

3,028 Voters = 64%

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts

STATE ELECTION

OFFICIAL SPECIMEN BALLOT

MATTAPOISETT

271/271

Penalty for willfully defacing, tearing down, removing or destroying a List of Candidates or Specimen Ballot - fine not exceeding One Hundred Dollars.

SECRETARY OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Tuesday, November 4, 2014

To vote for a candidate, connect the arrow to the right of the candidate's name. To vote for a person not on the ballot, write that person's name and residence in the blank space provided and connect the arrow.

SENATOR IN CONGRESS. EDWARD J. MARKEY 1600, BRIAN J. HERR 1286, DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE 135, WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY 2

GOVERNOR AND LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR. BAKER and POLITO 1637, COAKLEY and KERRIGAN 1184, FALCHUK and JENNINGS 83, LIVELY and SAUNDERS 33, McCORMICK and POST 32, DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE 53, WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY 1

ATTORNEY GENERAL. MAURA HEALEY 1523, JOHN B. MILLER 1359, DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE 139, WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY 0

SECRETARY OF STATE. WILLIAM FRANCIS GALVIN 1746, DAVID D'ARCANGELO 1037, DANIEL L. FACTOR 75, DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE 165, WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY 0

TREASURER. DEBORAH B. GOLDBERG 1327, MICHAEL JAMES HEFFERNAN 1394, IAN T. JACKSON 91, DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE 211, WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY 0

AUDITOR. SUZANNE M. BUMP 1350, PATRICIA S. SAINT AUBIN 1354, MK MERELICE 72, DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE 246, WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY 1

REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS. WILLIAM RICHARD KEATING 1604, JOHN C. CHAPMAN 1304, DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE 114, WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY 1

COUNCILLOR. JOSEPH C. FERREIRA 1864, DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE 1125, WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY 34

SENATOR IN GENERAL COURT. MARK C. MONTIGNY 2042, DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE 942, WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY 39

REPRESENTATIVE IN GENERAL COURT. WILLIAM M. STRAUS 1959, ABILIO BILL SOARES 940, DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE 124, WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY 0

DISTRICT ATTORNEY. TIMOTHY J. CRUZ 2152, DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE 836, WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY 35

REGISTER OF PROBATE. MATTHEW J. McDONOUGH 1356, ANTHONY THOMAS O'BRIEN, SR. 1337, DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE 329, WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY 1

COUNTY TREASURER. THOMAS J. O'BRIEN 1906, DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE 1085, WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY 32

COUNTY COMMISSIONER. SANDRA M. WRIGHT 1561, SCOTT M. VECCHI 1077, DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE 385, WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY 0

QUESTION 1 LAW PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION. Do you approve of a law summarized below... SUMMARY. YES 1496, NO 1316, Blank 211

QUESTION 2 LAW PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION. Do you approve of a law summarized below... SUMMARY. The proposed law would expand the state's beverage container deposit law...

CONTINUE ON BACK

VOTE BOTH SIDES

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 beverage container deposits.

YES ← 643
NO ← 2292

QUESTION 3 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 (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 definition 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.

Blanks 88

YES ← 1312
NO ← 605
106

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.

YES ← 1409
NO ← 1485
129

QUESTION 5 THIS QUESTION IS NOT BINDING

Shall the state representative from this district be instructed to vote in favor of a resolution calling upon Congress to propose an amendment to the U.S. Constitution affirming that 1) rights protected under the Constitution are the rights of natural persons only and 2) both Congress and the states may place limits on political contributions and political spending?

YES ← 1758
NO ← 644

271/271

621