

**TOWN OF SHREWSBURY  
STATE ELECTION  
NOVEMBER 8, 2016**

In accordance with the warrant the polls were opened at 7:00 A.M. and closed at 8:00 P.M. The voters met at their respective voting places: Precinct 1 & 2 at Richard D. Carney Municipal Building, 100 Maple Avenue; Precinct 3 at Calvin Coolidge School, 1 Florence Street; Precinct 4 at Scandinavian Athletic Club, 438 Lake Street; Precincts 5 & 10 at Sewer & Water Garage, 209 South Street; Precinct 6 at Shrewsbury Senior Center, 98 Maple Avenue; Precincts 7 & 8 at Spring Street School, 123 Spring Street and Precinct 9 at Fire Station #3, 20 Centech Blvd.

Votes were as follows:

<u>Pr. 1</u>	<u>Pr. 2</u>	<u>Pr. 3</u>	<u>Pr. 4</u>	<u>Pr. 5</u>	<u>Pr. 6</u>	<u>Pr. 7</u>	<u>Pr. 8</u>	<u>Pr. 9</u>	<u>Pr. 10</u>	<u>Total</u>
2339	1739	1569	1874	1692	1998	2361	2288	1423	1924	19207
84%	77%	74%	80%	80%	82%	84%	82%	82%	80%	81%

Registered Voters:

2795	2244	2114	2344	2106	2451	2802	2787	1738	2420	23801
------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	-------

One thousand four hundred twenty nine absentee ballot applications were processed.  
Six thousand eight hundred eighty nine early ballots were processed.

Pr. 1	Pr. 2	Pr. 3	Pr. 4	Pr. 5	Pr. 6	Pr. 7	Pr. 8	Pr. 9	Pr.10	Total
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

**PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT**

Clinton and Kaine	1214	967	838	1007	999	1131	1234	1262	875	1093	10620
Johnson and Weld	111	78	77	83	74	96	130	106	47	92	894
Stein and Baraka	26	13	15	27	25	20	18	20	15	18	197
Trump and Pence	885	639	586	702	532	692	860	808	454	650	6808
Charlie Baker	3	0	0	1	3	0	2	1	2	1	13
John Kasich	7	1	1	3	3	1	11	3	2	4	36
Evan McMullin	6	6	6	5	5	3	8	3	6	5	53
Mike Pence	1	1	3	0	5	2	4	9	1	3	29
Mitt Romney	5	5	3	2	3	2	17	7	3	7	54
Paul Ryan	3	2	3	0	0	1	9	4	1	1	24
Bernie Sanders	10	3	11	5	10	10	12	5	5	7	78
All Others	27	3	7	15	9	9	17	18	1	11	117
Blank	41	21	19	24	24	31	39	42	11	32	284
<b>Total</b>	<b>2339</b>	<b>1739</b>	<b>1569</b>	<b>1874</b>	<b>1692</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>2361</b>	<b>2288</b>	<b>1423</b>	<b>1924</b>	<b>19207</b>

**REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS**

James P. McGovern	1710	1310	1213	1451	1281	1457	1713	1713	1097	1483	14428
All Others	54	27	27	38	37	34	58	39	20	39	373
Blank	575	402	329	385	374	507	590	536	306	402	4406
<b>Total</b>	<b>2339</b>	<b>1739</b>	<b>1569</b>	<b>1874</b>	<b>1692</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>2361</b>	<b>2288</b>	<b>1423</b>	<b>1924</b>	<b>19207</b>

**COUNCILLOR**

Jennie L. Caissie	1203	787	686	870	765	896	1243	1083	613	883	9029
Matthew CJ Vance	817	711	688	819	710	826	835	884	678	789	7757
All Others	3	5	6	3	4	4	6	1	0	2	34
Blank	316	236	189	182	213	272	277	320	132	250	2387
<b>Total</b>	<b>2339</b>	<b>1739</b>	<b>1569</b>	<b>1874</b>	<b>1692</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>2361</b>	<b>2288</b>	<b>1423</b>	<b>1924</b>	<b>19207</b>

**STATE ELECTION  
NOVEMBER 8, 2016**

	Pr. 1	Pr. 2	Pr. 3	Pr. 4	Pr. 5	Pr. 6	Pr. 7	Pr. 8	Pr. 9	Pr.10	Total
<b>SENATOR IN GENERAL COURT</b>											
Michael O. Moore	1340	1083	1019	1191	1053	1240	1275	1357	896	1172	11626
Mesfin H. Beshir	669	408	358	483	410	479	721	577	367	487	4959
All Others	4	4	6	3	4	3	6	5	1	8	44
Blank	326	244	186	197	225	276	359	349	159	257	2578
<b>Total</b>	<b>2339</b>	<b>1739</b>	<b>1569</b>	<b>1874</b>	<b>1692</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>2361</b>	<b>2288</b>	<b>1423</b>	<b>1924</b>	<b>19207</b>

