

# GENERAL ELECTION RESULTS - November 4, 2008

## ELECTORS OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT, Vote for ONE

	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	Totals
Baldwin and Castle	2	4	4	3	2	0	5	20
Barr and Root	3	4	6	7	7	3	6	36
McCain and Palin	779	892	913	916	874	759	809	5942
McKinney and Clemente	0	7	2	1	0	3	5	18
Nader and Gonzales	13	19	9	10	10	10	13	84
<b>Obama and Biden</b>	<b>1006</b>	<b>1026</b>	<b>932</b>	<b>885</b>	<b>822</b>	<b>721</b>	<b>734</b>	<b>6126</b>
All Others	7	4	7	8	7	4	1	38
Blanks	57	53	39	19	32	18	26	244
<b>Totals</b>	<b>1867</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>1912</b>	<b>1849</b>	<b>1754</b>	<b>1518</b>	<b>1599</b>	<b>12508</b>

## SENATOR IN CONGRESS, Vote for ONE

	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	Totals
<b>John F. Kerry</b>	<b>1025</b>	<b>975</b>	<b>900</b>	<b>913</b>	<b>840</b>	<b>747</b>	<b>745</b>	<b>6145</b>
Jeffrey K. Beatty	740	905	899	854	797	699	755	5649
Robert J. Underwood	25	41	29	31	40	28	34	228
All Others	2	0	2	0	0	1	4	9
Blanks	75	88	82	51	77	43	61	477
<b>Totals</b>	<b>1867</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>1912</b>	<b>1849</b>	<b>1754</b>	<b>1518</b>	<b>1599</b>	<b>12508</b>

## REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS, TENTH DISTRICT, Vote for ONE

	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	Total
<b>William D. Delahunt</b>	<b>1341</b>	<b>1354</b>	<b>1341</b>	<b>1353</b>	<b>1234</b>	<b>1141</b>	<b>1175</b>	<b>8939</b>
All Others	14	33	27	16	16	18	16	140
Blanks	512	622	544	480	504	359	408	3429
<b>Totals</b>	<b>1867</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>1912</b>	<b>1849</b>	<b>1754</b>	<b>1518</b>	<b>1599</b>	<b>12508</b>

## COUNCILLOR, FIRST DISTRICT, Vote for ONE

	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	Totals
<b>Carole A. Fiola</b>	<b>1178</b>	<b>1182</b>	<b>1161</b>	<b>1187</b>	<b>1098</b>	<b>1000</b>	<b>1041</b>	<b>7847</b>
All Others	10	10	7	3	2	8	5	45
Blanks	679	817	744	659	654	510	553	4616
<b>Totals</b>	<b>1867</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>1912</b>	<b>1849</b>	<b>1754</b>	<b>1518</b>	<b>1599</b>	<b>12508</b>

## SENATOR IN GENERAL COURT, PLY MOUTH & BARNSTABLE DISTRICT, Vote for ONE

	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	Totals
<b>Therese Murray</b>	<b>1318</b>	<b>1330</b>	<b>1312</b>	<b>1299</b>	<b>1191</b>	<b>1091</b>	<b>1127</b>	<b>8668</b>
All Others	10	12	13	8	9	13	9	74
Blanks	539	667	587	542	554	414	463	3766
<b>Totals</b>	<b>1867</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>1912</b>	<b>1849</b>	<b>1754</b>	<b>1518</b>	<b>1599</b>	<b>12508</b>

## REPRESENTATIVE IN GENERAL COURT, FIFTH BARNSTABLE DISTRICT, Vote for ONE

	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	Totals
--	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	--------

<b>Jeffrey Davis Perry</b>	<b>1192</b>	<b>1304</b>	<b>1298</b>	<b>1309</b>	<b>1214</b>	<b>1084</b>	<b>1117</b>	<b>8518</b>
Glenn S Pare'	573	579	511	459	431	353	395	3301
All Others	0	1	1	0	2	0	2	6
Blanks	102	125	102	81	107	81	85	683
<b>Totals</b>	<b>1867</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>1912</b>	<b>1849</b>	<b>1754</b>	<b>1518</b>	<b>1599</b>	<b>12508</b>

