

# The Commonwealth of Massachusetts

## STATE ELECTION

DANVERS

### SAMPLE BALLOT

Tuesday, November 8, 2016

*William Francis Sullivan*  
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.

#### ELECTORS OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Vote for ONE

CLINTON and KAINE ..... Democratic

JOHNSON and WELD ..... Libertarian

STEIN and BARAKA ..... Green-Rainbow

TRUMP and PENCE ..... Republican

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

WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

#### REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS

SIXTH DISTRICT Vote for ONE

SETH MOULTON ..... Democratic   
10 Forrester St., Salem Candidate for Re-election

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

WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

#### COUNCILLOR

FIFTH DISTRICT Vote for ONE

EILEEN R. DUFF ..... Democratic   
8 Barberry Heights Rd., Gloucester Candidate for Re-election

RICHARD A. BAKER ..... Republican   
288 Middle St., West Newbury

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

WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

#### SENATOR IN GENERAL COURT

SECOND ESSEX DISTRICT Vote for ONE

JOAN B. LOVELY ..... Democratic   
14 Storv St., Salem 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

THIRTEENTH ESSEX DISTRICT Vote for ONE

THEODORE C. SPELIOTIS ..... Democratic   
4 Arcmore Dr., Danvers Candidate for Re-election

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

WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

#### SHERIFF

ESSEX COUNTY Vote for ONE

KEVIN F. COPPINGER ..... Democratic   
37 Martin Rd., Lynn

ANNE M. MANNING-MARTIN ..... Republican   
37 Dexter St., Peabody

MARK E. ARCHER ..... Independent   
240 Dudley Rd., Bedford

KEVIN J. LEACH ..... Independent   
33 Summer St., Manchester-E. -The-Sea

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

WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

#### 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.

YES

NO

Vertical line on the left side of the page with a series of horizontal lines and circles, likely a scanning artifact or a form element.

**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 3, 2016?

**SUMMARY**

This proposed law would allow the state Board of Elementary and Secondary Education to approve up to 12 new charter schools or enrollment expansions in existing charter schools each year. Approvals under this law could expand statewide charter school enrollment by up to 1% of the total statewide public school enrollment each year. New charters and enrollment expansions approved under this law would be exempt from existing limits on the number of charter schools, the number of students enrolled in them, and the amount of local school districts' spending allocated to them.

If the Board received more than 12 applications in a single year from qualified applicants, then the proposed law would require it to give priority to proposed charter schools or enrollment expansions in districts where student performance on statewide assessments is in the bottom 25% of all districts in the previous two years and where demonstrated parent demand for additional public school options is greatest.

**CONTINUE ON BACK**

**VOTE BOTH SIDES**

New charter schools and enrollment expansions approved under this proposed law would be subject to the same approval standards as other charter schools, and to recruitment, retention, and multilingual outreach requirements that currently apply to some charter schools. Schools authorized under this law would be subject to annual performance reviews according to standards established by the Board.

The proposed law would take effect on January 1, 2017.

**A YES VOTE** would allow for up to 12 approvals each year of either new charter schools or expanded enrollments in existing charter schools, but not to exceed 1% of the statewide public school enrollment.

**A NO VOTE** would make no change in current laws relative to charter schools.

YES

NO

### 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** would make no change in current laws relative to the keeping of farm animals.

YES

NO

## 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.

YES

NO

## QUESTION 5

Shall the Town of Danvers accept sections 3 to 7 inclusive, of Chapter 44B of the General Laws, as approved by its legislative body, a summary of which appears below?

### SUMMARY

Sections 3 to 7 of Chapter 44B of the General Laws of Massachusetts, also known as the Community Preservation Act, ("the Act") establish a dedicated funding source to enable cities and towns to (1) acquire, create and preserve open space, which includes land for parks, recreational uses, conservation areas, and the protection of drinking water supplies, and to rehabilitate local parks, playgrounds, and athletic fields; (2) acquire, preserve and rehabilitate historic buildings and resources; and (3) help meet local families' housing needs.

In Danvers, the funding source for these community preservation purposes will be a surcharge of 1.5% on the annual property tax assessed on real property beginning in fiscal year 2018, and by annual distributions made by the state from a trust fund created by the Act. Only communities that adopt the Community Preservation Act receive a distribution from this state trust fund.

The following will be exempt from the surcharge: (1) property owned and occupied as a domicile by any person who qualifies for low income housing or low or moderate income senior housing in the Town of Danvers, as defined in Section 2 of said Act; (2) \$100,000 of the value of each taxable parcel of residential property; (3) \$100,000 of the value of each taxable parcel of class three, commercial property, and class four, industrial property as defined in section 2A of Chapter 59. A taxpayer receiving a regular property tax abatement or exemption will also receive a pro rata reduction in surcharge.

A Community Preservation Committee composed of local citizens will make recommendations on the use of the funds and all expenditures must be approved by Town Meeting.

YES

NO

# YOU HAVE NOW COMPLETED VOTING