



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															
			7	1	2	8	11	4	2	4	10	3	0	0	3															
			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	Defec- tive	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									
580	538	579	1697	631	686	596	1913	523	565	376	1464	449	507	433	1389								10,803
								368	402	258	1028												1028
								11	8	2	21												21
								144	155	116	415												415
												321	390	335	1046								1046
												6	2	4	12								12
												122	115	94	331								331
																							949
																							11
																							309
																							1088
																							12
																							393
																							1074
																							28
																							476
262	241	246	749																				749
201	208	254	663																				663
4	4	3	11																				11
113	85	76	274																				274
				330	215	204	749																749
				265	441	334	1040																1040
				0	3	1	4																4
				36	27	57	120																120
								363	387	254	1004												1004
								8	4	3	15												15
								152	174	119	445												445



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	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 <del>904</del>	1058 <del>1056</del>	905	2865 <del>2868</del>	1096 <del>1095</del>	1571 <del>1566</del>	1548 <del>1544</del>	4205 <del>4215</del>	1468 <del>1461</del>	1382 <del>1380</del>	1604	4445 <del>4454</del>	
<u>ELECTORS OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT</u>													
Browne and Olivier	Libertarian	5	6	2	13	12	12	13	37	16	10	20	46
Buchanan and Higgins, Sr	Reform Party	5	4	5	14	3	11	5	19	5	1	6	12
Bush and Cheney	Republican	132	158	153	443	138	191	214	543	214	232	269	715
Gore and Lieberman	Democratic	668	791 <del>789</del>	665	2122 <del>2124</del>	765 <del>764</del>	1063 <del>1058</del>	1021 <del>1017</del>	2839 <del>2849</del>	985 <del>979</del>	814 <del>812</del>	1023	2894 <del>2902</del>
Hagelin and Tompkins	Unenrolled	0	2	1	3	1	4	0	5	2	1	2	5
Nader and LaDuke	Mass. Green Party	76 <del>75</del>	69	53	197 <del>198</del>	158	274	264	696	218 <del>217</del>	218	253	688 <del>689</del>
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	Democratic	734 <del>733</del>	843 <del>842</del>	735	2310 <del>2312</del>	884	1250 <del>1247</del>	1201 <del>1198</del>	3335 <del>3329</del>	1134 <del>1128</del>	1076 <del>1074</del>	1203	3405 <del>3413</del>
Carla A Howell	Libertarian	60	71	49	180	78	113	127	318	112	110	154	376
Jack E Robinson, III	Republican	54	52	48	154	63	99	90	252	90	87	91	268
Dale E Friedgen	Unenrolled	2	2	2	6	5	3	3	11	5	2	8	15
Philip Hyde, III	Timesizing not Downsizing	10	16	18	44	14	21	27 <del>26</del>	62 <del>61</del>	31	26	37	94
Philip F Lawler	Constitution Party	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 <del>61</del>	46	147 <del>148</del>	45 <del>44</del>	72 <del>70</del>	79	196 <del>193</del>	82 <del>81</del>	61	79	221 <del>222</del>
<u>REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS- Eighth District</u>													
Michael E Capuano	Democratic	783	895 <del>894</del>	790	2467 <del>2468</del>	932	1353 <del>1351</del>	1303 <del>1301</del>	3584 <del>3588</del>	1242 <del>1239</del>	1180 <del>1178</del>	136	3776 <del>3781</del>
Write-Ins		12	16	12	40	18	20	27	65	24 <del>22</del>	18	27	67 <del>69</del>
Blanks		110 <del>109</del>	147 <del>146</del>	103	358 <del>360</del>	146 <del>145</del>	198 <del>193</del>	218 <del>216</del>	556 <del>562</del>	202 <del>200</del>	184	218	602 <del>604</del>
<u>COUNCILLOR -Sixth District</u>													
Michael J Callahan	Democratic	710 <del>709</del>	809 <del>808</del>	698	2215 <del>2217</del>	850	1236 <del>1235</del>	1185 <del>1184</del>	3269 <del>3271</del>	1090 <del>1088</del>	1038 <del>1036</del>	1207	3329 <del>3335</del>
Write-Ins		5	7	7	19	10	14	21	45	20 <del>19</del>	14	19	52 <del>53</del>
Blanks		190	241	200	631	235	319 <del>317</del>	342 <del>339</del>	891 <del>896</del>	357 <del>356</del>	330	378	1064 <del>1065</del>
<u>SENATOR IN GENERAL COURT - Middlesex, Suffolk, &amp; Essex District</u>													
Thomas F Birmingham	Democratic	722 <del>721</del>			721 <del>722</del>	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	Democratic		841 <del>840</del>	730	1570 <del>1571</del>		1235 <del>1234</del>	1187 <del>1186</del>	2420 <del>2422</del>	1129 <del>1124</del>	1071 <del>1069</del>	1220	3413 <del>3420</del>
Write-Ins			13	10	23		17	26	43	15	14	17	46
Blanks			203	165	368		317 <del>315</del>	335 <del>332</del>	647 <del>652</del>	323 <del>322</del>	297	367	986 <del>987</del>
<u>REPRESENTATIVE IN GENERAL COURT Twenty-Ninth Middlesex District</u>													
Timothy J Toomey, Jr	Democratic	716 <del>715</del>	844 <del>843</del>	727	2285 <del>2287</del>	863	1250 <del>1249</del>		2112 <del>2113</del>				
Write-Ins		7	11	4	22	7	13		20				
Blanks		182	202	174	558	225	306 <del>304</del>		529 <del>531</del>				









