

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION							
MONTAGUE, MA							
Tuesday, November 08, 2016							

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 of which the following is the total vote as returned by the Precinct Officers.

TOTAL NUMBER OF BALLOTS CAST			
Turnout by precinct			
Precinct 1		1000	81.30%
Precinct 2		748	69.58%
Precinct 3		712	72.88%
Precinct 4		787	70.90%
Precinct 5		552	59.55%
Precinct 6		691	69.80%
TOTALS		4490	71.17%

ELECTORS OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT							Vote for One
PRECINCT	1	2	3	4	5	6	TOTAL
CLINTON and KAINE	729	418	411	490	388	422	2858
JOHNSON and WELD	31	50	38	37	27	30	213
STEIN and BARAKA	31	56	12	24	27	31	181
TRUMP and PENCE	182	206	218	208	90	190	1094
Others	5	7	14	6	10	12	54
BLANKS	22	11	19	22	10	6	90
TOTALS	1000	748	712	787	552	691	4490

REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS							Vote for one
PRECINCT	1	2	3	4	5	6	TOTAL
JAMES P. McGOVERN	860	594	593	654	480	567	3748
Others	1	2		4	2		9
BLANKS	139	152	119	129	70	124	733
TOTALS	1000	748	712	787	552	691	4490

COUNCILLOR							Vote for One
PRECINCT	1	2	3	4	5	6	TOTAL
MARY E. HURLEY	835	588	574	644	472	555	3668
Others	1	2		2	1		6
BLANKS	164	158	138	141	79	136	816
TOTALS	1000	748	712	787	552	691	4490

SENATOR IN GENERAL COURT							Vote for one
PRECINCT	1	2	3	4	5	6	TOTAL
STANLEY C. ROSENBERG	840	567	567	624	468	537	3603
DONALD PELTIER	124	130	117	127	62	123	683
Others							0
BLANKS	36	51	28	36	22	31	204
TOTALS	1000	748	712	787	552	691	4490

REPRESENTATIVE IN GENERAL COURT							Vote for One
PRECINCT	1	2	3	4	5	6	TOTAL
STEPHEN KULIK	865	613	612	676	477	580	3823
Others	1	4		1	1		7
BLANKS	134	131	100	110	74	111	660
TOTALS	1000	748	712	787	552	691	4490

SHERIFF							Vote for one
PRECINCT	1	2	3	4	5	6	TOTAL
CHRISTOPHER J. DONELAN	837	608	594	672	469	575	3755
Others	4	3	3	2	2	1	15
BLANKS	159	137	115	113	81	115	720
TOTALS	1000	748	712	787	552	691	4490

COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE							Vote for One
PRECINCT	1	2	3	4	5	6	TOTAL
JAY D. DiPUCCHIO	795	586	587	642	441	551	3602
Others		3		1	1		5
BLANKS	205	159	125	144	110	140	883
TOTALS	1000	748	712	787	552	691	4490

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 license 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; and (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.

QUESTION 1							
PRECINCT	1	2	3	4	5	6	TOTAL
YES	218	273	277	280	204	273	1525
NO	751	458	420	471	331	399	2830
BLANKS	31	17	15	36	17	19	135
TOTALS	1000	748	712	787	552	691	4490

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 breeding pig, calf raised for veal, or egg-laying hen in a way that prevents the animal from lying 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 or operator to rely in 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 make no change in current laws relative to the keeping of farm animals.

QUESTION 3

PRECINCT	1	2	3	4	5	6	TOTAL
YES	564	380	369	393	348	364	2418
NO	402	359	333	371	189	315	1969
BLANKS	34	9	10	23	15	12	103
TOTALS	1000	748	712	787	552	691	4490

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 violations 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 uses in public buildings or at or near schools. 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.

QUESTION 4							
PRECINCT	1	2	3	4	5	6	TOTAL
YES	663	478	360	424	408	440	2773
NO	311	253	337	343	131	238	1613
BLANKS	26	17	15	20	13	13	104
TOTALS	1000	748	712	787	552	691	4490

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

Debra Bourbeau							
Jay DiPucchio							
Juanita Caldwell							
Anne Stuart							
BOARD OF REGISTRARS							

Sunny. High 62F. Winds light and variable.

Attest: Debra A. Bourbeau, Montague Town Clerk