

<b>WEBSITE</b>	<b>STATE ELECTION</b>							
	<b>Montague, MA</b>							
	<b>Tuesday, November 04, 2014</b>							

According to the forgoing warrant, the legal votes of the six precincts of the Town of Montague, met in their respective polling places and cast votes for the following named offices is of which the following the total vote as returned by the Precinct Officers.

<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF BALLOTS CAST</b>			
			Turnout by precinct
PRECINCT 1		729	63.12%
PRECINCT 2		508	50.25%
PRECINCT 3		516	56.15%
PRECINCT 4		540	51.33%
PRECINCT 5		302	38.72%
PRECINCT 6		453	49.03%
<b>TOTAL</b>		3048	52.18%

<b>SENATOR IN CONGRESS</b>							<b>Vote for One</b>	
PRECINCT	1	2	3	4	5	6	TOTAL	
EDWARD J. MARKEY	591	364	367	384	238	322	2266	
BRIAN J. HERR	129	124	125	128	53	118	677	
rev charles dimoscola				1			1	
rob mclaughlin			1				1	
							0	
BLANKS	9	20	23	27	11	13	103	
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>729</b>	<b>508</b>	<b>516</b>	<b>540</b>	<b>302</b>	<b>453</b>	<b>3048</b>	

<b>GOVERNOR and LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR</b>							<b>Vote for One</b>	
PRECINCT	1	2	3	4	5	6	TOTAL	
BAKER and POLITO	153	162	194	186	68	153	916	
COAKLEY and KERRIGAN	510	273	248	287	205	243	1766	
FALCHUK and JENNINGS	39	45	46	32	20	34	216	
LIVELY and SAUNDERS	12	10	13	15	5	9	64	
McCORMICK and POST	8	6	5	8	1	7	35	
eric damkoehler				1			1	
BLANKS	7	12	10	11	3	7	50	
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>729</b>	<b>508</b>	<b>516</b>	<b>540</b>	<b>302</b>	<b>453</b>	<b>3048</b>	

<b>ATTORNEY GENERAL</b>							<b>Vote for One</b>	
PRECINCT	1	2	3	4	5	6	TOTAL	
MAURA HEALEY	584	354	350	366	240	305	2199	
JOHN B. MILLER	134	132	149	149	55	132	751	
							0	
BLANKS	11	22	17	25	7	16	98	
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>729</b>	<b>508</b>	<b>516</b>	<b>540</b>	<b>302</b>	<b>453</b>	<b>3048</b>	

<b>SECRETARY OF STATE</b>							<b>Vote for One</b>	
PRECINCT	1	2	3	4	5	6	TOTAL	
WILLIAM FRANCIS GALVIN	539	354	383	389	218	313	2196	
DAVID D'ARCANGELO	99	95	97	91	39	93	514	

DANIEL L. FACTOR	70	37	19	37	36	31	230
							0
BLANKS	21	22	17	23	9	16	108
TOTALS	729	508	516	540	302	453	3048

TREASURER							Vote for One	
PRECINCT	1	2	3	4	5	6	TOTAL	
DEBORAH B. GOLDBERG	475	308	318	321	194	270	1886	
MICHAEL JAMES HEFFERNAN	139	127	137	139	48	118	708	
IAN T. JACKSON	84	46	29	35	47	41	282	
							0	
BLANKS	31	27	32	45	13	24	172	
TOTALS	729	508	516	540	302	453	3048	

AUDITOR							Vote for One	
PRECINCT	1	2	3	4	5	6	TOTAL	
SUZANNE M. BUMP	495	318	347	348	200	282	1990	
PATRICIA S. SAINT AUBIN	122	120	114	118	46	106	626	
MK MERELICE	82	38	19	25	41	30	235	
							0	
BLANKS	30	32	36	49	15	35	197	
TOTALS	729	508	516	540	302	453	3048	

Second District REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS							Vote for One	
PRECINCT	1	2	3	4	5	6	TOTAL	
JAMES P. McGOVERN	645	418	429	440	259	366	2557	
a. english					1		1	
lachance laramie emily			1				1	
jason edson		1					1	
winn	1						1	
rich lovett				1			1	
david wiles				1			1	
BLANKS	83	89	86	98	42	87	485	
TOTALS	729	508	516	540	302	453	3048	

Eighth District COUNCILLOR							Vote for One	
PRECINCT	1	2	3	4	5	6	TOTAL	
MICHAEL J. ALBANO	610	413	424	434	254	359	2494	
richotte					1		1	
claus	1						1	
rich lovett				1			1	
copeland					1		1	
BLANKS	118	95	92	105	46	94	550	
TOTALS	729	508	516	540	302	453	3048	

