
No	138	216	156	510	216	258	301	775	329	300	353	982
Blanks	74	77	69	220	55	82	58	195	72	72	98	242

AT THE STATE ELECTION HELD THEREIN, NOVEMBER 3, 1998

WARD FOUR			TOTAL WARD FIVE			TOTAL WARD SIX			TOTAL WARD SEVEN			TOTAL			TOTALS:		
1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3			
850	888	938	2676	965	1009	1034	3008	1261	1217	912	3390	1156	1044	1140	3340		20,176
589	598	624	1811	674	680	644	1998	794	715	563	2072	746	690	761	2197		12,968
143	198	217	558	212	223	289	724	373	357	263	993	290	239	255	784		5,029
118	92	97	307	79	106	101	286	94	145	86	325	120	115	124	359		2,179
551	583	597	1731	619	629	598	1846	687	675	524	1886	715	668	771	2154		12,455
205	240	277	722	291	306	360	957	491	438	327	1256	349	294	301	944		6,146
94	65	64	223	55	74	76	205	83	104	61	248	92	82	68	242		1,575

A TRUE COPY ATTEST:

Mary Walker

CHAIRMAN

RECORD OF ABSENT VOTERS

TABULATED FROM THE TALLY SHEETS OF THE STATE ELECTION HELD NOVEMBER 3, 1998

REGISTERED VOTERS

Ward	Precinct	Ballots Mailed	Ballots Cast	Not Returned	Defective	Returned Too late	Voted In Person	Health Care Facility	Partial Ballots
1	1	15	12	1	1	1	3		
1	2	20	19	1			3		
1	3	13	9	2	2		3		
2	1	12	10	1		1	6		
2	2	18	11	5	2		9		
2	3	17	15	1		1	9		
3	1	19	18		1		12		
3	2	24	20	2	1	1	6	19	
3	3	25	19	3	1	2	7	28	
4	1	21	19		1	1	3	1	
4	2	7	7				6		
4	3	11	9	1	1		6		
5	1	9	7	2			3		
5	2	19	14	4	1		9		
5	3	25	20	2	1	2	8		
6	1	23	19	2	1	1	8		
6	2	14	13	1			8		
6	3	10	9	1			6		
7	1	19	14	4		1	10		
7	2	27	20	1	5	1	5		
7	3	9	7	1	1		9		
TOTALS:		357	291	35	19	12	139	48	

TOTAL BALLOTS CAST: 478

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>	480	667	519	1666	428	442	453	1323	782	710	742	2234
<u>For Mayor:</u>												
John R Buonomo 145 Central Street	291	360	321	972	193	202	216	611	299	267	381	947
Dorothy A Kelly Gay 1 Avon Street	188	296	194	678	231	237	236	704	465	436	355	1256
Write-Ins	0	7	0	7	2	1	0	3	8	6	3	17
Blanks	1	4	4	9	2	2	1	5	10	1	3	14

AT THE SPECIAL ELECTION HELD THEREIN MAY 11, 1999 FOR MAYOR

WARD FOUR				TOTAL			WARD FIVE			TOTAL			WARD SIX			TOTAL			WARD SEVEN			TOTAL			TOTALS:					
1	2	3		1	2	3		1	2	3		1	2	3		1	2	3		1	2	3		1	2	3				
637	661	626	1924	678	751	648	2077	697	777	588	2062	709	776	687	2172															
365	358	306	1029	364	287	305	956	262	286	217	765	347	442	404	1193															
266	294	316	876	310	458	333	1101	430	488	364	1282	359	332	282	973															
	2	3	7	1	2	8	11	4	2	4	10	3	0	0	3															
	4	6	12	3	4	2	9	1	1	3	5	0	2	1	3															

A TRUE COPY ATTEST:

