

STATE ELECTION

Nov. 8, 2022

Town of Hanson

	Precinct I	Precinct II	Precinct III	EV Pre I	EV Pre II	EV Pre III	Total
GOVERNOR and LIEUTENANT							
GOVERNOR (vote for one)							
DIEHL and ALLEN	645	740	585	286	261	187	2704
HEALEY and DRISCOLL	333	393	319	402	424	330	2201
REED and EVERETT	16	19	21	9	12	11	88
Write Ins (all others)	1	1	0	0	1	0	3
Blanks	6	3	7	14	7	7	44
ATTORNEY GENERAL (vote for one)							
ANDREA JOY CAMPBELL	325	392	312	391	410	314	2144
JAMES R. MCMAHON, III	652	744	597	296	278	211	2778
Write Ins (all others)	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Blanks	23	20	23	24	17	10	117
SECRETARY OF STATE (vote for one)							
WILLIAM FRANCIS GALVIN	427	495	384	449	469	365	2589
RAYLA CAMPBELL	543	623	521	239	214	154	2294
JUAN SANCHEZ	12	22	13	8	8	9	72
Write Ins (all others)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Blanks	19	16	14	15	14	7	85
TREASURER (Vote for one)							
DEBORAH B. GOLDBERG	482	560	432	467	470	370	2781
CRISTINA CRAWFORD	370	406	367	143	149	106	1541
Write Ins (all others)	2	6	0	1	2	0	11
Blanks	147	184	133	100	84	59	707
AUDITOR (vote for one)							
ANTHONY AMORE	600	693	549	285	261	186	2574
DIANA DIZOGLIO	280	317	268	339	354	268	1826
GLORIA A. CABALLERO-ROCA	10	17	8	12	13	9	69
DOMINIC GIANNONE, III	40	41	40	22	22	27	192
DANIEL RIEK	22	32	28	11	16	10	119
Write Ins (all others)	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Blanks	49	55	39	42	39	35	259
REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS (vote for one)							
BILL KEATING	386	453	353	405	436	340	2373
JESSE G. BROWN	595	669	555	283	247	175	2524
Write Ins (all others)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Blanks	20	34	24	23	22	20	143
COUNCILLOR (vote for one)							
ROBERT L. JUBINVILLE	345	429	342	398	420	324	2258
DASHE M. VIDEIRA	596	662	540	265	246	180	2489
Write Ins (all others)	0	1	2	0	0	0	3

Blanks	60	64	48	48	39	31	290
SENATOR IN GENERAL COURT (vote for one)							
MICHAEL D. BRADY	343	418	342	383	414	316	2216
JIM GORDON	627	711	564	307	268	203	2680
Write Ins (all others)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Blanks	31	27	26	21	23	16	144
REPRESENTATIVE IN GENERAL COURT 6th Plymouth District (vote for one)							
JOSH S. CUTLER		446	368		434	320	1568
KENNETH SWEEZEY		690	545		259	203	1697
Write Ins (all others)		0	0		0	0	0
Blanks		20	19		12	12	63
REPRESENTATIVE IN GENERAL COURT 5th Plymouth District (vote for one)							
DAVID F. DECOSTE	645			307			952
EMMANUEL J. DOCKTER	322			373			695
Write Ins (all others)	0			0			0
Blanks	34			31			65
DISTRICT ATTORNEY (vote for one)							
TIMOTHY J. CRUZ	749	866	699	432	431	310	3487
RAHSAAN HALL	222	260	211	252	247	213	1405
Write Ins (all others)	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Blanks	30	30	21	27	27	12	147
SHERIFF (vote for one)							
JOSEPH DANIEL MCDONALD, JR	814	954	783	503	490	368	3912
Write Ins (all others)	10	22	5	2	10	2	51
Blanks	177	180	144	206	205	165	1077
COUNTY COMMISSIONER (vote for one)							
SANDRA M. WRIGHT	671	748	609	338	313	227	2906
ALEX A. BEZANSON	282	353	279	332	362	282	1890
Write Ins (all others)	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
Blanks	48	54	44	40	30	26	242

QUESTION 1: PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Do you approve of the adoption of an amendment to the constitution summarized below, which was approved by the General Court in joint sessions of the two houses on June 12, 2019 (yeas 147 - nays 48); and again on June 9, 2021 (yeas 159 - nays 41)?