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, 2007?

**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, 2007?

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

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

Ward One Total Ward Two Total Ward Three Total

Total Number of Votes Cast

1	2	3		1	2	3		1	2	3	
905	1058		2865	1096	1571	1548	4203	1468	1332		4445
904	1056	905	2868	1095	1566	1544	4215	1461	1380	1604	4454

QUESTION 5 - LAW PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION

QUESTION 5: Law Proposed by Initiative Petition

10

Health Insurance and Health Care

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, 2000?

**A YES VOTE** would require health insurance carriers to guarantee certain rights to their patients and providers, and it would prohibit the conversion of non-profit hospitals, HMOs, and health insurers into for-profit entities until a system is created to provide comprehensive health care coverage for all Massachusetts residents.

**A NO VOTE** would make no change in the laws governing health insurance and health care.

This proposed law would set up a state Health Care Council to review and recommend legislation for a health care system that ensures comprehensive, high quality health care coverage for all Massachusetts residents. Until the Council decided that such a system had been set up, the proposed law would prohibit the conversion of non-profit hospitals, health maintenance organizations (HMOs), and health insurance firms to for-profit status. The proposed law would also require health insurance carriers to provide certain rights to patients and health care professionals, starting January 1, 2001.

The Council would recommend laws to set up, and would decide whether laws had been passed to ensure, a health care system that provides:

- barrier-free access to health care services;
- patients' freedom to choose their health care providers, get second opinions, and appeal denials of care;
- health care professionals' freedom to act solely in the best interest of their patients;
- affordable coverage, with cost increases no greater than national averages;
- preserving and increasing the quality of care and encouraging research;
- at least 90% of all premiums to be used for patient care, public health, and training/research, and no more than 10% for administrative costs, with simpler paperwork and administration;
- a prohibition of financial incentives that limit patient access to health care, and limits on incentives for inappropriate care.

The Council would include 17 members representing health care and other organizations. It would hold public hearings, study proposals, and make recommendations to the state Commissioner of Public Health and the Legislature on laws and other steps needed to set up a system meeting the above requirements. The proposed law would also create a special legislative committee, including legislators and members of the Council, to make recommendations by September 30, 2001, for laws to set up a system meeting the above requirements by July 1, 2002.

Starting January 1, 2001, the proposed law would require health insurance carriers to guarantee certain rights to their insured patients and to health care professionals. These rights would include:

- patients' right to choose all of their health care providers, subject to the approval of a freely chosen primary care provider who has no financial incentive to deny care, and subject to payment of a reasonable extra fee to see a provider outside the carrier's network;
- health care professionals' right to make medical decisions in consultation with their patients;
- patients' right to transitional insurance coverage when they are undergoing a course of treatment from a health care provider whose contract with a carrier is being terminated;
- patients' right to medically necessary referrals to specialists;
- limits on and disclosure of contracts between carriers and health care providers that create financial incentives to delay or limit care or provide inappropriate care;
- health care professionals' right to discuss health benefit plans with insured patients and to advocate on behalf of their patients;
- carriers could not terminate health care providers' contracts without cause;
- patients' right to receive emergency services, subject to authorization procedures, and to be reimbursed when they pay cash for emergency services from providers not affiliated with their carrier;
- utilization review procedures that meet specific standards, including patients' right to appeal to the Commissioner of Public Health;
- in any year at least 90% of a carrier's Massachusetts revenue must be spent on Massachusetts health care, and a carrier that spent more than 10% for non-health care purposes would have to refund the excess to its insured patients. Each carrier would have to report its revenues, premiums, and expenditures to the state Commissioner of Insurance every year.

