

**TOWN OF SHREWSBURY
STATE ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 2008**

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 at the Richard D. Carney Municipal Building, Maple Ave.; Precinct 2 at the Frohsinn Club, North Quinsigamond Ave.; Precinct 3 at the Calvin Coolidge School, May St.; Precinct 4 at the Scandinavian Athletic Club, Lake St.; Precincts 5 & 8 at the Sewer & Water Dept., South St.; Pr. 6 at the Shrewsbury Senior Center, Maple Ave.; Precinct 7 at the Spring St. School, Spring St.; and Precinct 9 at Fire Station #3, 20 CenTech Blvd. All precincts had reported by 8:30 P.M.

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>Total</u>
2038	1832	1508	2057	1900	1910	2268	2358	1958	17829
81%	78%	73%	79%	78%	79%	83%	82%	79%	79%

Registered Voters:

2516	2346	2079	2595	2450	2405	2726	2888	2465	22470
------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	-------

1,671 absentee ballot applications were processed;

	Pr. 1	Pr. 2	Pr. 3	Pr. 4	Pr. 5	Pr. 6	Pr. 7	Pr. 8	Pr. 9	Total
Pres & Vice Pres										
Baldwin & Castle	2	4	5	2	2	2	0	2	1	20
Barr & Root	10	8	8	9	7	10	5	9	6	72
McCain & Palin	898	678	535	844	734	709	1052	1047	799	7296
McKinney & Clemente	2	2	3	3	1	4	3	6	6	30
Nader & Gonzalez	19	20	24	20	20	22	27	18	13	183
Obama & Biden	1085	1077	908	1149	1119	1139	1159	1245	1119	10000
All Others	14	14	13	5	7	10	6	7	5	81
Blank	8	29	12	25	10	14	16	24	9	147
Total	2038	1832	1508	2057	1900	1910	2268	2358	1958	17829
Senator in Congress										
John F. Kerry	1124	1124	963	1236	1114	1184	1162	1324	1141	10372
Jeffrey K. Beatty	818	587	455	714	684	615	972	915	723	6483
Robert J. Underwood	45	52	36	42	43	46	49	34	41	388
All Others	0	1	0	3	0	2	0	1	1	8
Blank	51	68	54	62	59	63	85	84	52	578
Total	2038	1832	1508	2057	1900	1910	2268	2358	1958	17829
Rep. in Congress										
James P. McGovern	1546	1401	1196	1611	1445	1432	1623	1715	1514	13483
Peter Blute	0	2	3	0	2	2	0	2	2	13
Karyn Polito	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	5
John Samia	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	5
All Others	5	8	10	11	15	17	29	14	10	119
Blank	487	421	299	435	438	458	607	627	432	4204
Total	2038	1832	1508	2057	1900	1910	2268	2358	1958	17829

STATE ELECTION
November 4, 2008

Councillor	Pr. 1	Pr. 2	Pr. 3	Pr. 4	Pr. 5	Pr. 6	Pr. 7	Pr. 8	Pr. 9	Total
Thomas J. Foley	1414	1293	1116	1491	1341	1324	1468	1532	1408	12387
All Others	2	4	4	5	11	7	11	5	4	53
Blank	622	535	388	561	548	579	789	821	546	5389
Total	2038	1832	1508	2057	1900	1910	2268	2358	1958	17829
Sen. In Gen. Court										
Steven W. Baer	97	92	79	115	85	113	92	98	102	873
John I. Lebeaux	1204	926	694	1052	1099	953	1380	1389	1018	9715
Michael O. Moore	616	674	634	752	605	702	640	706	718	6047
All Others	4	1	0	3	1	0	2	1	0	12
Blank	117	139	101	135	110	142	154	164	120	1182
Total	2038	1832	1508	2057	1900	1910	2268	2358	1958	17829
Rep. in Gen. Court										
Karyn E. Polito	1698	1443	1199	1675	1557	1492	1912	1907	1602	14485
Mark Adler	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	9
All Others	2	5	1	13	7	9	14	12	7	70
Blank	336	384	308	369	336	409	342	436	345	3265
Total	2038	1832	1508	2057	1900	1910	2268	2358	1958	17829
Register of Probate										
Stephen G. Abraham	1379	1244	1092	1485	1308	1303	1482	1507	1373	12173
All Others	2	2	4	5	9	4	11	5	6	48
Blank	657	586	412	567	583	603	775	846	579	5608
Total	2038	1832	1508	2057	1900	1910	2268	2358	1958	17829

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 6, 2008?

SUMMARY

This proposed law would reduce the state personal income tax rate to 2.65% for all categories of taxable income for the tax year beginning on or after January 1, 2009, and would eliminate the tax for all tax years beginning on or after January 1, 2010.

