

**TOWN CLERK'S RECORD OF
MASSACHUSETTS STATE ELECTION**

November 7, 2006

(seal)

Wellesley, Mass.
November 7, 2006

In pursuance of the foregoing Warrant, the inhabitants of the Town of Wellesley qualified to vote in Primaries met at the polling places designated for the several precincts in said Wellesley, on Tuesday, November 7, 2006 at 7:00 A.M.

Polling places had been designated as follows:
The voters of Precinct A, in Katherine Lee Bates School
The voters of Precinct B, in Sprague School
The voters of Precinct C, in Ernest F. Upham School
The voters of Precinct D, in Otho L. Schofield School
The voters of Precinct E, in Joseph E. Fiske School
The voters of Precinct F, in Wellesley Senior High School
The voters of Precinct G, in Hunnewell School

The following served as Precinct Officers in the respective precincts by appointment either by the Selectmen or by the Town Clerk:

PRECINCT A (Bates School)

Warden, John G. Schuler
Clerk, Edwina W. Schuler

William T. Magorty
Roseda Warren
Deborah T. Rempis
Sandy Goldstein

Elizabeth A. Ide
Richard M. Tucker
Gerda Plouffe
Helen Turner

PRECINCT B (Sprague School)

Warden, Jayne M. Moore
Clerk, Barbara M. Sturgis

Barbara Jean West
Irene C. Flint
Robert McCarthy
Judy Shannon
Anne Marie McDonald

Deborah A. Bates
Timothy Flint
Gertrude Dobday
Sue A. Cousin

PRECINCT C (Upham School)

Warden, Paul E. Carter
Clerk, James B. Corscadden

Lois E. Dickinson
Hertha Marie Page
Joseph Hanlon
Ellie Everts

Minnie Ito
Edwin T. Donahue
Judith Hull
Nancy Saumsiegle

Frances Antonelli

PRECINCT D (Schofield School)

Warden, Bob White

Clerk, Alice N. Erickson

Joseph E. Connolly
Joseph D. Nickerson
Cynthia Bostwick
Celesta A. Nickerson

Janet V. Beyer
Ann Hile
Hector Macdonald

PRECINCT E (Fiske School)

Warden, John E. Woodacre

Clerk, Gail E. Fleischer

Ralph E. Bailey
Richard Bostwick
William A. Monroe, Jr.
Meredith Stokes
Althea Glick

Grace Berestecki
Elaine Putnam
Paula F. Burton
Esther H. McKenzie

PRECINCT F (Senior High School)

Warden, Jilda R. Johnson

Clerk, Harold Foley

Barbara A. Charlton
Dorothy M. Holmes
Ruth von Kelsch
Helen F. Stewart
Cynthia Edwards

William E. Charlton
Edward D. (Ted) Becker
Joan Savitt
Eunice Twitchell

PRECINCT G (Hunnewell School)

Warden, Stanley G. Hodges

Clerk, Henry J. Lysaght

Alix Jackson
Nancy B. Lane
Claire D. Wilson
Richard Surman

Joseph Stephen Harkins
Cathleen Hardisty
Francis (Frank) Foley

FINAL TABULATING CENTER (Town Hall)

Terrance Connolly

Caitlin Conlon

The Town Clerk and Registrars of Voters, upon receipt of the returns from the several precincts, forthwith canvassed the same and announced the final results at 10:30 P.M.

Six provisional ballots were accepted and 8 absentee ballots posted from outside of the United States were received until November 17, 2006. This resulted in an additional 14 ballots tallied after the date of the election.