The proposed law states that it would not interfere with any existing contract, including contract terms (such as automatic renewal or option clauses) that may go into effect after January 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	1136 435	526 525	443	1403 1405	622	834 835	875 871	2326 2331	823 818	757 755	834	2407 2414
No	372	424	379	1175	403	613	579	1595	547	541	647	1735
Blanks	97	107	83	287	70	122 120	94	284 286	97 96	84	123	303 304

QUESTION 6 - LAW PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION

QUESTION 6: Law Proposed by Initiative Petition

12

Tax Credit for Tolls and Motor Vehicle Excise Taxes

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, 2000?

**A YES VOTE** would allow a state personal income tax or corporate excise tax credit for Massachusetts tolls and motor vehicle excise taxes.

**A NO VOTE** would make no change in the state tax laws.

This proposed law would allow a state personal income taxpayer a tax credit equal to the amount of tolls the taxpayer paid during the taxable year on all Massachusetts roads, highways, tunnels, and bridges, including the Massachusetts Turnpike and its Boston Extension, the Tobin Bridge, and the Summer, Callahan, and Ted Williams Tunnels. Also, a corporation would be allowed a credit against its corporate excise taxes in an amount equal to all such tolls paid during the taxable year by the corporation or by its employees in furtherance of the corporation's business.

porate excise taxes in an amount equal to all registered motor vehicle excise taxes the corporation paid during the taxable year.

The tax credits could not be used to reduce a personal income taxpayer's taxes below zero or a corporate excise taxpayer's taxes below the minimum levels set by state law. Any amount of tax credit not usable in a taxable year because of these limits could be carried over and used in later taxable years, for up to ten years.

The proposed law would also allow a state personal income taxpayer a tax credit equal to the amount of excise taxes on registered motor vehicles the taxpayer paid during the taxable year. A corporation would be allowed a credit against its cor-

porate excise taxes in an amount equal to all registered motor vehicle excise taxes the corporation paid during the taxable year. The proposed law states that if any of its parts were declared invalid, the other parts would stay in effect.

Yes	268	353 352	312	932 933	342	408 407	402 401	1150 1152	427 425	365 364	457	1246 1249
No	535 534	603	511	1648 1649	684	1061 1060	1070 1067	2811 2815	950 947	933 932	1028	2907 2911
Blanks	102	101	82	285	69	100 99	76	244 245	90 89	84	119	292 293

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	Overseas	Partial Ballots		
1120	1236	<del>1289</del>	<del>3645</del>	1375	1448	<del>1586</del>	<del>1399</del>	1840	1694	1389	4919	1624	1525	1591	4732			29255
		1289	3646	1372	1445	1582	4409	1839	1693	1387	4923	1621	1522	1589	4740			29210
534	648	<del>673</del>	<del>1854</del>	705	757	879	2337	999	917	717	2632	877	750	773	2397	Overseas Ballots		15379
		672	1855	704	755	878	2341	999	916	717	2633	875	749	773	2400			15356
476	498	537	1511	540	594	615	1749	739	677	597	2013	649	652	711	2012			11790
110	90	80	280	128	96	90	313	101	100	74	274	98	106	105	323	Overseas Ballots		2071
						89	314			73	275	97	121	105	325			2064
408	432	451	1291	429	412	410	1249	423	438	370	1231	485	445	530	1458	Overseas Ballots		8567
					410	410	1251	423	438	370	1231	483	445	530	1460			8557
604	726	<del>774</del>	<del>2104</del>	819	819	943	1101	1335	1170	945	3450	1065	959	967	2991	Overseas Ballots		18785
		774	2105	818	943	1099	8863	1335	1170	945	3450	1065	959	967	2992			18771
108	78	64	250	125	92	73	290	81	86	73	238	74	118	93	283	Overseas Ballots		1888
								81	85	72	240	73	118	92	285			1882

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 4454

QUESTION 7 - LAW PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION

QUESTION 7: Law Proposed by Initiative Petition 14

**Tax Deduction for Charitable Contributions**

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, 2007?

**A YES VOTE** would create a state income tax deduction for charitable contributions. **A NO VOTE** would make no change in the state income tax laws.