REGISTER OF PROBATE, BARNSTABLE COUNTY, Vote for ONE

	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	Totals
<b>Anastasia Welsh Perrino</b>	<b>881</b>	<b>1025</b>	<b>1041</b>	<b>978</b>	<b>876</b>	<b>796</b>	<b>800</b>	<b>6397</b>
Eric T. Turkington	690	662	582	606	576	493	546	4155
James A. Feeney	80	100	91	106	102	102	109	690
All Others	0	2	2	1	0	0	1	6
Blanks	216	220	196	158	200	127	143	1260
<b>Totals</b>	<b>1867</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>1912</b>	<b>1849</b>	<b>1754</b>	<b>1518</b>	<b>1599</b>	<b>12508</b>

COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, BARNSTABLE COUNTY, Vote for not more than TWO

	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	Totals
<b>Ricardo M. Barros</b>	<b>599</b>	<b>706</b>	<b>709</b>	<b>726</b>	<b>625</b>	<b>594</b>	<b>575</b>	<b>4534</b>
William B. Crowell	544	623	623	556	505	453	462	3766
<b>Mary Pat Flynn</b>	<b>727</b>	<b>692</b>	<b>647</b>	<b>618</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>547</b>	<b>578</b>	<b>4409</b>
Sheila R. Lyons	536	527	491	454	440	400	561	3409
All Others	0	1	0	2	7	2	0	12
Blanks	1328	1469	1354	1342	1331	1040	1222	9086
<b>Totals</b>	<b>3734</b>	<b>4018</b>	<b>3824</b>	<b>3698</b>	<b>3508</b>	<b>3036</b>	<b>3398</b>	<b>25216</b>

BARNSTABLE ASSEMBLY DELEGATE, SANDWICH, Vote for ONE

	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	Totals
<b>Thomas F. Keyes</b>	<b>1316</b>	<b>1364</b>	<b>1375</b>	<b>1367</b>	<b>1248</b>	<b>1166</b>	<b>1188</b>	<b>9024</b>
All Others	8	5	8	1	4	1	5	32
Blanks	543	640	529	481	502	351	406	3452
<b>Totals</b>	<b>1867</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>1912</b>	<b>1849</b>	<b>1754</b>	<b>1518</b>	<b>1599</b>	<b>12508</b>

REGIONAL TECHNICAL SCHOOL COMMITTEE, BOURNE, Vote for ONE

	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	Totals
<b>Joseph A. Agrillo, Sr.</b>	<b>774</b>	<b>782</b>	<b>809</b>	<b>820</b>	<b>784</b>	<b>732</b>	<b>771</b>	<b>5472</b>
Donald DuBerger	323	343	287	323	268	261	289	2094
All Others	4	1	5	4	3	6	5	28
Blanks	766	883	811	702	699	519	534	4914
<b>Totals</b>	<b>1867</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>1912</b>	<b>1849</b>	<b>1754</b>	<b>1518</b>	<b>1599</b>	<b>12508</b>

REGIONAL TECHNICAL SCHOOL COMMITTEE, FALMOUTH, Vote for ONE

	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	Totals
<b>Donald P. Haynes</b>	<b>1070</b>	<b>1033</b>	<b>1082</b>	<b>1114</b>	<b>1007</b>	<b>953</b>	<b>995</b>	<b>7254</b>
All Others	7	3	6	3	7	6	6	38
Blanks	790	973	824	732	740	559	598	5216
<b>Totals</b>	<b>1867</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>1912</b>	<b>1849</b>	<b>1754</b>	<b>1518</b>	<b>1599</b>	<b>12508</b>

REGIONAL TECHNICAL SCHOOL COMMITTEE, MARION, Vote for ONE

	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	Totals
<b>Eunice C. Manduca</b>	<b>1028</b>	<b>1007</b>	<b>1052</b>	<b>1077</b>	<b>971</b>	<b>929</b>	<b>969</b>	<b>7033</b>
All Others	7	1	9	2	5	3	4	31

Blanks	832	1001	851	770	778	586	626	5444
Totals	1867	2009	1912	1849	1754	1518	1599	12508

