

DOINGS AT THE NOVEMBER 6, 2018 STATE ELECTION

The polls were declared open at 7am by Warden, Stanley Kostek. Clerk was Connie Mieczkowski and Joanne Pliska, checkers were Dale Tessier, Linda Wienser, Tess Barstow, Diane Baj, Pat Zuzgo, Carol Smith, Janet Hukowicz and Sharon Parsons. Ballot box clerks were Jean Fydenkevez and Marlene Merzbach. Counters were: Brenda Tudryn, Vadja Waskiewicz, Janet Barrett and Terry Mushenski. Constables were Mitch Kuc, Harry Santiago, Kenny Hartright and Joe Lafond.

2756 was the registered number on the ballot box including 135 AV’s , 535 EV’s
3 hand counts
12 provisional ballots (3 accepted)
19 SQV & UOCAVA ballots
2781 Grand total of accepted ballots cast.

There were 21 spoiled ballots and 54 affirmations

A total of ____3946____were eligible to vote = 70 % turnout

Tape results were announced by Warden Stanley Kostek @ 8:15pm

SENATOR IN CONGRESS

(D)	*Elizabeth A. Warren received one thousand eight hundred ninety one votes	1891
(R)	Geoff Diehl received seven hundred fifty three votes	753
(I)	Shiva Ayyadurai received ninety six votes	96
	All others	4
	Blanks	37
	Totals	2781

GOVERNOR AND LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR:

(R)	*Baker and Polito received one thousand five hundred seventy one votes	1571
(D)	Gonzalez and Palfrey received one thousand one hundred fifty four votes	1154
	All others	7
	Blanks	49
	Totals	2781

ATTORNEY GENERAL:

(D)	*Maura Healey received two thousand ninety three votes	2093
(R)	James R. McMahon, III received six hundred thirty eight votes	638
	All others	2
	Blanks	48
	Totals	2781

SECRETARY OF STATE:

(D)	*William Francis Galvin received one thousand nine hundred eighty six votes	1986
(R)	Anthony M. Amore received five hundred thirty five votes	535
(GR)	Juan G. Sanchez, Jr. received one hundred sixty two votes	162
	All others	1
	Blanks	97
	Totals	2781

TREASURER:

(D)	*Deborah B. Goldberg received one thousand eight hundred ninety six votes	1896
(R)	Keiko M. Orrall received five hundred eighty three votes	583
(GR)	Jamie M. Guerin received one hundred seventy nine votes	179
	All others	2
	Blanks	121
	Totals	2781

AUDITOR:

(D)	*Suzanne M. Bump received one thousand seven hundred ninety three votes	1793
(R)	Helen Brady received six hundred eight votes	608
(L)	Daniel Fishman received forty nine votes	49
(GR)	Edward J. Stamas received one hundred seventy seven votes	177
	All others	2
	Blanks	152
	Totals	2781

REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS:

(D)	*James P. McGovern received two thousand one hundred twelve votes	2112
(R)	Tracy Lyn Lovvorn received six hundred four votes	604
	All others	2
	Blanks	63
	Totals	2781

COUNCILLOR:

(D)	*Mary E. Hurley received two thousand fifty two votes	2052
(MI)	Mike Franco received five hundred thirty eight votes	538
	All others	5
	Blanks	186
	Totals	2781

SENATOR IN GENERAL COURT:

(D)	Joanne M. Comerford received two thousand two hundred twenty four votes	2224
	All others	26
	Blanks	531
	Totals	2781

REPRESENTATIVE IN GENERAL COURT:

(D)	Daniel R. Carey received two thousand thirty one votes	2031
(R)	Donald Peltier received six hundred eleven votes	611
	All others	9
	Blanks	130
	Totals	2781

DISTRICT ATTORNEY:

(D)	*David E. Sullivan received two thousand three hundred votes	2300
	All others	26
	Blanks	455
	Totals	2781

CLERK OF COURTS:

(D)	*Harry J. Jekanowski received two thousand three hundred sixty one votes	2361
	All others	17
	Blanks	403
	Totals	2781

REGISTRY OF DEEDS:

(D)	Mary K. Olberding received two thousand two hundred thirty six votes	2236
	All others	25
	Blanks	520
	Totals	2781

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 2, 2018?

SUMMARY

This proposed law would limit how many patients could be assigned to each registered nurse in Massachusetts hospitals and certain other health care facilities. The maximum number of patients per registered nurse would vary by type of unit and level of care, as follows:

- In units with step-down/intermediate care patients: 3 patients per nurse;
- In units with post-anesthesia care or operating room patients: 1 patient under anesthesia per nurse; 2 patients post-anesthesia per nurse;
- In the emergency services department: 1 critical or intensive care patient per nurse (or 2 if the nurse has assessed each patient’s condition as stable); 2 urgent non-stable patients per nurse; 3 urgent stable patients per nurse; or 5 non-urgent stable patients per nurse;
- In units with maternity patients: (a) active labor patients: 1 patient per nurse; (b) during birth and for up to two hours immediately postpartum: 1 mother per nurse and 1 baby per nurse; (c) when the condition of the mother and baby are determined to be stable: 1 mother and her baby or babies per nurse; (d) postpartum: 6 patients per nurse; (e) intermediate care or continuing care babies: 2 babies per nurse; (f) well-babies: 6 babies per nurse;
- In units with pediatric, medical, surgical, telemetry, or observational/outpatient treatment patients, or any other unit: 4 patients per nurse; and
- In units with psychiatric or rehabilitation patients: 5 patients per nurse.

The proposed law would require a covered facility to comply with the patient assignment limits without reducing its level of nursing, service, maintenance, clerical, professional, and other staff.