SUMMARY

This proposed constitutional amendment would establish an additional 4% state income tax on that portion of annual taxable income in excess of \$1 million. This income level would be adjusted annually, by the same method used for federal taxable income-tax brackets, to reflect increases in the cost of living. Revenues from this tax would be used, subject to appropriation by the state Legislature, for public educutions, public colleges and universities; and for the repair and maintenance of roads, bridges, and public transportation. The proposed amendment would apply to tax years beginning on or after January 1, 2023.

A YES VOTE would amend the state Constitution to impose an additional 4% tax on that portion of incomes over one million dollars to be used, subject to appropriation by the state Legislature, on education and transportation.

A NO VOTE would make no change in the state Constitution relative to income tax.

	Precinct I	Precinct II	Precinct III	EV Pre I	EV Pre II	Pre III	Total
YES	282	349	307	341	334	289	1902
NO	700	791	617	345	355	232	3040
BLANKS	19	16	8	25	16	14	98

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, 2022?

SUMMARY

This proposed law would direct the Commissioner of the Massachusetts Division of Insurance to approve or disapprove the rates of dental benefit plans and would require that a dental insurance carrier meet an annual aggregate medical loss ratio for its covered dental benefit plans of 83 percent. The medical loss ratio would measure the amount of premium dollars a dental insurance carrier spends on its members' dental expenses and quality improvements, as opposed to administrative expenses. If a carrier's annual aggregate medical loss ratio is less than 83 percent, the carrier would be required to refund the excess premiums to its covered individuals and groups. The proposed law would allow the Commissioner to waive or adjust the refunds only if it is determined that issuing refunds would result in financial impairment for the carrier.

The proposed law would apply to dental benefit plans regardless of whether they are issued directly by a carrier, through the connector, or through an intermediary. The proposed law would not apply to dental benefit plans issued, delivered, or renewed to a self-insured group or where the carrier is acting as a third-party administrator.

The proposed law would require the carriers offering dental benefit plans to submit information about their current and projected medical loss ratio, administrative expenses, and other financial information to the Commissioner. Each carrier would be required to submit an annual comprehensive financial statement to the Division of Insurance, itemized by market group size and line of business. A carrier that also provides administrative services to one or more self-insured groups would also be required to file an appendix to their annual financial statement with information about its self-insured business. The proposed law would impose a late penalty on a carrier that does not file its annual report on or before April 1.

The Division would be required to make the submitted data public, to issue an annual summary to certain legislative committees, and to exchange the data with the Health Policy Commission. The Commissioner would be required to adopt standards requiring the registration of person or entities not otherwise licensed or registered by the Commissioner and criteria for the standardized reporting and uniform allocation methodologies among carriers.

The proposed law would allow the Commissioner to approve dental benefit policies for the purpose of being offered to individuals or groups. The Commissioner would be required to adopt regulations to determine eligibility criteria.

The proposed law would require carriers to file group product base rates and any changes to group rating factors that are to be effective on January 1 of each year on or before July 1 of the preceeding year. The Commissioner would be required to disapprove any proposed changes to base rates that are excessive, inadequate, or unreasonable in relation to the benefits charged. The Commissioner would also be required to disapprove any change to group rating factors that is discriminatory or not actuarially sound.

The proposed law sets forth criteria that, if met, would require the Commissioner to presumptively disapprove a carrier's

rate, including if the aggregate medical loss ratio for all dental benefit plans offered by a carrier is less than 83 percent.

The proposed law would establish procedures to be followed if a proposed rate is presumptively disapproved or if the Commissioner disapproves a rate.

The proposed law would require the Division to hold a hearing if a carrier reports a risk-based capital ratio on a combined entity basis that exceeds 700 percent in its annual report.

The proposed law would require the Commissioner to promulgate regulations consistent with its provisions by October 1, 2023. The proposed law would apply to all dental benefit plans issued, made effective, delivered, or renewed on or after January 1, 2024.

A YES VOTE would regulate dental insurance rates, including by requiring companies to spend at least 83% of premiums on member dental expenses and quality improvements instead of administrative expenses, and by making other changes to dental insurance regulations.

A NO VOTE would make no change in the law relative to the regulations that apply to dental insurance companies.

	Precinct I	Precinct II	Precinct III	EV Pre I	EV Pre II	Pre III	Total
YES	574	653	519	488	519	381	3134
NO	406	477	402	201	173	150	1809
BLANKS	21	26	11	22	13	4	97

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, 2022?