<b>REPRESENTATIVE IN GENERAL COURT</b>											
Hannah E. Kane	1766	1270	1150	1424	1265	1454	1834	1743	1032	1436	14374
Jason Palitsch	7	0	0	1	1	5	8	3	5	0	30
All Others	27	21	27	34	26	32	33	23	14	28	265
Blank	539	448	392	415	400	507	486	519	372	460	4538
<b>Total</b>	<b>2339</b>	<b>1739</b>	<b>1569</b>	<b>1874</b>	<b>1692</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>2361</b>	<b>2288</b>	<b>1423</b>	<b>1924</b>	<b>19207</b>

<b>SHERIFF</b>											
Lewis G. Evangelidis	1723	1248	1136	1405	1214	1421	1772	1676	1009	1361	13965
All Others	24	21	20	33	24	26	27	20	14	20	229
Blank	592	470	413	436	454	551	562	592	400	543	5013
<b>Total</b>	<b>2339</b>	<b>1739</b>	<b>1569</b>	<b>1874</b>	<b>1692</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>2361</b>	<b>2288</b>	<b>1423</b>	<b>1924</b>	<b>19207</b>

**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 3, 2016?

**SUMMARY**

This proposed law would allow the state Gaming Commission to issue one additional category 2 license, which would permit operation of a gaming establishment with no table games and not more than 1,250 slot machines.

The proposed law would authorize the Commission to request applications for the additional licenses to be granted to a gaming establishment located on property that is (i) at least four acres in size; (ii) adjacent to and within 1,500 feet of a race track, including the track's additional facilities, such as the track, grounds, paddocks, barns, auditorium, amphitheatre, and bleachers; (iii) where a horse racing meeting may physically be held; (iv) where a horse racing meeting shall have been hosted; (v) not separated from the race track by a highway or railway.

**A YES VOTE** would permit the state Gaming Commission to license one additional slot machine gaming establishment at a location that meets certain conditions specified in the law.

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

	Pr. 1	Pr. 2	Pr. 3	Pr. 4	Pr. 5	Pr. 6	Pr. 7	Pr. 8	Pr. 9	Pr.10	Total
YES	847	678	703	774	635	756	817	757	469	745	7181
NO	1389	943	789	1019	974	1152	1458	1404	894	1105	11127
Blank	103	118	77	81	83	90	86	127	60	74	899
<b>Total</b>	<b>2339</b>	<b>1739</b>	<b>1569</b>	<b>1874</b>	<b>1692</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>2361</b>	<b>2288</b>	<b>1423</b>	<b>1924</b>	<b>19207</b>

**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 3, 2016?

## SUMMARY

This proposed law would allow the state Board of Elementary and Secondary Education to approve up to 12 new charter schools or enrollment expansions in existing charter schools each year. Approvals under this law could expand statewide charter school enrollment by up to 1% of the total statewide public school enrollment each year. New charters and enrollment expansions approved under this law would be exempt from existing limits on the number of charter schools, the number of students enrolled in them, and the amount of local school districts' spending allocated to them.

If the Board received more than 12 applications in a single year from qualified applicants, then the proposed law would require it to give priority to proposed charter schools or enrollment expansions in districts where student performance on statewide assessments is in the bottom 25% of all districts in the previous two years and where demonstrated parent demand for additional public school options is greatest.

New charter schools and enrollment expansions approved under this proposed law would be subject to the same approval standards as other charter schools, and to recruitment, retention, and multilingual outreach requirements that currently apply to some charter schools. Schools authorized under this law would be subject to annual performance reviews according to standards established by the Board.

The proposed law would take effect on January 1, 2017.

**A YES VOTE** would allow for up to 12 approvals each year of either new charter schools or expanded enrollments in existing charter schools, but not to exceed 1% of the statewide public school enrollment.

**A NO VOTE** would make no change in current laws relative to charter schools.

	Pr. 1	Pr. 2	Pr. 3	Pr. 4	Pr. 5	Pr. 6	Pr. 7	Pr. 8	Pr. 9	Pr.10	Total
YES	767	576	500	610	555	575	864	789	504	666	6406
NO	1524	1100	1017	1224	1098	1369	1455	1431	883	1221	12322
Blank	48	63	52	40	39	54	42	68	36	37	479
<b>Total</b>	<b>2339</b>	<b>1739</b>	<b>1569</b>	<b>1874</b>	<b>1692</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>2361</b>	<b>2288</b>	<b>1423</b>	<b>1924</b>	<b>19207</b>

### 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 3, 2016?

## SUMMARY

This proposed law would prohibit any farm owner or operator from knowingly confining any breed pig, calf raised for veal, or egg-laying hen in a way that prevents the animal from laying down, standing up, fully extending its limbs, or turning around freely. The proposed law would also prohibit any business owner or operator in Massachusetts from selling whole eggs intended for human consumption or any uncooked cut of veal or pork if the business owner or operator knows or should know that the hen, breeding pig, or veal calf that produced these products was confined in a manner prohibited by the proposed law. The proposed law would exempt sales of food products that combine veal or pork with other products, including soups, sandwiches, pizzas, hotdogs, or similar processed or prepared food items.

