

## **GENERAL ELECTION NOVEMBER 4, 2008 PROCEEDINGS**

Pursuant to the foregoing warrant the General Election was held on Tuesday, November 4, 2008 at the Miscoe Hill Elementary School gymnasium. Polls were open at 7:00am. It is noted that the poll workers were sworn in at a training session held on Oct. 23, 2008. Carol Cook served as Warden. Workers from opening to 5:00pm were: Ruth O'Grady, Gloria Hogarth, Martha Gebelien, Roy Spindel, Nancy Bradley, Kristie Heumann (until 12:00), Cindy Donatelli, John Hogarth, Robert Carlson, Sandra Barry from 12:00pm-5:00pm and Mary Ames as clerk. The officer was Brian Massey from 6:45am- 9:00pm.

Students from Nipmuc Regional High School were available to help with the election, they were Jason Hopkins, Sam Leone, Margaret Barthel, Jon Barthel, Katie Annunziato, and Alex Carter. These students were a tremendous help throughout the day to our election officials.

Poll workers serving from 5:00pm to 8:00pm were, Diane Harper, Pat Ghelli, Deb Costa, Marilyn Walton, Kathy Rich, Nancy Fleury, Kimberly DiChiara, Ann Vandersluis, Tom Irons and Diane Willoughby as clerk.

Polls were closed at 8:00pm. 3247 votes cast. One provisional ballot was cast and the results were added to the totals. The final votes cast number is 3248. Results were announced at 8:30pm by Warden Carol Cook.

### **PRESIDENT/VICE PRESIDENT**

Chuck Baldwin/ Darrell Castle	3
Robert Barr/Allen Root	17
John McCain/Sarah Palin	1641
Cynthia McKinney/Rosa Clemente	6
Ralph Nader/Matthew Gonzalez	33
Barack Obama/ Joseph Biden	1513
All others	19
Blanks	16

### **SENATOR IN CONGRESS**

John F. Kerry	1670
Jeffrey K. Beatty	1372
Robert J. Underwood	91
All others	4
Blanks	111

### **REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS**

Richard E. Neal	2194
All others	25
Blanks	1029

### **COUNCILLOR**

Thomas J. Foley	2092
All others	15
Blanks	1141

### **SENATOR IN GENERAL COURT**

Richard T. Moore	2346
All others	18
Blanks	884

### **REPRESENTATIVE IN GENERAL COURT**

John V. Fernandes	2310
All others	18
Blanks	920

### **REGISTER OF PROBATE**

Stephen G. Abraham	2065
All others	12
Blanks	1171

### **BLACKSTONE VALLEY REGIONAL TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL COMMITTEE MEMBER**

Jeff T. Koopman	2286
All others	6
Blanks	956

### 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.

<b>YES</b>	<b>1275</b>
<b>NO</b>	<b>1934</b>
<b>BLANKS</b>	<b>39</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 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.

<b>YES</b>	<b>2073</b>
<b>NO</b>	<b>1138</b>
<b>BLANKS</b>	<b>37</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 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.

A **NO VOTE** would make no change in the laws governing dog racing.

<b>YES</b>	<b>1839</b>
<b>NO</b>	<b>1332</b>
<b>BLANKS</b>	<b>77</b>

### QUESTION 4: Police Station

**Shall the Town of Mendon be allowed to exempt from the provisions of proposition two and one-half, so-called, the amounts required to pay for the bond issued in order to construct and originally equip a new police station?**

<b>YES</b>	<b>1229</b>
<b>NO</b>	<b>1708</b>
<b>BLANKS</b>	<b>311</b>

A true copy. Attest:

Margaret Bonderenko  
Town Clerk