

WARRANT FOR STATE ELECTION
COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS



Middlesex, ss.

To either of the Constables of the Town of Sudbury

GREETING:

In the name of the Commonwealth you are hereby required to notify and warn the inhabitants of said Town who are qualified to vote in the election to vote

at PETER NOYES SCHOOL, SUDBURY, MA
on TUESDAY, THE FOURTH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 1986
from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m. for the following purpose:

To cast their votes in the State Election for the election of candidates for the following offices:

- GOVERNOR - LT. GOVERNOR. For the Commonwealth
- ATTORNEY GENERAL For the Commonwealth
- SECRETARY. For the Commonwealth
- TREASURER. For the Commonwealth
- AUDITOR. For the Commonwealth
- REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS 5th Congressional District
- COUNCILLOR 3rd Councillor District
- SENATOR IN GENERAL COURT Middlesex & Worcester
Senatorial District
- REPRESENTATIVE IN GENERAL COURT. 13th Middlesex
Representative District
- DISTRICT ATTORNEY. Northern District
- SHERIFF. Middlesex County
- COUNTY COMMISSIONER. Middlesex County
- MIDDLESEX COUNTY CHARTER COMMISSIONER. . . 13th Middlesex District

BALLOT QUESTIONS

QUESTION A

Shall a charter study commission be created to study the present governmental structure of Middlesex county to consider and make findings concerning the form of government and make recommendations thereon?

YES	
NO	

Ballot questions 1 through 9 continued on pages 2 and 3.

Hereof fail not and make return of this warrant with your doings thereon at the time and place of said meeting.

Given under our hands this twenty-third day of October, 1986.

SELECTMEN OF SUDBURY

Josiah F. Frost
Josiah F. Frost, Chairman
Anne W. Donald
Anne W. Donald
David A. Wallace
David A. Wallace

QUESTION 1
PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

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 House of Representatives and the Senate on June 27, 1984 by a vote of 120-67, and on April 30, 1986 by a vote of 123-69?*

YES	
NO	

SUMMARY

The proposed constitutional amendment would allow the legislature to prohibit or regulate abortions to the extent permitted by the United States Constitution. It would also provide that the state constitution does not require public or private funding of abortions, or the provision of services or facilities for performing abortions, beyond what is required by the United States Constitution. The provisions of this amendment would not apply to abortions required to prevent the death of the mother.

QUESTION 2
PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

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 House of Representatives and the Senate on December 12, 1984 by a vote of 108-79, and on April 16, 1986 by a vote of 107-87?*

YES	
NO	

SUMMARY

The proposed constitutional amendment would allow the expenditure of public funds for private schools and private school students.

It would remove primary and secondary schools from the list of non-public institutions barred from receiving public aid and would allow public money, property, or loans of credit to be used for founding, maintaining, or aiding those schools. The proposed amendment would also allow public financial aid, materials, or services to be provided to a non-public school student requesting such aid, but only if that school does not discriminate in its entrance requirements on the basis of race, color, national origin, religious belief, sex, or physical handicap. The state legislature would have the power to impose limits on aid, materials, or services provided to students.

QUESTION 3
LAW PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION

Do you approve of a law summarized below, *which was disapproved by the House of Representatives on May 6, 1986, by a vote of 49 - 93, and on which no vote was taken by the Senate before May 7, 1986?*

YES	
NO	

SUMMARY

The proposed law would reduce and then repeal the 7½% surtax on Massachusetts state income taxes and would limit state tax revenue growth to the level of growth in total wages and salaries of the citizens of the state.

It would set the rate of the surtax on Massachusetts state income taxes at 3¾% for tax years beginning during 1986, and it would repeal the surtax for tax years beginning on or after January 1, 1987.