The total number of votes cast was 11441, 74% of eligible registered voters

15,466.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	TOTAL
Total Turnout	1857	1848	1855	1650	1845	1504	882	11441
Total Eligible Voters	2433	2516	2539	2187	2462	1981	1348	15466
Percentage	76%	73%	73%	75%	75%	76%	65%	74%

The vote by precincts is as follows:

PRECINCT	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	Total
SENATOR IN CONGRESS								
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Dem.	1227	1247	984	1146	1155	964	657	7380
KENNETH G. CHASE, Republican	570	542	801	446	608	469	193	3629
WRITE-IN	0	0	0	0	5	2	0	7
BLANKS	60	59	70	58	77	69	32	425
GOVERNOR								
HEALEY AND HILLMAN, Rep.	645	653	917	566	750	572	234	4337
PATRICK AND MURRAY, Dem.	1101	1068	848	986	963	804	590	6360
MIHOS AND SULLIVAN, Ind.	62	70	52	48	78	69	23	402
ROSS AND ROBINSON, Gr-Rainbow	32	40	20	24	24	42	19	201
WRITE-IN	0	0	3	1	0	1	1	6
BLANKS	17	17	15	25	30	16	15	135
ATTORNEY GENERAL								
MARTHA COAKLEY, Democratic	1286	1258	1037	1158	1184	975	650	7548
LARRY FRISOLI, Republican	500	510	728	422	553	450	171	3334
WRITE-IN	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
BLANKS	71	80	89	70	107	79	61	557
SECRETARY OF STATE								
WILLIAM FRANCIS GALVIN, Dem	1289	1279	1228	1162	1217	1003	602	7780
JILL E. STEIN, Green-Rainbow	339	327	285	293	334	263	172	2013
WRITE-IN	1	0	9	8	4	1	1	24
BLANKS	228	242	333	187	290	237	107	1624

TREASURER								
TIMOTHY P. CAHILL, Democratic	1346	1310	1236	1201	1254	1043	619	8009
JAMES O'KEEFE, Green-Rainbow	255	268	229	225	239	185	123	1524
WRITE-IN	0	0	9	1	5	1	1	17
BLANKS	256	270	381	223	347	275	139	1891
AUDITOR								
A. JOSEPH DENUCCI, Democratic	1347	1323	1200	1206	1243	1045	630	7994
RAND WILSON, Working Families	225	234	216	193	232	140	100	1340
WRITE-IN	0	0	12	1	6	3	0	22
BLANKS	285	291	427	250	364	316	152	2085
REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS								
BARNEY FRANK, Democratic	1404	1362	1216	1244	1317	1074	701	8318
WRITE- IN	15	20	39	33	35	15	7	164
BLANKS	438	466	600	373	493	415	174	2959
COUNCILLOR SECOND DISTRICT								
KELLY A. TIMILTY, Democratic		1032				773	543	2348
MICHAEL W. MCCUE, Republican		543				481	193	1217
WRITE-INS		0				0	0	0
BLANKS		273				250	146	669
COUNCILLOR THIRD DISTRICT								
MARILYN M. PETTITO DEVANEY, Democratic	1177		980	1044	1096			4297
WRITE-INS	12		7	8	11			38
BLANKS	668		868	598	738			2872
Totals	1857		1855	1650	1845			
SENATOR IN GENERAL COURT- NORFOLK BRISTOL AND MIDDLESEX DISTRICT								
SCOTT P. BROWN, Republican		1164				953	465	2582

WRITE-INS		14				12	10	36
BLANKS		670				539	407	1616
SENATOR IN GENERAL COURT- FIRST MIDDLESEX AND NORFOLK DISTRICT								
CYNTHIA STONE CREEM, Dem.	1260		1074	1127	1165			4626
WRITE-INS	10		13	8	18			49
BLANKS	587		768	515	662			2532
REPRESENTATIVE IN GENERAL COURT								
ALICE HANLON PEISCH, Dem	1402	1406	1266	1278	1339	1124	704	8519
PETER G. HILL, Write-in	1	1	0	12	2	2	0	18
WRITE-INS	11	9	22	9	14	11	3	79
BLANKS	443	432	567	351	490	367	175	2825
DISTRICT ATTORNEY								
WILLIAM R. KEATING, Dem	1265	1285	1089	1132	1184	999	648	7602
WRITE-IN	6	4	7	2	4	3	1	27
BLANKS	586	559	759	516	657	502	233	3812
CLERK OF COURTS								
WALTER F. TIMILTY JR., Dem	1208	1203	1047	1098	1134	957	627	7274
WRITE-IN	9	5	7	4	7	1	3	36
BLANKS	640	640	801	548	704	546	252	4131
REGISTER OF DEEDS								
WILLIAM P. O'DONNELL, Dem	1217	1214	1029	1088	1126	961	622	7257
Write-Ins	6	6	5	2	6	2	1	28
BLANKS	634	628	821	560	713	541	259	4156
COUNTY COMMISSIONER								
PETER H. COLLINS, Democratic	971	967	718	889	868	710	523	5646
THOMAS E. GORMAN, Republican	569	570	767	460	613	526	202	3707
WRITE INS	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
BLANKS	317	311	369	301	364	268	157	2087

