



STATE ELECTION
COHASSET, MASSACHUSETTS
 Tuesday, November 4, 2014

Polls opened at 7 AM and closed at 8 PM

Election officers sworn in by the Town Clerk, Carol St. Pierre at 7:45 AM were as follows:

Elizabeth Anderson	Elizabeth Durant	Barbara Murray
Carol Anglin	Roy Fitzsimmons	Ruth Nedrow
Carol Barrett	Margaret Goodwin	Chartis Tebbetts
James Carroll	Kelly Grech	Kenneth Warner
Jody Doyle	Rita Killion-Jones	

PRECINCT	1	2	Total
TOTAL REGISTERED VOTERS	2847	2926	5773
TOTAL VOTES CAST	1783	1836	3619
PERCENT OF BALLOTS CAST	62.6%	62.7%	62.7%

Absentees	Pct. 1	Pct. 2	Total
	153	108	261

SENATOR IN CONGRESS

Vote for One

Blanks	79	86	165
EDWARD J. MARKEY	782	876	1658
BRIAN J. HERR	920	871	1791
Write-ins/Scattering	2	3	5
TOTAL	1783	1836	3619

GOVERNOR AND LIETUENANT GOVERNOR

Vote for One

Blanks	11	14	25
BAKER and POLITO	1193	1111	2304
COAKLEY and KERRIGAN	536	641	1177
FALCHUK and JENNINGS	30	48	78
LIVELY and SAUNDERS	4	8	12
McCORMICK and POST	7	13	20
Write-ins/Scattering	2	1	3
TOTAL	1783	1836	3619

ATTORNEY GENERAL

Vote for One

Blanks	87	101	188
MAURA HEALEY	796	921	1717
JOHN B. MILLER	900	809	1709
Write-ins/Scattering	0	5	5
TOTAL	1783	1836	3619

Pct. 1	Pct. 2	TOTAL
--------	--------	-------

SECRETARY OF STATE

Vote for One

Blanks	88	104	192
WILLIAM FRANCIS GALVIN	956	1082	2038
DAVID D'ARCANGELO	705	612	1317
DANIEL L. FACTOR	34	35	69
Write-ins/Scattering	0	3	3
TOTAL	1783	1836	3619

TREASURER

Vote for One

Blanks	121	139	260
DEBORAH B. GOLDBERG	621	760	1381
MICHAEL JAMES HEFFERNAN	1001	896	1897
IAN T. JACKSON	40	39	79
Write-ins/Scattering	0	2	2
TOTAL	1783	1836	3619

Pct. 1	Pct. 2	TOTAL
--------	--------	-------

AUDITOR

Vote for One

Blanks	157	182	339
SUZANNE M. BUMP	690	799	1489
PATRICIA S. SAINT AUBIN	894	811	1705
MK MERELICE	41	42	83
Write-ins/Scattering	1	2	3
TOTAL	1783	1836	3619

REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS

Vote for One

Blanks	592	497	1089
STEPHEN F. LYNCH	1172	1320	2492

Write-ins/Scattering	19	19	38
TOTAL	1783	1836	3619

COUNCILLOR

Vote for One

Blanks	452	401	853
CHRISTOPHER A. IANNELLA, JR.	778	886	1664
JASON M. CROSBY	470	454	924
JOE URENECK	81	88	169
Write-ins/Scattering	2	7	9
TOTAL	1783	1836	3619

Pct. 1	Pct. 2	TOTAL
--------	--------	-------

SENATOR IN GENERAL COURT

Vote for One

Blanks	347	385	732
ROBERT L. HEDLUND, JR.	1426	1433	2859
Write-ins/Scattering	10	18	28
TOTAL	1783	1836	3619

REPRESENTATIVE IN GENERAL COURT

Vote for One

Blanks	520	475	995
GARRETT J. BRADLEY	1253	1341	2594
Write-ins/Scattering	10	20	30
TOTAL	1783	1836	3619

DISTRICT ATTORNEY

Vote for One

Blanks	675	606	1281
MICHAEL W. MORRISSEY	1096	1212	2308
Write-ins/Scattering	12	18	30
TOTAL	1783	1836	3619

REGISTER OF PROBATE

Vote for One

Blanks	745	664	1409
PATRICK W. McDERMOTT	1026	1159	2185
Write-ins/Scattering	12	13	25
TOTAL	1783	1836	3619

COUNTY TREASURER

Vote for One

Blanks	738	662	1400
JOSEPH A. CONNOLLY	1035	1158	2193

Write-ins/Scattering	10	16	26
TOTAL	1783	1836	3619

COUNTY COMMISSIONER

Vote for One

Blanks	256	260	516
PETER H. COLLINS	688	818	1506
MICHAEL J. SOTER	839	755	1594
Write-ins/Scattering	0	3	3
TOTAL	1783	1836	3619

QUESTION 1

LAW PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION

Do you approve of a law summarized below, on which no vote was taken by the Senate or the House of Representatives on or before May 6, 2014?