SUMMARY

This proposed law would increase the statewide limits on the combined number of licenses for the sale of alcoholic beverages for off-premises consumption (including licenses for "all alcoholic beverages" and for "wines and malt beverages") that any one retailer could own or control: from 9 to 12 licenses in 2023; to 15 licenses in 2027; and to 18 licenses in 2031.

Beginning in 2023, the proposed law would set a maximum number of "all alcoholic beverages" licenses that any one retailer could own or control at 7 licenses unless a retailer currently holds more than 7 such licenses.

The proposed law would require retailers to conduct the sale of alcoholic beverages for off-premises consumption through face-to-face transactions and would prohibit automated or self-checkout sales of alcoholic beverages by such retailers.

The proposed law would alter the calculation of the fine that the Alcoholic Beverages Control Commission may accept in lieu of suspending any license issued under the State Liquor Control Act. The proposed law would modify the formula for calculating such fee from being based on the gross profits on the sale of alcoholic beverages to being based on the gross profits on all retail sales.

The proposed law would also add out-of-state motor vehicles licenses to the list of the forms of identification that any holder of a license issued under the State Liquor Control Act, or their agent or employee, may choose to reasonable rely on for proof of a person's identity and age.

A YES VOTE would increase the number of licenses a retailer could have for the sale of alcoholic beverages to be

consumed off premises, limit the number of "all-alcoholic beverages" licenses that a retailer could acquire, restrict use of self-checkout, and require retailers to accept customers' out-of-state identification.

A NO VOTE would make no change in the laws governing the retail sale of alcoholic beverages.

	Precinct I	Precinct II	Precinct III	EV Pre I	EV Pre II	Pre III	Total
YES	363	435	299	270	287	215	1869
NO	612	699	611	418	389	305	3034
BLANKS	26	22	22	23	29	15	137

QUESTION 4: 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 May 26, 2022?

SUMMARY

This law allows Massachusetts residents who cannot provide proof of lawful presence in the United States to obtain a standard driver's license or learner's permit if they meet all the other qualifications for a standard license or learner's permit, including a road test and insurance, and provide provide proof of their identity, date of birth, and residency. The law provides that, when processing an application for such a license or learner's permit or motor vehicle registration, the registrar of motor vehicles may not ask about or create a record of the citizenship or immigration status of the applicant, except as otherwise required by law. This law does not allow people who cannot provide proof of lawful presence in the United States to obtain a REAL ID.

To prove identity and date of birth, the law requires an applicant to present at least two documents one from each of the following categories: (1) a valid unexpired foreign passport or a valid unexpired Consular Identification document; and (2) a valid unexpired driver's license from any United States state or territory, an original or certified copy of a birth certificate, a valid unexpired foreign national identification card, a valid unexpired foreign driver's license, or a marriage certificate or divorce decree issued by any state or territory of the United States. One of the documents presented by an applicant must include a photograph and one must include a date of birth. Any documents not in English must be accompanied by a certified translation. The registrar may review any documents issued by another country to determine whether they may be used as proof of identity or date of birth.

The law requires that applicants for a driver's license or learner's permit shall attest, under the pains and penalties of perjury, that their license has not been suspended or revoked in any other state, country, or jurisdiction.

The law specifies that information provided by or relating to any applicant or license-holder will not be a public record and shall not be disclosed, except as required by federal law or as authorized by Attorney General regulations, and except for purposes of motor vehicle insurance.

The law directs the registrar of motor vehicles to make regulations regarding the documents required of United States citizens and others who provide proof of lawful presence with their license application.

The law also requires the registrar and the Secretary of the Commonwealth to establish procedures and regulations to ensure that an applicant for a standard driver's license or learner's permit who does not provide proof of lawful presence will not be automatically registered to vote.

The law takes effect on July 1, 2023.

A YES VOTE would keep in place the law, which would allow Massachusetts residents who cannot provide

proof of lawful presence in the United States to obtain a driver's license or permit if they meet the other requirements for doing so.

A NO VOTE would repeal this law.

	Precinct I	Precinct II	Precinct III	EV Pre I	EV Pre II	EV Pre III	Total
YES	304	312	283	300	319	240	1758
NO	682	826	640	396	369	285	3198
BLANKS	15	18	9	15	17	10	84
TOTAL BALLOTS CAST	1001	1156	932	711	705	535	5040

A true copy of the vote, Attest:

Elizabeth Sloan, CMC, CMMC
Town Clerk