The Commonwealth of Massachusetts

STATE ELECTION

WAREHAM

OFFICIAL ABSENTEE BALLOT
Tuesday, November 6, 2018

1510/1510

SECRETARY OF THE
COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

To vote for a candidate, fill in the oval ⬤ to the right of the candidate's name. To vote for a person not on the ballot, write the person's name and residence in the blank space provided and fill in the oval.

SENATOR IN CONGRESS
Vote for ONE

ELIZABETH A. WARREN ++++++++ **Democratic**
24 Linnaean St., Cambridge · Candidate for Re-election

GEOFF DIEHL +++++++++++++++++ **Republican**
10 Village Way, Whitman

SHIVA AYYADURAI +++++++++++++ **Independent**
69 Snake Hill Rd., Belmont

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.

_____
WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

GOVERNOR AND LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR
Vote for ONE

BAKER and POLITO +++++++++++++ **Republican**

GONZALEZ and PALFREY +++++++ **Democratic**

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.

_____
WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

ATTORNEY GENERAL
Vote for ONE

MAURA HEALEY +++++++++++++++ **Democratic**
40 Winthrop St., Boston

JAMES R. McMAHON, III ++++++ **Republican**
14 Canal View Rd., Bourne

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.

_____
WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

SECRETARY OF STATE
Vote for ONE

WILLIAM FRANCIS GALVIN +++++ **Democratic**
46 Lake St., Boston · Candidate for Re-election

ANTHONY M. AMORE +++++++++++ **Republican**
182 Norfolk Ave., Swampscott

JUAN G. SANCHEZ, JR. ++++++ **Green-Rainbow**
362 High St., Holyoke

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.

_____
WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

TREASURER
Vote for ONE

DEBORAH B. GOLDBERG +++++++ **Democratic**
37 Hyslop Rd., Brookline · Candidate for Re-election

KEIKO M. ORRALL +++++++++++++ **Republican**
120 Crooked Ln., Lakeville

JAMIE M. GUERIN +++++++++++ **Green-Rainbow**
386 Pleasant St., Northampton

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.

_____
WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

AUDITOR
Vote for ONE

SUZANNE M. BUMP +++++++++++ **Democratic**
6 Hoe Shop St., Easton · Candidate for Re-election

HELEN BRADY +++++++++++++++++ **Republican**
1630 Monument St., Concord

DANIEL FISHMAN ++++++++++++++ **Libertarian**
36 Colgate Rd., Beverly

EDWARD J. STAMAS +++++++++ **Green-Rainbow**
42 Laurel Park, Northampton

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.

_____
WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS
NINTH DISTRICT · **Vote for ONE**

BILL KEATING +++++++++++++++++ **Democratic**
10 Briarwood Ln., Bourne · Candidate for Re-election

PETER D. TEDESCHI +++++++++++ **Republican**
1265 Union St., Marshfield

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.

_____
WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

COUNCILLOR
FIRST DISTRICT · **Vote for ONE**

JOSEPH C. FERREIRA +++++++++ **Democratic**
7 Thomas Dr., Somerset · Candidate for Re-election

THOMAS F. KEYES ++++++++++++ **Republican**
22 Water St., Sandwich

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.

_____
WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

SENATOR IN GENERAL COURT
FIRST PLYMOUTH & BRISTOL DISTRICT · **Vote for ONE**

MARC R. PACHECO +++++++++++ **Democratic**
7 Dartmouth St., Taunton · Candidate for Re-election

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.

_____
WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

REPRESENTATIVE IN GENERAL COURT
SECOND PLYMOUTH DISTRICT · **Vote for ONE**

SUSAN WILLIAMS GIFFORD ++++ **Republican**
11 Lincoln Hwy, Wareham · Candidate for Re-election

SARAH G. HEWINS ++++++++++++ **Democratic**
52 Forest St., Carver

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.

_____
WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

DISTRICT ATTORNEY
PLYMOUTH DISTRICT · **Vote for ONE**

TIMOTHY J. CRUZ +++++++++++++ **Republican**
141 Aunt Lizzies Ln., Marshfield · Candidate for Re-election

JOHN E. BRADLEY, JR. +++++++++ **Democratic**
27 Burgess Rd., Plymouth

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.