SUMMARY

This proposed law would eliminate the requirement that the state's gasoline tax, which was 24 cents per gallon as of September 2013, (1) be adjusted every year by the percentage change in the Consumer Price Index over the preceding year, but (2) not be adjusted below 21.5 cents per gallon.

A YES VOTE would eliminate the requirement that the state's gas tax be adjusted annually based on the Consumer Price Index.

A NO VOTE would make no change in the laws regarding the gas tax.

	Pct. 1	Pct. 2	TOTAL
Blanks	70	73	143
YES	958	972	1930
NO	755	791	1546
TOTAL	1783	1836	3619

QUESTION 2

LAW PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION

Do you approve of a law summarized below, on which no vote was taken by the Senate or the House of Representatives on or before May 6, 2014?

SUMMARY

This proposed law would expand the state's beverage container deposit law, also known as the Bottle Bill, to require deposits on containers for all non-alcoholic non-carbonated drinks in liquid form intended for human consumption, except beverages

primarily derived from dairy products, infant formula, and FDA approved medicines. The proposed law would not cover containers made of paper-based biodegradable material and aseptic multi-material packages such as juice boxes or pouches.

The proposed law would require the state Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs (EEA) to adjust the container deposit amount every five years to reflect (to the nearest whole cent) changes in the consumer price index, but the value could not be set below five cents.

The proposed law would increase the minimum handling fee that beverage distributors must pay dealers for each properly returned empty beverage container, which was 2 1/4 cents as of September 2013, to 3 1/2 cents. It would also increase the minimum handling fee that bottlers must pay distributors and dealers for each properly returned empty reusable beverage container, which was 1 cent as of September 2013, to 3 1/2 cents. The Secretary of EEA would review the fee amounts every five years and make appropriate adjustments to reflect changes in the consumer price index as well as changes in the costs incurred by redemption centers. The proposed law defines a redemption center as any business whose primary purpose is the redemption of beverage containers and that is not ancillary to any other business.

The proposed law would direct the Secretary of EEA to issue regulations allowing small dealers to seek exemptions from accepting empty deposit containers. The proposed law would define small dealer as any person or business, including the operator of a vending machine, who sells beverages in beverage containers to consumers, with a contiguous retail space of 3,000 square feet or less, excluding office and stock room space; and fewer than four locations under the same ownership in the Commonwealth. The proposed law would require that the regulations consider at least the health, safety, and convenience of the public, including the distribution of dealers and redemption centers by population or by distance or both.

The proposed law would set up a state Clean Environment Fund to receive certain unclaimed container deposits. The Fund would be used, subject to appropriation by the state Legislature, to support programs such as the proper management of solid waste, water resource protection, parkland, urban forestry, air quality and climate protection.

The proposed law would allow a dealer, distributor, redemption center or bottler to refuse to accept any beverage container that is not marked as being refundable in Massachusetts.

The proposed law would take effect on April 22, 2015.

A YES VOTE would expand the state's beverage container deposit law to require deposits on containers for all non-alcoholic, non-carbonated drinks with certain exceptions, increase the associated handling fees, and make other changes to the law.

A NO VOTE would make no change in the laws regarding beverages container law.

	Pct. 1	Pct. 2	TOTAL
Blanks	38	25	63
YES	557	551	1108
NO	1188	1260	2448
TOTAL	1783	1836	3619

QUESTION 3

LAW PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION

Do you approve of a law summarized below, on which no vote was taken by the the Senate or the House of Representatives on or before May 6, 2014?

SUMMARY

This proposed law would (1) prohibit the Massachusetts Gaming Commission from issuing any license for a casino or other gaming establishment with table games and slot machines, or any license for a gaming establishment with slot machines; (2) prohibit any such casino or slots gaming under any such licenses that the Commission might have issued before the proposed law took effect; and (3) prohibit wagering on the simulcasting of live greyhound races.