The personal income tax applies to income received or gain realized by individuals and married couples, by estates of deceased persons, by certain trustees and other fiduciaries, by persons who are partners in and receive income from partnerships, by corporate trusts, and by persons who receive income as shareholders of "S corporations" as defined under federal tax law. The proposed law would not affect the tax due on income or gain realized in a tax year beginning before January 1, 2009.

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

A YES VOTE would reduce the state personal income tax rate to 2.65% for the tax year beginning on January 1, 2009, and would eliminate the tax for all tax years beginning on or after January 1, 2010.

A NO VOTE would make no change in state income tax laws.

	Pr. 1	Pr. 2	Pr. 3	Pr. 4	Pr. 5	Pr. 6	Pr. 7	Pr. 8	Pr. 9	Total
Yes	616	581	468	720	650	607	801	778	725	5946
*No	1376	1179	994	1295	1204	1262	1408	1516	1190	11424
Blank	46	72	46	42	46	41	59	64	43	459
Total	2038	1832	1508	2057	1900	1910	2268	2358	1958	17829

STATE ELECTION
November 4, 2008

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 6, 2008?

SUMMARY

This proposed law would replace the criminal penalties for possession of one ounce or less of marijuana with a new system of civil penalties, to be enforced by issuing citations, and would exclude information regarding this civil offense from the state's criminal record information system. Offenders age 18 or older would be subject to forfeiture of the marijuana plus a civil penalty of \$100. Offenders under the age of 18 would be subject to the same forfeiture and, if they complete a drug awareness program within one year of the offense, the same \$100 penalty.

Offenders under 18 and their parents or legal guardian would be notified of the offense and the option for the offender to complete a drug awareness program developed by the state Department of Youth Services. Such programs would include ten hours of community service and at least four hours of instruction or group discussion concerning the use and abuse of marijuana and other drugs and emphasizing early detection and prevention of substance abuse.

The penalty for offenders under 18 who fail to complete such a program within one year could be increased to as much as \$1,000, unless the offender showed an inability to pay, an inability to participate in such a program, or the unavailability of such a program. Such an offender's parents could also be held liable for the increased penalty. Failure by an offender under 17 to complete such a program could also be a basis for a delinquency proceeding.

The proposed law would define possession of one ounce or less of marijuana as including possession of one ounce or less of tetrahydrocannabinol ("THC"), or having metabolized products of marijuana or THC in one's body.

Under the proposed law, possessing an ounce or less of marijuana could not be grounds for state or local government entities imposing any other penalty, sanction, or disqualification, such as denying student financial aid, public housing, public financial assistance including unemployment benefits, the right to operate a motor vehicle, or the opportunity to serve as a foster or adoptive parent. The proposed law would allow local ordinances or bylaws that prohibit the public use of marijuana, and would not affect existing laws, practices, or policies concerning operating a motor vehicle or taking other actions while under the influence of marijuana, unlawful possession of prescription forms of marijuana, or selling, manufacturing, or trafficking in marijuana.

The money received from the new civil penalties would go to the city or town where the offense occurred.

A YES VOTE would replace the criminal penalties for possession of one ounce or less of marijuana with a new system of civil penalties.

A NO VOTE would make no change in state criminal laws concerning possession of marijuana.

	Pr. 1	Pr. 2	Pr. 3	Pr. 4	Pr. 5	Pr. 6	Pr. 7	Pr. 8	Pr. 9	Total
*YES	1256	1163	990	1296	1204	1234	1344	1456	1198	11141
No	747	610	474	719	647	638	880	834	728	6277
Blank	35	59	44	42	49	38	44	68	32	411
Total	2038	1832	1508	2057	1900	1910	2268	2358	1958	17829

STATE ELECTION
November 4, 2008

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 before May 6, 2008?

SUMMARY

This proposed law would prohibit any dog racing or racing meeting in Massachusetts where any form of betting or wagering on the speed or ability of dogs occurs.

The State Racing Commission would be prohibited from accepting or approving any application or request for racing dates for dog racing.

Any person violating the proposed law could be required to pay a civil penalty of not less than \$20,000 to the Commission. The penalty would be used for the Commission's administrative purposes, subject to appropriation by the state Legislature. All existing parts of the chapter of the state's General Laws concerning dog and horse racing meetings would be interpreted as if they did not refer to dogs.

These changes would take effect January 1, 2010. 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 dog races on which betting or wagering occurs, effective January 1, 2010.

	Pr. 1	Pr. 2	Pr. 3	Pr. 4	Pr. 5	Pr. 6	Pr. 7	Pr. 8	Pr. 9	Total
*YES	1177	1014	831	1176	1137	1130	1359	1369	1216	10409
No	814	744	631	830	715	735	854	918	701	6942
Blank	47	74	46	51	48	45	55	71	41	478
Total	2038	1832	1508	2057	1900	1910	2268	2358	1958	17829