_____
WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

CLERK OF COURTS
PLYMOUTH COUNTY · **Vote for ONE**

ROBERT S. CREEDON, JR. ++++++ **Democratic**
393 West Elm St., Brockton · Candidate for Re-election

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.

_____
WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

COUNTY COMMISSIONER
PLYMOUTH COUNTY · **Vote for ONE**

SANDRA M. WRIGHT ++++++++++ **Republican**
150 East St., Bridgewater · Candidate for Re-election

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.

_____
WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

REGISTER OF DEEDS
PLYMOUTH DISTRICT · **Vote for ONE**

JOHN R. BUCKLEY, JR. ++++++++ **Democratic**
308 Rockland St., Brockton · Candidate for Re-election

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.

_____
WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

You may vote for every position on the Upper Cape Cod Regional Technical School District Committee, regardless of where you reside in the District.

REGIONAL SCHOOL COMMITTEE
UPPER CAPE COD (4 YEARS) BOURNE +++
Vote for not more than ONE

_____
WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

REGIONAL SCHOOL COMMITTEE
UPPER CAPE COD (4 YEARS) FALMOUTH
Vote for not more than ONE

THOMAS PAUL CORRIVEAU +++++++++++
25 Braeburn Ct., Falmouth · Candidate for Re-election

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.

_____
WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

REGIONAL SCHOOL COMMITTEE
UPPER CAPE COD (4 YEARS) SANDWICH
Vote for not more than ONE

MICHAEL D. DEGAN +++++++++++++++++++
10 Raymond St., Sandwich · Candidate for Re-election

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.

_____
WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

REGIONAL SCHOOL COMMITTEE
UPPER CAPE COD (4 YEARS) WAREHAM
Vote for not more than ONE

DOMINIC A. CAMMARANO, JR. +++++++++
22 West Blvd., Wareham · Candidate for Re-election

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.

_____
WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

VOTE BOTH SIDES

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 2, 2018?

SUMMARY

This proposed law would limit how many patients could be assigned to each registered nurse in Massachusetts hospitals and certain other health care facilities. The maximum number of patients per registered nurse would vary by type of unit and level of care, as follows:

- In units with step-down/intermediate care patients: 3 patients per nurse;
- In units with post-anesthesia care or operating room patients: 1 patient under anesthesia per nurse; 2 patients post-anesthesia per nurse;
- In the emergency services department: 1 critical or intensive care patient per nurse (or 2 if the nurse has assessed each patient's condition as stable); 2 urgent non-stable patients per nurse; 3 urgent stable patients per nurse; or 5 non-urgent stable patients per nurse;
- In units with maternity patients: (a) active labor patients: 1 patient per nurse; (b) during birth and for up to two hours immediately postpartum: 1 mother per nurse and 1 baby per nurse; (c) when the condition of the mother and baby are determined to be stable: 1 mother and her baby or babies per nurse; (d) postpartum: 6 patients per nurse; (e) intermediate care or continuing care babies: 2 babies per nurse; (f) well-babies: 6 babies per nurse;
- In units with pediatric, medical, surgical, telemetry, or observational/outpatient treatment patients, or any other unit: 4 patients per nurse; and
- In units with psychiatric or rehabilitation patients: 5 patients per nurse.

The proposed law would require a covered facility to comply with the patient assignment limits without reducing its level of nursing, service, maintenance, clerical, professional, and other staff.

The proposed law would also require every covered facility to develop a written patient acuity tool for each unit to evaluate the condition of each patient. This tool would be used by nurses in deciding whether patient limits should be lower than the limits of the proposed law at any given time.

The proposed law would not override any contract in effect on January 1, 2019 that set higher patient limits. The proposed law's limits would take effect after any such contract expired.

The state Health Policy Commission would be required to promulgate regulations to implement the proposed law. The Commission could conduct inspections to ensure compliance with the law. Any facility receiving written notice from the Commission of a complaint or a violation would be required to submit a written compliance plan to the Commission. The Commission could report violations to the state Attorney General, who could file suit to obtain a civil penalty of up to $25,000 per violation as well as up to $25,000 for each day a violation continued after the Commission notified the covered facility of the violation. The Health Policy Commission would be required to establish a toll-free telephone number for complaints and a website where complaints, compliance plans, and violations would appear.