The proposed law would also require every covered facility to develop a written patient acuity tool for each unit to evaluate the condition of each patient. This tool would be used by nurses in deciding whether patient limits should be lower than the limits of the proposed law at any given time.

The proposed law would not override any contract in effect on January 1, 2019 that set higher patient limits. The proposed law’s limits would take effect after any such contract expired.

The state Health Policy Commission would be required to promulgate regulations to implement the proposed law. The Commission could conduct inspections to ensure compliance with the law. Any facility receiving written notice from the Commission of a complaint or a violation would be required to submit a written compliance plan to the Commission. The Commission could report violations to the state Attorney General, who could file suit to obtain a civil penalty of up to \$25,000 per violation as well as up to \$25,000 for each day a violation continued after the Commission notified the covered facility of the violation. The Health Policy Commission would be required to establish a toll-free telephone number for complaints and a website where complaints, compliance plans, and violations would appear.

The proposed law would prohibit discipline or retaliation against any employee for complying with the patient assignment limits of the law. The proposed law would require every covered facility to post within each unit, patient room, and waiting area a notice explaining the patient limits and how to report violations. Each day of a facility’s non-compliance with the posting requirement would be punishable by a civil penalty between \$250 and \$2,500.

The proposed law’s requirements would be suspended during a state or nationally declared public health emergency.

The proposed law states that, if any of its parts were declared invalid, the other parts would stay in effect. The proposed law would take effect on January 1, 2019.

A YES VOTE would limit the number of patients that could be assigned to one registered nurse in hospitals and certain other health care facilities.

A NO VOTE would make no change in current laws relative to patient-to-nurse limits.

Yes votes received nine hundred seventy one votes	971
No votes received on thousand six hundred forty nine votes	1649
Blanks	161
Totals	2781

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 2, 2018?

SUMMARY

This proposed law would create a citizens commission to consider and recommend potential amendments to the United States Constitution to establish that corporations do not have the same Constitutional rights as human beings and that campaign contributions and expenditures may be regulated.

Any resident of Massachusetts who is a United States citizen would be able to apply for appointment to the 15-member commission, and members would serve without compensation. The Governor, the Secretary of the Commonwealth, the state Attorney General, the Speaker of the state House of Representatives, and the President of the state Senate would each appoint three members of the commission and, in making these appointments, would seek to ensure that the commission reflects a range of geographic, political, and demographic backgrounds.

The commission would be required to research and take testimony, and then issue a report regarding (1) the impact of political spending in Massachusetts; (2) any limitations on the state’s ability to regulate corporations and other entities in light of Supreme Court decisions that allow corporations to assert certain constitutional rights; (3) recommendations for constitutional amendments; (4) an analysis of constitutional amendments introduced to Congress; and (5) recommendations for advancing proposed amendments to the United States Constitution.

The commission would be subject to the state Open Meeting Law and Public Records Law. The commission’s first report would be due December 31, 2019, and the Secretary of the Commonwealth would be required to deliver the commission’s report to the state Legislature, the United States Congress, and the President of the United States.

The proposed law states that, if any of its parts were declared invalid, the other parts would stay in effect. The proposed law would take effect on January 1, 2019.

A YES VOTE would create a citizens commission to advance an amendment to the United States Constitution to limit the influence of money in elections and establish that corporations do not have the same rights as human beings.

A NO VOTE would not create this commission.

Yes votes received two thousand eighty seven votes	2087
No votes received six hundred thirteen votes	613
Blanks	81
Totals	2781

QUESTION 3: LAW PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION

Do you approve of a law summarized below, which was approved by the House of Representatives and the Senate on July 7, 2016?

SUMMARY

This law adds gender identity to the list of prohibited grounds for discrimination in places of public accommodation, resort, or amusement. Such grounds also include race, color, religious creed, national origin, sex, disability, and ancestry. A “place of public accommodation, resort or amusement” is defined in existing law as any place that is open to and accepts or solicits the patronage of the general public, such as hotels, stores, restaurants, theaters, sports facilities, and hospitals. “Gender identity” is defined as a person’s sincerely held gender-related identity, appearance, or behavior, whether or not it is different from that traditionally associated with the person’s physiology or assigned sex at birth.

This law prohibits discrimination based on gender identity in a person’s admission to or treatment in any place of public accommodation. The law requires any such place that has separate areas for males and females (such as restrooms) to allow access to and full use of those areas consistent with a person’s gender identity. The law also prohibits the owner or manager of a place of public accommodation from using advertising or signage that discriminates on the basis of gender identity.

This law directs the state Commission Against Discrimination to adopt rules or policies and make recommendations to carry out this law. The law also directs the state Attorney General to issue regulations or guidance on referring for legal action any person who asserts gender identity for an improper purpose.

The provisions of this law governing access to places of public accommodation are effective as of October 1, 2016. The remaining provisions are effective as of July 8, 2016.

A YES VOTE would keep in place the current law, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of gender identity in places of public accommodation.

A **NO VOTE** would repeal this provision of the public accommodation law.

Yes votes received two thousand ninety two votes	2092
No votes received six hundred thirty one votes	631
Blanks	58
Totals	2781

QUESTION 4: THIS QUESTION IS NOT BINDING

Shall the state representative from this District be instructed to vote for legislation to create a single-payer system of universal health care that would provide all Massachusetts residents with comprehensive health care coverage including the freedom to choose doctors and other health care professionals, facilities,and services, and that would eliminate the role of insurance companies in health care by creating a publicly administered insurance trust fund?

Yes votes received one thousand eight hundred sixty four votes	1864
No votes received six hundred seventy five votes	675
Blanks	242
Total	2781

ATTEST:

Jessica Spanknebel
Town Clerk