Mary Walker
 MARY WALKER, CHAIRMAN

RECORD OF ABSENT VOTERS

TABULATED FROM THE TALLY SHEETS OF THE SPECIAL ELECTION HELD MAY 11, 1999 FOR MAYOR

REGISTERED VOTERS

Ward	Precinct	Ballots Mailed	Ballots Cast	Not Returned	Defective	Returned Too Late	Voted In Person	Health Care Facility
1	1	17	14	3			1	
1	2	41	33	8			6	
1	3	14	12	1	1			
2	1	13	12		1		4	
2	2	4	2	1	1		2	
2	3	10	10				4	
3	1	29	23	5	1		6	
3	2	27	25	1	1		6	19
3	3	20	17	3			6	42
4	1	13	13				2	
4	2	12	12				6	
4	3	10	10				4	
5	1	6	4	2			5	
5	2	11	5	4		2	4	
5	3	12	10	1	1		1	
6	1	17	16	1			8	
6	2	6	5	1			8	
6	3	8	6	1	1		2	
7	1	7	7				1	
7	2	31	27	3	1		2	
7	3	6	5			1	5	
<u>TOTALS:</u>		314	268	35	8	3	83	61

AT THE CITY ELECTION HELD THEREIN, NOVEMBER 2, 1999

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			
580	538	579	1697	631	686	596	1913	523	565	376	1464	449	507	433	1389		10,803
												316	362	318	996		996
												5	3	6	14		14
												128	142	109	379		379
325	355	390	1070	418	461	406	1285	358	380	266	1004	301	314	280	895		7148
65	68	62	195	83	86	78	247	81	75	61	217	75	60	72	207		1338
190	115	127	432	130	139	112	381	84	110	49	243	73	133	81	287		2317

A TRUE COPY ATTEST:

Mary Walker

CHAIRMAN

3876

RECORD OF ABSENT VOTERS

TABULATED FROM THE TALLY SHEETS OF THE CITY ELECTION HELD NOVEMBER 2, 1999

REGISTERED VOTERS

WARD	PRECINCT	BALLOTS MAILED	BALLOTS CAST	DEFECTIVE	VOTED IN PERSON	RETURNED TOO LATE	NOT RETURNED	HEALTH CARE FACILITY
1	1	20	18				2	
1	2	43	32	6			5	
1	3	11	10		1		1	
2	1	14	13		5		1	
2	2	12	9	1	2		2	
2	3	13	9	1	1	1	2	
3	1	21	14	1	3		6	
3	2	16	13		5		3	15
3	3	25	16	2	6	1	6	38
4	1	20	16	1	2		3	
4	2	10	8		6		2	
4	3	9	8		5		1	
5	1	9	8		6		1	
5	2	15	12		8		3	
5	3	11	11		5			
6	1	18	14	1	2		3	
6	2	9	8		2	1		
6	3	3	3		2			
7	1	6	5		2		1	
7	2	25	16				9	
7	3	7	7		3			
TOTALS:		317	250	13	66	3	51	53
								TOTAL BALLOTS CAST:
								369

RECORD OF ABSENT VOTERS

TABULATED FROM THE TALLY SHEETS OF THE CITY ELECTION HELD NOVEMBER 2, 1999

NON-REGISTERED VOTERS

WARD	PCT	BALLOTS MAILED	BALLOTS CAST	DEFECTIVE	NOT RETURNED
1	1				
1	2				
1	3				
2	1				
2	2				
2	3				
3	1				
3	2				
3	3				
4	1				
4	2				
4	3				
5	1				
5	2				
5	3				
6	1				
6	2				
6	3	2	2		
7	1				
7	2				
7	3				
TOTALS:		2	2		
		TOTAL BALLOTS CAST: 2			