The proposed law would prohibit discipline or retaliation against any employee for complying with the patient assignment limits of the law. The proposed law would require every covered facility to post within each unit, patient room, and waiting area a notice explaining the patient limits and how to report violations. Each day of a facility's non-compliance with the posting requirement would be punishable by a civil penalty between $250 and $2,500.

The proposed law's requirements would be suspended during a state or nationally declared public health emergency.

The proposed law states that, if any of its parts were declared invalid, the other parts would stay in effect. The proposed law would take effect on January 1, 2019.

A YES VOTE would limit the number of patients that could be assigned to one registered nurse in hospitals and certain other health care facilities.

A NO VOTE would make no change in current laws relative to patient-to-nurse limits.

YES ◯

NO ◯

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 2, 2018?

SUMMARY

This proposed law would create a citizens commission to consider and recommend potential amendments to the United States Constitution to establish that corporations do not have the same Constitutional rights as human beings and that campaign contributions and expenditures may be regulated.

Any resident of Massachusetts who is a United States citizen would be able to apply for appointment to the 15-member commission, and members would serve without compensation. The Governor, the Secretary of the Commonwealth, the state Attorney General, the Speaker of the state House of Representatives, and the President of the state Senate would each appoint three members of the commission and, in making these appointments, would seek to ensure that the commission reflects a range of geographic, political, and demographic backgrounds.

The commission would be required to research and take testimony, and then issue a report regarding (1) the impact of political spending in Massachusetts; (2) any limitations on the state's ability to regulate corporations and other entities in light of Supreme Court decisions that allow corporations to assert certain constitutional rights; (3) recommendations for constitutional amendments; (4) an analysis of constitutional amendments introduced to Congress; and (5) recommendations for advancing proposed amendments to the United States Constitution.

The commission would be subject to the state Open Meeting Law and Public Records Law. The commission's first report would be due December 31, 2019, and the Secretary of the Commonwealth would be required to deliver the commission's report to the state Legislature, the United States Congress, and the President of the United States.

The proposed law states that, if any of its parts were declared invalid, the other parts would stay in effect. The proposed law would take effect on January 1, 2019.

A YES VOTE would create a citizens commission to advance an amendment to the United States Constitution to limit the influence of money in elections and establish that corporations do not have the same rights as human beings.

A NO VOTE would not create this commission.

YES ◯

NO ◯

QUESTION 3
REFERENDUM ON AN EXISTING LAW

Do you approve of a law summarized below, which was approved by the House of Representatives and the Senate on July 7, 2016?

SUMMARY

This law adds gender identity to the list of prohibited grounds for discrimination in places of public accommodation, resort, or amusement. Such grounds also include race, color, religious creed, national origin, sex, disability, and ancestry. A "place of public accommodation, resort or amusement" is defined in existing law as any place that is open to and accepts or solicits the patronage of the general public, such as hotels, stores, restaurants, theaters, sports facilities, and hospitals. "Gender identity" is defined as a person's sincerely held gender-related identity, appearance, or behavior, whether or not it is different from that traditionally associated with the person's physiology or assigned sex at birth.

This law prohibits discrimination based on gender identity in a person's admission to or treatment in any place of public accommodation. The law requires any such place that has separate areas for males and females (such as restrooms) to allow access to and full use of those areas consistent with a person's gender identity. The law also prohibits the owner or manager of a place of public accommodation from using advertising or signage that discriminates on the basis of gender identity.

This law directs the state Commission Against Discrimination to adopt rules or policies and make recommendations to carry out this law. The law also directs the state Attorney General to issue regulations or guidance on referring for legal action any person who asserts gender identity for an improper purpose.

The provisions of this law governing access to places of public accommodation are effective as of October 1, 2016. The remaining provisions are effective as of July 8, 2016.

A YES VOTE would keep in place the current law, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of gender identity in places of public accommodation.

A NO VOTE would repeal this provision of the public accommodation law.

YES ◯

NO ◯

QUESTION 4

Shall the Town of Wareham be allowed to exempt from the provisions of proposition two and one-half, so-called, the amounts required to pay for the bonds issued in order to construct a new Pre-K through 4th Grade Elementary School on the existing Minot Forest school site, including the payment of all costs incidental or related thereto?

YES ◯

NO ◯

YOU HAVE NOW COMPLETED VOTING