The proposed law's confinement prohibitions would not apply during transportation; state and county fair exhibitions; 4-H programs; slaughter in compliance with applicable laws and regulations; medical research; veterinary exams, testing, treatment and operation if performed under the direct supervision of a licensed veterinarian; five days prior to a pregnant pig's expected date of giving birth; any day that pig is nursing piglets; and for temporary periods for animal husbandry purposes not to exceed six hours in any twenty-four hour period.

The proposed law would create a civil penalty of up to \$1,000 for each violation and would give the Attorney General the exclusive authority to enforce the law, and to issue regulations to implement it. As a defense to enforcement proceedings, the proposed law would allow a business owner to rely on good faith upon a written certification or guarantee of compliance by a supplier.

The proposed law would be in addition to any other animal welfare laws and would not prohibit stricter local laws.

The proposed law would take effect on January 1, 2022. 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 any confinement of pigs, calves, and hens that prevents them from lying down, standing up, fully extending their limbs, or turning around freely.

**A NO VOTE** would make no change in current laws relative to keeping of farm animals.

	Pr. 1	Pr. 2	Pr. 3	Pr. 4	Pr. 5	Pr. 6	Pr. 7	Pr. 8	Pr. 9	Pr.10	Total
YES	1721	1278	1195	1401	1298	1491	1790	1713	1066	1487	14440
NO	566	398	320	433	347	445	532	499	306	390	4236
Blank	52	63	54	40	47	62	39	76	51	47	531
<b>Total</b>	<b>2339</b>	<b>1739</b>	<b>1569</b>	<b>1874</b>	<b>1692</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>2361</b>	<b>2288</b>	<b>1423</b>	<b>1924</b>	<b>19207</b>

#### 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 3, 2016?

#### SUMMARY

The proposed law would permit the possession, use, distribution, and cultivation of marijuana in limited amounts by persons age 21 and older and would remove criminal penalties for such activities. It would provide for the regulation of commerce in marijuana, marijuana accessories, and marijuana products and for the taxation of proceeds from sales of these items.

The proposed law would authorize persons at least 21 years old to possess up to one ounce of marijuana outside of their residences; possess up to ten ounces of marijuana inside their residences; grow up to six marijuana plants in their residences; give one ounce or less of marijuana to a person at least 21 years old without payment; possess, produce or transfer hemp; or make or transfer items related to marijuana use, storage, cultivation, or processing.

The measure would create a Cannabis Control Commission of three members appointed by the state Treasurer which would generally administer the law governing marijuana use and distribution, promulgate regulations, and be responsible for the licensing of marijuana commercial establishments.

The proposed law would also create a Cannabis Advisory Board of fifteen members appointed by the Governor. The Cannabis Control Commission would adopt regulations governing licensing qualifications; security; record keeping; health and safety standards; packaging and labeling; testing; advertising and displays; required inspections; and such other matters as the Commission considers appropriate. The records of the Commission would be public records.

The proposed law would authorize cities and towns to adopt reasonable restrictions on the time, place, and manner of operating marijuana businesses and to limit the number of marijuana establishments in their communities. A city or town could hold a local vote to determine whether to permit the selling of marijuana and marijuana products for consumption on the premises at commercial establishments.

The proceeds of retail sales of marijuana and marijuana products would be subject to the state sales tax and an additional excise tax of 3.75%. A city or town could impose a separate tax of up to 2%. Revenue received from the additional state excise tax or from license application fees and civil penalties for violation of this law would be deposited in a Marijuana Regulation Fund and would be used subject to appropriation for administration of the proposed law. Marijuana-related activities authorized under this proposed law could not be a basis for adverse orders in child welfare cases absent clear and convincing evidence that such activities had created an unreasonable danger to the safety of a minor child.

The proposed law would not affect existing law regarding medical marijuana treatment centers or the operation of motor vehicles while under the influence. It would permit property owners to prohibit the use, sale, or production of marijuana on their premises (with an exception that landlords cannot prohibit consumption by tenants of marijuana by means other than by smoking); and would permit employers to prohibit the consumption of marijuana by employees in the workplace. State and local governments could continue to restrict use in public buildings or at or near school. Supplying marijuana to persons under age 21 would be unlawful.

The proposed law would take effect on December 15, 2016

A **YES VOTE** would allow persons 21 and older to possess, use, and transfer marijuana and products containing marijuana concentrate (including edible products) and to cultivate marijuana, all in limited amounts, and would provide for the regulation and taxation of commercial sale of marijuana and marijuana products.

A **NO VOTE** would make no change in current laws relative to marijuana.

	Pr. 1	Pr. 2	Pr. 3	Pr. 4	Pr. 5	Pr. 6	Pr. 7	Pr. 8	Pr. 9	Pr.10	Total
YES	985	786	766	907	779	900	892	892	535	882	8324
NO	1319	897	770	940	878	1058	1441	1341	855	1009	10508
Blank	35	56	33	27	35	40	28	55	33	33	375
<b>Total</b>	<b>2339</b>	<b>1739</b>	<b>1569</b>	<b>1874</b>	<b>1692</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>2361</b>	<b>2288</b>	<b>1423</b>	<b>1924</b>	<b>19207</b>