The allowable state tax revenues for any fiscal year are limited to the allowable state tax revenues for the prior fiscal year as increased by the average rate of growth of Massachusetts wages and salaries for the three immediately preceding calendar years. For purposes of calculating the proposed limit for fiscal year 1987, allowable state tax revenues for fiscal 1986 are the net tax revenues for that fiscal year, but excluding revenues derived from the surtax on state personal income tax. Further, if in any fiscal year the calculation of the limit results in allowable state tax revenues less than the amount of allowable state tax revenues for the prior year, then allowable state tax

(continued next column)

QUESTION 3 *(continued)*

revenues for that fiscal year shall be equal to the allowable state tax revenues for the prior year. The revenues limited by this law would not include non-tax revenues such as federal reimbursements, tuitions, fees and earnings on investments.

The amount of allowable state tax revenues for any fiscal year would have to be reduced if a new state law were enacted allowing local governments to impose new or increased taxes or excises. The reduction would be equal to the amount of revenue derived from the new tax or increase. The reduction in state tax revenues would first take effect in the fiscal year following the enactment of the new law authorizing new local taxes or increases.

If state tax revenues exceed the limit imposed by the proposed law, as determined by the State Auditor, a tax credit would have to be granted equal to the total amount of excess tax revenue. The credit would be applied to the then current personal income tax liability of all taxpayers in proportion to their personal income tax liability in the preceding year.

The provisions of this Act could be enforced in court by a group of taxpayers.

QUESTION 4
LAW PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION

Do you approve of a law summarized below, *which was approved by the House of Representatives on May 5, 1986, by a vote of 145 - 0, and on which no vote was taken by the Senate before May 7, 1986?*

YES	
NO	

SUMMARY

The proposed law would require the state Department of Environmental Quality Engineering (DEQE) to search for sites in the Commonwealth where oil or hazardous materials have been disposed of and to take all steps necessary, to clean up those sites within specified time limits. Provisions are made for informing the public about sites in their communities.

Beginning on January 15, 1987, DEQE would be required to publish lists every three months of all sites where it has confirmed that uncontrolled oil or hazardous materials have been disposed of and locations to be investigated as possible disposal sites. The lists would describe what actions have been taken at each site or location. DEQE would be required to list, to the extent that it has identified, at least 400 possible disposal sites by January 15, 1987, 600 additional locations by January 15, 1988, and 1,000 additional locations in each subsequent year.

Within one year after a location is listed as a possible disposal site DEQE would be required to determine if further investigation is warranted. If so, within two years after the listing, DEQE must confirm whether the location is a disposal site, and whether it poses an imminent or substantial hazard to health, safety, public welfare or the environment.

For sites found to pose a substantial hazard, DEQE would be required, within the next two years, to ensure that those hazards are eliminated and to develop a plan to eliminate permanently future risks from those sites. Imminent hazards would have to be eliminated immediately. For sites found not to pose any substantial hazards DEQE must, within seven years after the listing, ensure that the full extent of contamination is evaluated and that a plan to eliminate permanently future risks is developed.

The proposed law would require DEQE to provide public notice and encourage public participation. Within 30 days after completing a site investigation, DEQE would have to inform the public through local newspapers of the results of that investigation and of the rights of local citizens under the state law. If ten citizens of a town potentially affected by a site submit a request, DEQE would be required to develop a plan for involving the public in its clean-up decisions and present that plan at a public meeting. The chief municipal officer of a city or town in which a disposal site is located could appoint individual(s) to inspect the site on behalf of the community.

Massachusetts residents could bring lawsuits to enforce the provisions of the proposed law or to lessen a hazard related to oil or hazardous materials. If such a lawsuit is brought, a court could award costs, including reasonable fees for attorneys and expert witnesses.

QUESTION 5
REFERENDUM ON AN EXISTING LAW

Do you approve of a law summarized below, which was approved by the House of Representatives on October 17, 1985, by a vote of 77 - 62, and which was approved by the Senate on October 17, 1985?

