OFFICIAL RESULTS OF THE STATE ELECTION TUESDAY NOVEMBER 6, 2018

OFFICIAL RESULTS

	Party	Inc.	PCT 1	PCT 2	PCT 3	TOTALS
SENATOR IN CONGRESS						
BLANKS			19	24	13	56
ELIZABETH A. WARREN	D		542	484	555	1581
GEOFF DIEHL	R	Χ	981	670	813	2464
SHIVA AYYADURAI	1		49	96	62	207
WRITE IN			0	2	1	3
TOTALS			1591	1276	1444	4311
GOVERNOR AND LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR						
BLANKS			32	35	47	114
BAKER and POLITO	R	Х	1337	996	1154	3487
GONZALEZ and PALFREY	D		217	241	237	695
WRITE IN			5	4	6	15
TOTALS			1591	1276	1444	4311
ATTORNEY GENERAL						
BLANKS			36	30	33	99
MARY E. HURLEY	D		650	614	690	1954
JAMES R. McMAHON, III	R	Х	905	632	721	2258
WRITE IN			0	0	0	0
TOTALS			1591	1276	1444	4311
SECRETARY OF STATE						
BLANKS			69	54	54	177
WILLIAM FRANCIS GALVIN	D	Х	699	605	709	2013
ANTHONY M. AMORE	R		782	<i>554</i>	634	1970
JUAN G. SANCHEZ, JR.	GR		40	63	47	150
WRITE IN			1	0	0	1
TOTALS			1591	1276	1444	4311

OFFICIAL RESULTS OF THE STATE ELECTION TUESDAY NOVEMBER 6, 2018

OFFICIAL RESULTS

	Party	Inc.	PCT 1	PCT 2	PCT 3	TOTALS
TREASURER						
IKLASSKEK						
BLANKS			100	72	78	250
DEBORAH B. GOLDBERG	D		601	564	647	1812
KEIKO M. ORRALL	R	Χ	825	566	655	2046
JAMIE M. GUERIN	GR		65	74	63	202
WRITE IN			0	0	1	1
TOTALS			1591	1276	1444	4311
AUDITOR						
Noone						
BLANKS			102	76	72	250
SUZANNE M. BUMP	D		566	503	607	1676
HELEN BRADY	R	Χ	820	573	669	2062
DANIEL FISHMAN	L		54	74	51	179
EDWARD J. STAMAS	GR		49	50	45	144
WRITE IN			0	0	0	0
TOTALS			1591	1276	1444	4311
REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS						
BLANKS			520	352	438	1310
RICHARD E. NEAL	D	x	993	870	946	2809
WRITE IN			78	54	60	192
TOTALS			1591	1276	1444	4311
COUNCILLOR						
BLANKS			195	126	169	490
MARY E. HURLEY	D	х	704	648	735	2087
MIKE FRANCO	I		683	495	530	1708
WRITE IN			9	7	10	26
TOTALS			1591	1276	1444	4311

OFFICIAL RESULTS OF THE STATE ELECTION TUESDAY NOVEMBER 6, 2018

OFFICIAL RESULTS

	Party	Inc.	PCT 1	PCT 2	PCT 3	TOTALS
SENATOR IN GENERAL COURT						
BLANKS			240	209	209	658
DONALD F. HUMASON, JR	R	x	1334	1045	1213	3592
WRITE IN TOTALS			17 1591	22 1276	22 1444	61 4311
REPRESENTATIVE IN GENERAL COURT						
BLANKS			60	46	40	146
NICHOLAS A. BOLDYGA	R	х	1165	876	1034	3075
FORREST W. BRADFORD	D		364	354	367	1085
WRITE IN			2	0	3	5
TOTALS			1591	1276	1444	4311
DISTRICT ATTORNEY						
BLANKS			519	349	400	1268
ANTHONY D. GULLUNI	D	Х	1031	896	1008	2935
WRITE IN			41	31	36	108
TOTALS			1591	1276	1444	4311
CLERK OF COURTS						
BLANKS			576	384	460	1420
LAURA S. GENTILE	D	x	969	863	950	2782
WRITE IN			46	29	34	109
TOTALS			1591	1276	1444	4311
REGISTER OF DEEDS						
BLANKS			86	54	52	192
MARIE ANGELIDES	R	х	984	702	831	2517
CHERYL COAKLEY-RIVERA	D		517	519	561	1597
WRITE IN			4	1	0	5
TOTALS			1591	1276	1444	4311

OFFICIAL RESULTS OF THE STATE ELECTION TUESDAY NOVEMBER 6, 2018

OFFICIAL RESULTS

Party Inc. PCT 1 PCT 2 PCT 3 TOTALS

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?

QUESTION #1		

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 unites 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 urgentnon-stable patients per nurse; 3 urgent stable patients per nurse; or 5 non-urgent stable patients per nurse;
- In unites 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 compliant or a voilation 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 VOTEwould 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.

BLANKS		46	40	45	131
YES		354	340	329	1023
NO	Х	1191	896	1070	3157
TOTALS		1591	1276	1444	4311

OFFICIAL RESULTS OF THE STATE ELECTION TUESDAY NOVEMBER 6, 2018

OFFICIAL RESULTS

Party	Inc.	PCT 1	PCT 2	PCT 3	TOTALS

QUESTION #2

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 demopraphic 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 oncstitutional 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 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.

BLANKS	69	42	59	170
YES	x 906	802	843	2551
NO	616	432	542	1590
TOTALS	1591	1276	1444	4311

OFFICIAL RESULTS OF THE STATE ELECTION TUESDAY NOVEMBER 6, 2018

OFFICIAL RESULTS

Party	Inc.	PCT 1	PCT 2	PCT 3	TOTALS
7					

QUESTION #3

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

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.

BLANKS	44	32	36	112
YES	x 786	705	766	2257
NO	761	539	642	1942
TOTALS	1591	1276	1444	4311
VOTER REGISTRATION 10/17/2018	2423	2157	2279	6859
TOTAL VOTED NOVEMBER 06, 2018	1591	1276	1444	4311
% VOTED NOVEMBER 06, 2018	65.66%	<i>59.16%</i>	63.36%	62.85%

A TRUE COPY ATTEST: Michelle L. Hill