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>	905 904	1058 1056	905	2865 2868	1096 1095	1571 1566	1548 1544	4205 4215	1468 1461	1382 1380	1604	4445 4454
<u>ELECTORS OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT</u>												
Browne and Olivier	5	6	2	13	12	12	13	37	16	10	20	46
Buchanan and Higgins, Sr	5	4	5	14	3	11	5	19	5	1	6	12
Bush and Cheney	132	158	153	443	138	191	214	543	214	232	269	715
Gore and Lieberman	668	791 789	665	2122 2124	765 764	1063 1058	1021 1017	2839 2849	985 979	814 812	1023	2894 2902
Hagelin and Tompkins	0	2	1	3	1	4	0	5	2	1	2	5
Nader and LaDuke	76 75	69	53	197 198	158	274	264	696	218 217	218	253	688 689
Write-Ins	2	2	2	6	4	3	6	13	1	5	6	12
Blanks	17	26	24	67	15	13	25	53	27	21	25	73
<u>SENATOR IN CONGRESS</u>												
Edward M Kennedy	734 733	843 842	735	2310 2312	884	1250 1247	1201 1198	3335 3329	1134 1128	1076 1074	1203	3405 3413
Carla A Howell	60	71	49	180	78	113	127	318	112	110	154	376
Jack E Robinson, III	54	52	48	154	63	99	90	252	90	87	91	268
Dale E Friedgen	2	2	2	6	5	3	3	11	5	2	8	15
Philip Hyde, III	10	16	18	44	14	21	27 26	62 61	31	26	37	94
Philip F Lawler	5	10	7	22	5	10	14	29	9	15	30	54
Write-Ins	0	2	0	2	2	3	7	12	5	5	2	12
Blanks	40	62 61	46	147 148	45 44	72 70	79	196 193	82 81	61	79	221 222
<u>REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS- Eighth District</u>												
Michael E Capuano	783	895 894	790	2467 2468	932	1353 1351	1303 1301	3584 3588	1242 1239	1180 1178	136	3776 3781
Write-Ins	12	16	12	40	18	20	27	65	24 22	18	27	67 69
Blanks	110 109	147 146	103	358 360	146 145	198 193	218 216	556 562	202 200	184	218	602 604
<u>COUNCILLOR -Sixth District</u>												
Michael J Callahan	710 709	809 808	698	2215 2217	850	1236 1235	1185 1184	3269 3271	1090 1088	1038 1036	1207	3329 3335
Write-Ins	5	7	7	19	10	14	21	45	20 19	14	19	52 53
Blanks	190	241	200	631	235	319 317	342 339	891 896	357 356	330	378	1064 1065
<u>SENATOR IN GENERAL COURT - Middlesex, Suffolk, & Essex District</u>												
Thomas F Birmingham	722 721			721 722	837			837				
Write-Ins	7			7	15			15				
Blanks	176			176	243			243				
<u>SENATOR IN GENERAL COURT - Second Middlesex District</u>												
Charles E Shannon, Jr		841 840	730	1570 1571		1235 1234	1187 1186	2420 2422	1129 1124	1071 1069	1220	3413 3420
Write-Ins		13	10	23		17	26	43	15	14	17	46
Blanks		203	165	368		317 315	335 332	647 652	323 322	297	367	986 987
<u>REPRESENTATIVE IN GENERAL COURT Twenty-Ninth Middlesex District</u>												
Timothy J Toomey, Jr	716 715	844 843	727	2285 2287	863	1250 1249		2112 2113				
Write-Ins	7	11	4	22	7	13		20				
Blanks	182	202	174	558	225	306 304		529 531				

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	905 904	1058 1056	905	2865 2868	1096 1095	1571 1566	1548 1544	4205 4215	1468 1461	1382 1380	1604 1604	4445 4454

QUESTION 2 - PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

QUESTION 2: Proposed Amendment to the Constitution

Voting By Incarcerated Felons

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 two houses on July 29, 1998 (years 135 - rays 34), and again on June 28, 2000 (years 144 - rays 43)?

A YES VOTE would amend the constitution to limit the voting rights of incarcerated felons. **A NO VOTE** would make no change in the voting rights of incarcerated felons.

This proposed constitutional amendment would prohibit persons who are incarcerated in a correctional facility due to a felony conviction from voting in elections for governor, lieutenant governor, state senator, or state representative. The amendment would also result in such persons being ineligible to vote for governor's councillor, secretary of state, state treasurer, state auditor, state attorney general, or United States senator or representative in Congress.

Yes	392	505	437	1334	440	601 600	585	1625 1626	606	557 556	684	1846 1847
No	408 407	432	375	1214 1215	544	861 860	880 877	2281 2285	746 740	731 730	811	2281 2288
Blanks	105	120 119	93	317 318	111	107 106	83 82	299 301	115	94	109	318

QUESTION 3 - LAW PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION

QUESTION 3: Law Proposed by Initiative Petition

Dog Racing

Do you approve of a law summarized below, on which no vote was taken by the Senate or the House of Representatives before May 3, 2001?