REGIONAL TECHNICAL SCHOOL COMMITTEE, SANDWICH, Vote for ONE

Name	P1	00	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	Totals
Steven L. Chalke	1149	1105	1172	1171	1068	1036	1050	7751
All Others	5	2	4	0	5	4	4	24
Blanks	713	902	736	678	681	478	545	4733
Totals	1867	2009	1912	1849	1754	1518	1599	12508

REGIONAL TECHNICAL SCHOOL COMMITTEE, WAREHAM, Vote for ONE

	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	Totals
Robert N. Fitchenmayer	1044	1000	1055	1064	967	920	967	7017
All Others	3	1	6	3	6	5	7	31
Blanks	820	1008	851	782	781	593	625	5460
Totals	1867	2009	1912	1849	1754	1518	1599	12508

QUESTION 1 (STATE INCOME TAX)

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.

QUESTION 1 (STATE INCOME TAX)

	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	Totals
Yes	660	833	778	771	682	606	709	5039
No	1068	1051	1013	999	971	869	838	6809
Blanks	139	125	121	79	101	43	52	660
Totals	1867	2009	1912	1849	1754	1518	1599	12508

**QUESTION 2 (MARIJUANA)**

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?

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 (“TLC”), 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.

**QUESTION 2 (MARIJUANA)**

	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	Totals
<b>Yes</b>	<b>1102</b>	<b>1232</b>	<b>1070</b>	<b>1116</b>	<b>1062</b>	<b>973</b>	<b>1013</b>	<b>7568</b>
<b>No</b>	<b>629</b>	<b>641</b>	<b>723</b>	<b>647</b>	<b>587</b>	<b>498</b>	<b>539</b>	<b>4264</b>
<b>Blanks</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>676</b>
<b>Totals</b>	<b>1867</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>1912</b>	<b>1849</b>	<b>1754</b>	<b>1518</b>	<b>1599</b>	<b>12508</b>

### QUESTION 3 (GREYHOUNDS)

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?

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 persons 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.

### QUESTION 3 (GREYHOUNDS)

	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	Totals
<b>Yes</b>	<b>1089</b>	<b>1178</b>	<b>1078</b>	<b>1084</b>	<b>983</b>	<b>855</b>	<b>914</b>	<b>7181</b>
<b>No</b>	<b>628</b>	<b>677</b>	<b>703</b>	<b>669</b>	<b>664</b>	<b>603</b>	<b>635</b>	<b>4579</b>
<b>Blanks</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>748</b>
<b>Totals</b>	<b>1867</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>1912</b>	<b>1849</b>	<b>1754</b>	<b>1518</b>	<b>1599</b>	<b>12508</b>

### QUESTION 4 (STABILIZATION FUND)

THIS QUESTION IS NOT BINDING

Shall the state representative from this district be instructed to vote in favor of legislation distributing \$450 million from the state's "rainy day" stabilization fund to the cities and towns of the Commonwealth for residential property tax relief?

	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	Totals
<b>Yes</b>	<b>1036</b>	<b>1178</b>	<b>1038</b>	<b>1100</b>	<b>1011</b>	<b>900</b>	<b>973</b>	<b>7236</b>
<b>No</b>	<b>451</b>	<b>460</b>	<b>512</b>	<b>446</b>	<b>410</b>	<b>395</b>	<b>392</b>	<b>3066</b>
<b>Blanks</b>	<b>380</b>	<b>371</b>	<b>362</b>	<b>303</b>	<b>333</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>234</b>	<b>2206</b>
<b>Totals</b>	<b>1867</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>1912</b>	<b>1849</b>	<b>1754</b>	<b>1518</b>	<b>1599</b>	<b>12508</b>

12,508 votes were cast in total, which is 79.9% of the voters.

The total number of voters at the close of registration prior to the election was 15,654.

There were 1,443 absentee ballots casted:

- Precinct 1 – 284
- Precinct 2 – 276
- Precinct 3 – 234
- Precinct 4 – 178
- Precinct 5 – 170
- Precinct 6 – 173
- Precinct 7 – 128