The proposed law would change the defining of "illegal gaming" under Massachusetts law to include wagering on the simulcasting of live greyhound races, as well as table games and slot machines at Commission-licensed casinos, and slot machines at other Commission-licensed gaming establishments. This would make those types of gaming subject to existing state laws providing criminal penalties for, or otherwise regulating or prohibiting, activities involving illegal gaming.

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

A YES VOTE would prohibit casinos, any gaming establishment with slot machines, and wagering on simulcast greyhound races.

A NO VOTE would make no change in the current laws regarding gaming.

	Pct. 1	Pct. 2	TOTAL
Blanks	43	52	95
YES	998	840	1838
NO	742	944	1686
TOTAL	1783	1836	3619

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 on or before May 6, 2014?

SUMMARY

This proposed law would entitle employees in Massachusetts to earn and use sick time according to certain conditions.

Employees who work for employers having eleven or more employees could earn and use up to 40 hours of paid sick time per calendar year, while employees working for smaller employers could earn and use up to 40 hours of unpaid sick time per calendar year.

An employee could use earned sick time if required to miss work in order (1) to care for a physical or mental illness, injury or medical condition affecting the employee or the employee's child, spouse, parent, or parent of a spouse; (2) to attend routine medical appointments of the employee or the employee's child, spouse, parent, or parent of a spouse; or (3) to address the effects of domestic violence on the employee or the employee's dependent child. Employees would earn one hour of sick time for every 30 hours worked, and would begin accruing those hours on the date of hire or on July 1, 2015, whichever is later. Employees could begin to use earned sick time on the 90th day after hire.

The proposed law would cover both private and public employers, except that employees of a particular city or town would be covered only if, as required by the state constitution, the proposed law were made applicable by local or state legislative vote or by appropriation of sufficient funds to pay for the benefit. Earned paid sick time would be compensated at the same hourly rate paid to the employee when the sick time is used.

Employees could carry over up to 40 hours of unused sick time to the next calendar year, but could not use more than 40 hours in a calendar year. Employers would not have to pay employees for unused sick time at the end of their employment. If an employee missed work for a reason eligible for earned sick time, but agreed with the employer to work the same number of hours or shifts in the same or next pay period, the employee would not have to use earned sick time for the missed time, and the employer would not have to pay for that missed time. Employers would be prohibited from requiring such an employee to work additional hours to make up for missed time, or to find a replacement employee.

Employers could require certification of the need for sick time if an employee used sick time for more than 24 consecutively scheduled work hours. Employers could not delay the taking of or payment for earned sick time because they have not received the certification.

Employees would have to make a good faith effort to notify the employer in advance if the need for earned sick time is foreseeable.

Employers would be prohibited from interfering with or retaliating based on an employee’s exercise of earned sick time rights, and from retaliating based on an employee’s support of another employee’s exercise of such rights.

The proposed law would not override employers’ obligations under any contract or benefit plan with more generous provisions than those in the proposed law. Employers that have their own policies providing as much paid time off, usable for the same purposes and under the same conditions, as the proposed law would not be required to provide additional paid sick time.

The Attorney General would enforce the proposed law, using the same enforcement procedures applicable to other state wage laws, and employees could file suits in court to enforce their earned sick time rights. The Attorney General would have to prepare a multilingual notice regarding the right to earned sick time, and employers would be required to post the notice in a conspicuous location and to provide a copy to employees. The state Executive Office of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the Attorney General, would develop a multilingual outreach program to inform the public of the availability of earned sick time.

The proposed law would take effect on July 1, 2015, and states that if any of its parts were declared invalid, the other parts would stay in effect.

A YES VOTE would entitle employees in Massachusetts to earn and use sick time according to certain conditions.

A NO VOTE would make no change in the laws regarding earned sick time.

	Pct. 1	Pct. 2	TOTAL
Blanks	70	55	125
YES	772	937	1709
NO	941	844	1785
TOTAL	1783	1836	3619

QUESTION 5

THIS QUESTION IS NOT BINDING

Shall the state representative from this district be instructed to vote in favor of legislation requiring municipal electric utilities (1) to adopt the same net metering rates and policies that are applicable to investor-owned electric utilities, and (2) to adopt rates and policies that do not discriminate against, or impose other financial or technical impediments upon, customers who seek to generate their own electricity from solar power?

Pct. 1	Pct. 2	TOTAL
--------	--------	-------

Blanks	453	461	914
YES	1036	1056	2092
NO	294	319	613
TOTAL	1783	1836	3619