--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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 before May 3, 2006?

SUMMARY

This proposed law would allow local licensing authorities to issue licenses for food stores to sell wine. The proposed law defines a "food store" as a retail vendor, such as a grocery store, supermarket, shop, club, outlet, or warehouse-type seller, that sells food to consumers to be eaten elsewhere (which must include meat, poultry, dairy products, eggs, fresh fruit and produce, and other specified items), and that may sell other items usually found in grocery stores. Holders of licenses to sell wine at food stores could sell wine either on its own or together with any other items they sell.

The licensing authorities in any city or town of up to 5000 residents could issue up to 5 licenses for food stores to sell wine. In cities or towns of over 5000 residents, one additional license could be issued for each additional 5000 residents (or fraction of 5000). No person or business could hold more than 10% of the total number of the licenses that could be issued under the proposed law. Such licenses would not be counted when applying the laws that limit the number of other kinds of alcoholic beverage licenses that may be issued or held. Any applicant for a license would have to be approved by the state Alcoholic Beverages Control Commission, and any individual applicant would have to be at least 21 years old and not have been convicted of a felony.

In issuing any licenses for food stores to sell wine, local licensing authorities would have to use the same procedures that apply to other licenses for the retail sale of alcoholic beverages. Except where the proposed law has different terms, the same laws that apply to issuance, renewal, suspension and termination of licenses for retail sales of alcoholic beverages which are not to be consumed on the seller's premises, and that apply to the operations of holders of such licenses, would govern licenses to sell wine at food stores, and the operation of holders of such licenses. Local authorities could set fees for issuing and renewing such licenses.

A YES VOTE would create a new category of licenses for food stores to sell wine, and it would allow local licensing authorities to issue such licenses.

A NO VOTE would make no change in the laws concerning the sale of wine.

Question 1 Wine in Food Stores

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	TOTAL
YES	945	919	987	923	903	824	458	5959
NO	869	856	805	677	860	625	396	5088
BLANK	43	73	63	50	82	55	28	394

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 before May 3, 2006?

SUMMARY

This proposed law would allow candidates for public office to be nominated by more than one political party or political designation, to have their names appear on the ballot once for each nomination, and to have their votes counted separately for each nomination but then added together to determine the winner of the election. The proposed law would repeal an existing requirement that in order to appear on the state primary ballot as a candidate for a political party's nomination for certain offices, a person cannot have been enrolled in any other party during the preceding year. The requirement applies to candidates for nomination for statewide office, representative in Congress, governor's councilor, member of the state Legislature, district attorney, clerk of court, register of probate, register of deeds, county commissioner, sheriff, and county treasurer. The proposed law would also allow any person to appear on the primary ballot as a candidate for a party's nomination for those offices if the party's state committee gave its written consent. The proposed law would also repeal the existing requirement that in order to be nominated to appear as an unenrolled candidate on the state election ballot, or on any city or town ballot following a primary, a person cannot have been enrolled in any political party during the 90 days before the deadline for filing nomination papers.

The proposed law would provide that if a candidate were nominated by more than one party or political designation, instead of the candidate's name being printed on the ballot once, with the candidate allowed to choose the order in which the party or political designation names appear after the candidate's name, the candidate's name would appear multiple times, once for each nomination received. The candidate would decide the order in which the party or political designation nominations would appear, except that all parties would be listed before all political designations. The ballot would allow voters who vote for a candidate nominated by multiple parties or political designations to vote for that candidate under the party or political designation line of their choice.