This proposed law would allow taxpayers who give to charity a state personal income tax deduction for those charitable contributions. A taxpayer could take a deduction from any Part B income, including wages and salaries, of an amount equal to his or her charitable contributions for the year. The taxpayer could take the deduction whether or not the taxpayer itemized deductions on his or her federal income tax return. The proposed law would apply to any contribution that met the definition of charitable contribution used under federal income tax law. The proposed law would apply to taxable years beginning on or after January 1, 2001.

Yes

No

Blanks

500 499	640	522	1661 1662	690	968 966	1021 1017	2673 2679	901 896	843 841	1069	2806 2813
287	294 293	286	866 867	317	467	416	1200	433	435	399	1267
118	123	97	338	88	134 133	111	332 333	133 132	104	136	372 373

QUESTION 8 - LAW PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION

QUESTION 8: Law Proposed by Initiative Petition 15

**Drug-Dependency Treatment and Drug-Crime Fines and Forfeitures**

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, 2007?

**A YES VOTE** would change state laws governing drug-dependency treatment and fines paid and money and property forfeited in connection with drug crimes. **A NO VOTE** would make no change in the laws governing drug-dependency treatment and fines and forfeitures based on drug crimes.

This proposed law would create a state Drug Treatment Trust Fund, to be used, subject to appropriation by the state Legislature, solely for the treatment of drug-dependent persons. The Fund would include fines paid under the state's criminal drug laws; money forfeited because of its use in connection with drug crimes; and the proceeds from selling property forfeited because of its use in connection with drug crimes. The Fund would be administered by the state's Director of Drug Rehabilitation. Money in the Fund would be spent to increase, rather than replace, existing government funding for drug treatment programs. Those programs would be expanded to apply to persons who are at risk of becoming drug-dependent and to include drug abuse prevention through education. The proposed law would expand eligibility for the program under which a person charged with a drug crime may request a court finding that he is drug-dependent and would benefit from court-monitored treatment. If the court so finds, and the person then successfully completes a treatment program, the criminal charges are dismissed. The proposed law would allow requests to enter this program by persons who are at risk of becoming drug dependent and by persons charged with a first or second offense of manufacturing, distributing, or dispensing a controlled substance, or possessing a controlled substance with the intent to do any of those things, or trafficking 14 to 28 grams of cocaine. The proposed law would change the state law governing forfeiture of money and property used in connection with drug crimes. Land and buildings could not be forfeited if used in a manner that was merely incidental to a drug crime. The state would have to prove by clear and convincing evidence that money or property was subject to forfeiture, and the property owner could then try to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the money or property was legally exempt from forfeiture. All forfeited money, instead of being divided between the prosecuting agency and responsible police department and used for law enforcement purposes, would be put in the Fund. All forfeited property, instead of being so divided and used, would be sold and the proceeds put in the Fund. Records of all state and local forfeiture activities would have to be kept and made public unless harm to law enforcement efforts would result. The state Inspector General could audit and investigate these activities. Any official who concealed or diverted any forfeited money or property could be punished by a fine of up to \$1000, imprisonment for up to one year, or both. The proposed law states that if any of its parts were declared invalid, the rest of the law would remain in effect.

Yes

No

Blanks

449	548 547	458	1454 1455	671	987 985	1009 1006	2662 2667	896 891	830 828	977	2696 2703
335 334	387	343	1064 1065	333	449	432	1214	449	451	489	1389
121	122	104	347	91	133 132	107 106	329 331	122 121	101	138	360 361

QUESTION 9 - THIS QUESTION IS NOT BINDING

QUESTION 9 THIS QUESTION IS NOT BINDING

Shall the state representative from this district be instructed to vote in favor of legislation that would end all medical and psychological experiments on nonhuman primates in Massachusetts?

Yes

No

Blanks

281 280		280 281	361		361
367		367	471		471
257		257	263		263



3936

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	4445 4454

QUESTION 9 - THIS QUESTION IS NOT BINDING

**QUESTION 9 THIS QUESTION IS NOT BINDING**  
 Shall the state senator from this district be instructed to vote in favor of legislation that would make possession of less than one ounce of marijuana a civil violation, subject to a fine of no more than \$100 and not subject to any criminal penalties?

Yes		488	436	924	976 974	946 992	1966 1972	881 876	835 833	944	2653 2660
No		314 313	273	586 587	326	336	662	326	309	345	980
Blanks		255	196	451	267 266	216	482 483	260 259	238	315	812 813

QUESTION 10 - THIS QUESTION IS NOT BINDING

**QUESTION 10 THIS QUESTION IS NOT BINDING**  
 Shall the state representative from this district be instructed to vote in favor of legislation that would end all medical and psychological experiments on nonhuman primates in Massachusetts?