A YES VOTE would prohibit dog races where betting or wagering occurs. **A NO VOTE** would make no change in the laws governing dog racing.

This proposed law would prohibit in Massachusetts any dog racing or racing meeting where any form of betting or wagering on the speed or ability of dogs occurs.

The State Racing Commission would be prohibited from accepting or approving any application or request for racing dates for dog racing.

Any person violating the proposed law could be required to pay a civil penalty of not less than \$20,000 to the State Racing Commission. The penalty would be used for the

Commission's administrative purposes, subject to appropriation by the state Legislature.

All existing provisions of the part of the state's General Law concerning dog and horse racing meetings would be interpreted as not applying to anything dog-related.

The proposed law would take effect on June 1, 2001. The proposed law states that if any of its parts were declared invalid, the rest of the law would stay in effect.

Yes	442 441	490	393	1324 1325	587	914 913	966 964	2464 2467	834 831	792 790	872	2493 2498
No	378	470	432	1280	422	557	508 507	1486 1487	525 524	507	621	1652 1653
Blanks	85	97 96	80	261 262	86	98 96	74 73	255 258	108 106	83	111	300 302

QUESTION 4 - LAW PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION

QUESTION 4: Law Proposed by Initiative Petition

Income Tax Rate Reduction

Do you approve of a law summarized below, on which no vote was taken by the Senate or the House of Representatives before May 3, 2001?

A YES VOTE would reduce the state personal income tax rate in steps over three years to 5%. **A NO VOTE** would make no change in the state income tax laws.

This proposed law would repeal the law setting the state personal income tax rate on Part B taxable income (such as wages and salaries), which was 5.95% as of September 1, 1999, and would set the rate at 5.6% for tax year 2001, 5.3% for tax year 2002, and 5% for tax year 2003 and after. If the Legislature set

a lower rate for any of those years, that lower rate would apply.

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

Yes	362	473 472	397	1231 1232	430	562	575	1567	563 561	512 510	618	1689 1693
No	453 454	488	434	1376 1377	610	917 916	905 902	2428 2432	829 826	797	887	2510 2513
Blanks	88	96	74	258	55	90 88	68 67	210 213	75 74	73	99	246 247

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			
1120	1236	1289	3645 3646	1375 1372	1448 1445	1586 1582	4399 4409	1840 1839	1694 1693	1389 1387	4919 4923	1624 1621	1525 1522	1581 1589	4732 4740	Overseas & Partial Ballots	29255 29210
604	630	588 587	1821 1822	639 638	626 625	626	1889 1891	745	635	564	1944	677	658	793	2128	Overseas Ballots	12592 12587
395	508	618	1521	613	724 723	863 861	2197 2200	1011	960 959	745 744	2714 2716	853 851	749 748	692	2291 2294	Overseas Ballots	14519 14499
121	98	84	303	121	97	95	313	83	99	79	261	94 93	116	105 104	313 315	Overseas Ballots	2129 2124
479	659	692	1830	678 677	801 800	973 971	2448 2452	1138	1044 1043	842 841	3022 3024	920 919	794	800	2513 2514	Overseas Ballots	16110 16094
548	506	523 522	1576 1577	597	569 568	541	1706 1707	633	554	481	1668	630 629	629	706	1964 1965	Overseas Ballots	11337 11332
93	71	75	239	98	77	70	245	68	96	65	229	74 73	100 99	84 83	255 258	Overseas Ballots	1793 1784
561	550	576 575	1686 1687	562	543 541	578 577	1680 1683	656	657	514	1827	645 643	588	716	1947 1949	Overseas Ballots	11638 11627
478	621	656	1755	697 696	824	947	2467 2468	1129	959 958	810	2897 2898	912	832 831	807	2550 2551	Overseas Ballots	15994 15983
81	65	58	204	114	80	59 58	252 253	54	78	64 63	195 196	67 66	103	67 66	235 237	Overseas Ballots	1608 1600