Hampshire, Franklin & Worcester District		SENATOR IN GENERAL COURT					Vote for One	
PRECINCT	1	2	3	4	5	6	TOTAL	
STANLEY C. ROSENBERG	644	430	450	458	265	368	2615	
dion					1		1	
stevens	1						1	
micahel valanzola		1					1	
fairbanks					1		1	
rich lovett				1			1	
BLANKS	84	77	66	81	35	85	428	
TOTALS	729	508	516	540	302	453	3048	
First Franklin District		REPRESENTATIVE IN GENERAL COURT					Vote for One	
PRECINCT	1	2	3	4	5	6	TOTAL	
STEPHEN KULIK	574	328	345	375	229	277	2128	
DYLAN E. KORPITA	139	159	154	141	62	159	814	
silva					1		1	
richard laramie			1				1	
BLANKS	16	21	16	24	10	17	104	
TOTALS	729	508	516	540	302	453	3048	
Northwestern District		DISTRICT ATTORNEY					Vote for One	
PRECINCT	1	2	3	4	5	6	TOTAL	
DAVID E. SULLIVAN	620	414	433	445	254	365	2531	
jackson					1		1	
john dolan	1						1	
ricks	1						1	
rich lovett				1			1	
							0	
BLANKS	107	94	83	94	47	88	513	
TOTALS	729	508	516	540	302	453	3048	
Franklin County		REGISTER OF PROBATE				Vote for One		
PRECINCT	1	2	3	4	5	6	TOTAL	
JOHN F. MERRIGAN	618	422	443	449	254	375	2561	
hawkins					1		1	
john jones					1		1	
manny	1						1	
BLANKS	110	86	73	91	46	78	484	
TOTALS	729	508	516	540	302	453	3048	
Franklin County		COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE					Vote for One	
PRECINCT	1	2	3	4	5	6	TOTAL	
BILL PERLMAN	568	407	420	431	236	349	2411	
joseph kennedy						1	1	
wayne farrell	1						1	
visconti					1		1	
rich lovett				1			1	
BLANKS	160	101	96	108	65	103	633	
TOTALS	729	508	516	540	302	453	3048	

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**QUESTION 1**

**LAW PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION  
Eliminating Gas Tax Indexing**

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?

	<b>SUMMARY</b>						
--	----------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

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.

<b>QUESTION 1</b>						<b>QUESTION 1</b>	
-------------------	--	--	--	--	--	-------------------	--

PRECINCT	1	2	3	4	5	6	TOTAL
<b>YES</b>	283	240	239	247	123	220	1352
<b>NO</b>	428	255	263	275	169	221	1611
<b>BLANKS</b>	18	13	14	18	10	12	85
<b>TOTALS</b>	729	508	516	540	302	453	3048

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**QUESTION 2**

**LAW PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION  
Expanding the Beverage Container Deposit Law**

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?

	<b>SUMMARY</b>						
--	----------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

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 2¼ cents as of September 2013, to 3½ 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 3½ 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 laws regarding beverage container deposits.

**QUESTION 2**

**QUESTION 2**

PRECINCT	1	2	3	4	5	6	TOTAL
<b>YES</b>	402	160	126	153	139	133	1113
<b>NO</b>	318	342	381	371	158	312	1882
<b>BLANKS</b>	9	6	9	16	5	8	53
<b>TOTALS</b>	729	508	516	540	302	453	3048

**QUESTION 3**

**LAW PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION  
Expanding Prohibitions on Gaming**

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.

**QUESTION 3**

**QUESTION 3**

PRECINCT	1	2	3	4	5	6	TOTAL
<b>YES</b>	433	191	147	174	127	148	1220
<b>NO</b>	280	311	358	350	164	294	1757
<b>BLANKS</b>	16	6	11	16	11	11	71
<b>TOTALS</b>	729	508	516	540	302	453	3048

**QUESTION 4**

**LAW PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION  
Earned Sick Time for Employees**

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.								
<b>QUESTION 4</b>						<b>QUESTION 4</b>		
<b>PRECINCT</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	
<b>YES</b>	494	325	328	300	202	282	1931	
<b>NO</b>	181	148	159	202	66	147	903	
<b>BLANKS</b>	54	35	29	38	34	24	214	
<b>TOTALS</b>	729	508	516	540	302	453	3048	
						verify	3048	
<b>QUESTION 5</b>								
<b>THIS QUESTION IS NOT BINDING</b>								
<p>Should the State Senator from this district be instructed to vote in favor of legislation that would prohibit candidates for state or local office from taking campaign contributions from industries regulated by such offices; regulate campaign spending by corporations; require increased disclosure of contributions to, and spending by, groups unaffiliated with candidates or political parties; provide voters with a tax rebate to make contributions to their preferred candidates; prohibit elected officials and their senior staff from negotiating a future job while in office and engaging in any lobbying activity for five years once they leave office; and increase penalties for candidates and groups that violate campaign finance laws?</p>								
<b>QUESTION 5</b>						<b>QUESTION 5</b>		
<b>PRECINCT</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	
<b>YES</b>	512	310	301	328	155	277	1883	
<b>NO</b>	70	70	81	98	61	69	449	
<b>BLANKS</b>	147	128	134	114	86	107	716	
<b>TOTALS</b>	729	508	516	540	302	453	3048	

This is the return of the total votes cast in the various precincts and returned to the Board of Registrars of the Town of Montague.

Jay Di Pucchio							
Juanita Caldwell							
Anne Stuart							
Debra Bourbeau							
	BOARD OF REGISTRARS						
<b>Attest</b>							
Debra Bourbeau, Montague Town Clerk							
<b>WEATHER: Mostly cloudy high 59</b>							