Yes		314	315	629	510 509		509 510				
No		458 457	376	833 834	739		739				
Blanks		285	214	499	320 318		318 320				

QUESTION 10 - THIS QUESTION IS NOT BINDING

**QUESTION 10 THIS QUESTION IS NOT BINDING**  
 Shall the state representative from this district be instructed to vote in favor of legislation that equitably invests state funds in local public schools; reduces class size; excludes use of voucher programs that shift funds away from public education; bars for-profit schools from public funding; suspends the MCAS tests as the criteria for promotion or graduation, and establishes a fair system of assessing educational progress for students and schools?

Yes					1019 1015	1015 1019	836 832	834 832	930	2594 2600
No					273	337 336	268	328	932 933	
Blanks					256	294 293	280	346	919 920	



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	Overseas & Partial Ballots	29255	29210	
1120	1236	<del>1289</del> 1290	<del>3645</del> 3646	<del>1375</del> 1372	<del>1448</del> 1445	<del>1586</del> 1582	<del>4399</del> 4409	<del>1840</del> 1839	<del>1694</del> 1693	<del>1389</del> 1387	<del>4919</del> 4923	<del>1624</del> 1621	<del>1525</del> 1522	<del>1591</del> 1589	<del>4732</del> 4740			
518	651	<del>746</del> 745	<del>1914</del> 1915	740	<del>832</del> 830	<del>974</del> 972	<del>2542</del> 2546	1199	<del>1087</del> 1086	<del>876</del> 875	<del>3160</del> 3162	<del>966</del> 964	<del>882</del> 881	894	<del>2739</del> 2742			Overseas Ballots
306	320	318	944	371	351	355	1077	391	352	330	1073	349	322	364	1035			14945
296	265	226	787	<del>262</del> 261	264	255	<del>780</del> 781	249	255	182	686	<del>309</del> 308	319	<del>332</del> 331	<del>958</del> 960			14922
			435															7204
	435																	7203
	506																	5091
																		5086
	295																	1574
																		1573
																		2079
																		2078
																		1114
																		1112
																		9230
																		9215
																		3211
																		3210
																		2885
																		2882

A TRUE COPY ATTEST:

*Mary Walker*

MARY WALKER, CHAIRMAN

RECORD OF ABSENT VOTERS (71)

TABULATED FROM THE TALLY SHEETS OF THE STATE ELECTION HELD NOVEMBER 7, 2000

UNREGISTERED VOTERS

	Wd	Pct	Ballots Mailed	Ballots Cast	Not Returned	Defective	Too Late	Partial Ballots
	1	1	1			1		
	1	2	1	1				1
	1	3	1	1				
	2	1	3	2	1			
	2	2	6	2	2	1	1	2
	2	3	5	4		1		
	3	1						
	3	2	3	2	1			
	3	3	5	3	1	1		
	4	1						
	4	2	1		1			
	4	3	6	5	1			
	5	1	5	3	2			1
	5	2	10	7	2	1		1
	5	3	5	3	1	1		2
	6	1	11	5	3	2	1	
	6	2	9	7	1		1	
	6	3	7	3	3	1		1
	7	1	6	6				
	7	2	6	4	1	1		2
	7	3	6	3	2		1	
TOTALS:			97	61	22	10	4	10

RECORD OF ABSENT VOTERS (1202)

TABULATED FROM THE TALLY SHEETS OF THE STATE ELECTION HELD NOVEMBER 7, 2000

Wd	Pct	Ballots Mailed	Ballots Cast	Not Returned	Defective	Returned Too Late	Voted In Person	Health Care Facility	Partial Ballots
1	1	35	28	5	1	1	12		
1	2	43	40	2		1	13		
1	3	16	13	1	1	1	6		
2	1	36	29	6	1		19		1
2	2	32	25	6		1	31		
2	3	43	37	4		2	16		
3	1	50	40	4	4	2	21		1
3	2	44	39	4		1	15	16	
3	3	56	45	6	1	4	27	51	
4	1	25	18	5	2		9		
4	2	23	19	2		2	14		
4	3	33	31			2	23		
5	1	30	25	3	1	1	22	41	1
5	2	41	36	3		2	25		
5	3	38	33	3		2	19		
6	1	70	58	9		3	39		1
6	2	50	41	7		2	25		
6	3	30	24	5		1	10		
7	1	38	36	1		1	18		
7	2	39	31	5	1	2	19		
7	3	41	35	5	1		23		1
TOTALS:		813	683	86	13	31	406	108	5