If a voter voted for the same candidate for the same office on multiple party or political designation lines, the ballot would remain valid but would be counted as a single vote for the candidate on a line without a party or political designation. If voting technology allowed, voting machines would be required to prevent a voter from voting more than the number of times permitted for any one office.

The proposed law would provide that if a candidate received votes under more than one party or political designation, the votes would be combined for purposes of determining whether the candidate had won the election. The total number of votes each candidate received under each party or political designation would be recorded. Election officials would announce and record both the aggregate totals

and the total by party or political designation.

The proposed law would allow a political party to obtain official recognition if its candidate had obtained at least 3% of the vote for any statewide office at either of the two most recent state elections, instead of at only the most recent state election as under current law.

The proposed law would allow a person nominated as a candidate for any state, city or town office to withdraw his name from nomination within six days after any party's primary election for that office, whether or not the person sought nomination or was nominated in that primary. Any candidate who withdrew from an election could not be listed on the ballot for that election, regardless of whether the candidate received multiple nominations.

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

A YES VOTE would allow a candidate for public office to be nominated for the same office by more than one political party or political designation at the same election.

A NO VOTE would make no change in the laws concerning nomination of candidates for public office.

Question 2 Ballot Access

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	TOTAL
YES	588	555	560	551	563	508	309	3634
NO	1108	1090	1093	941	1065	830	462	6589
BLANK	161	203	202	158	217	166	111	1218

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 before May 3, 2006?

SUMMARY

This proposed law would allow licensed and other authorized providers of child care in private homes under the state's subsidized child care system to bargain collectively with the relevant state agencies about all terms and conditions of the provision of child care services under the state's child care assistance program and its regulations.

Under the proposed law, these family child care providers who provide state-subsidized child care would not be considered public employees, but if 30% of the providers gave written authorization for an employee organization to be their exclusive representative in collective bargaining, the state Labor Relations Commission would hold a secret mail ballot election on whether to certify that organization as the exclusive representative. Parts of the state's public employee labor relation's law and regulations would apply to the election and collective bargaining processes. The proposed law would not authorize providers to engage in a strike or other refusal to deliver child care services.

An exclusive representative, if certified, could then communicate with providers to develop and present a proposal to the state agencies concerning the terms and conditions of child care provider services. The proposed law would then require the parties to negotiate in good faith to try to reach a binding agreement. If the agreed-upon terms and conditions required changes in existing regulations, the state agencies could not finally agree to the terms until they completed the required

procedures for changing regulations and any cost items agreed to by the parties had been approved by the state Legislature. If any actions taken under the proposed law required spending state funds, that spending would be subject to appropriation by the Legislature. Any complaint that one of the parties was refusing to negotiate in good faith could be filed with and ruled upon by the Labor Relations Commission. An exclusive representative could collect a fee from providers for the costs of representing them.

An exclusive representative could be de-certified under Commission regulations and procedures if certain conditions were met. The Commission could not accept a decertification petition for at least 2 years after the first exclusive representative was certified, and any such petition would have to be supported by 50% or more of the total number of providers. The Commission would then hold a secret mail ballot election for the providers to vote on whether to decertify the exclusive representative.

The proposed law states that activities carried out under it would be exempt from federal anti-trust laws. The proposed law states that if any of its parts were declared invalid, the other parts would stay in effect.

A YES VOTE would allow licensed and other authorized providers of child care in private homes under the state’s subsidized child care system to bargain collectively with the state.

A NO VOTE would make no change in the laws concerning licensed and other authorized family child care providers.

Question 3 Child Care	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	Total
YES	722	682	567	635	610	553	394	4163
NO	973	962	1084	860	1032	790	379	6080
BLANK	162	204	204	155	203	161	109	1198

The ballots cast and the unused ballots in the several precincts were returned to the Town Clerk in sealed boxes. The voting lists used at the entrances and exits to the polling places, the tally sheets and the precinct records of election were also returned, all properly sealed in conformity with the laws governing elections.

Attest:

Kathleen F. Nagle
Town Clerk