YES	
NO	

SUMMARY

The law requires all drivers and passengers to wear properly adjusted and fastened safety belts while traveling in motor vehicles on public ways. It does not apply to: children under five years old who are required by another law to wear safety belts or be restrained in safety car seats; passengers in vehicles where all safety belts are being used by others; passengers in buses; persons riding in vehicles built before July 1, 1966, or in which safety belts were not installed as original equipment; or persons who are certified by a physician to be physically unable to use safety belts. The law also does not apply to police officers, rural mail carriers, or drivers or passengers of other vehicles that stop frequently and travel at speeds not exceeding 15 miles per hour between stops.

Drivers or passengers sixteen years or older who do not wear safety belts are subject to a \$15.00 fine. The driver of a vehicle is also subject to a \$15.00 fine for each passenger under sixteen who does not wear a safety belt. This law, however, can be enforced only if the driver is stopped for a violation of another motor vehicle law. Safety belt violations will not result in surcharges on motor vehicle insurance premiums. The law also requires that when the Commissioner of Insurance sets motor vehicle insurance rates, the rates must reflect any savings attributable to increased use of safety belts.

The law also requires that all motor vehicles manufactured after September 1, 1989, that are sold or registered in Massachusetts be equipped with crash protection devices, as specified by federal regulations. Any manufacturer who sells or delivers motor vehicles that are not equipped with such safety devices will be subject to a fine of not more than \$100 for each sale or delivery. This law is not intended to eliminate the federal requirements for passive crash protection devices in motor vehicles.

The law also provides that a non-binding question, unlike this binding referendum, shall be placed on the 1986 general election ballot asking whether the voters approve of the law.

QUESTION 6
LAW PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION

Do you approve of a law summarized below, which was disapproved by the House of Representatives on May 6, 1986, by a vote of 56 - 93, and on which no vote was taken by the Senate before May 7, 1986?

YES	
NO	

SUMMARY

The proposed law would provide a system of voter registration by mail applicable to all qualified voters and would eliminate statutory provisions permitting certain persons to vote only for presidential electors.

Under this proposed law, the State Secretary would be required to prepare blank forms for affidavits of registration. The Secretary and local boards of registrars would be required to make such forms available to any person eligible to vote in whatever quantity the person requests and to transmit such forms, upon written request, to any person claiming to be qualified to vote. Registrars would also be required to make these forms available at all post offices and at other places within their municipalities. The Secretary would be required to establish a reasonable fee for providing more than 50 forms and to prepare instructions to accompany the forms.

A person seeking to register to vote would be required to complete the affidavit of registration and sign it under oath in the presence of a witness who is at least eighteen years old. The witness would be required to certify that the affidavit was signed in his presence and to date the affidavit.

(continued next column)

QUESTION 6 (continued)

A completed affidavit of registration could be either delivered or mailed to the appropriate registrar's office. If, from the facts set forth in the affidavit, it appears that the person is qualified to vote, the registrars would be required to add the person's name to the list of registered voters and to so notify the person by first-class, non-forwardable mail, unless the person's name already appears on the local list of residents at the same address. The cost of mailing such notices would be assumed by the Commonwealth, subject to appropriation. If in any year the General Court fails to appropriate funds for that purpose, such notices would not have to be sent. If such a notice is returned undelivered, the city or town clerk would be required to instruct election officials to challenge the person's right to vote at the next election in which he attempts to vote.

The proposed law would also impose criminal penalties of imprisonment for up to two years or a fine up to \$2,000 for knowingly or willfully making a false affidavit, taking a false oath, or signing a false certificate relative to the qualifications or registration of any person to vote.

QUESTION 7
THIS QUESTION IS NONBINDING

Shall the Commonwealth of Massachusetts urge the United States Congress to enact a national health program which:

YES	
NO	

provides high quality comprehensive personal health care including preventive, curative and occupational health services; is universal in coverage, community controlled, rationally organized, equitably financed, with no out-of-pocket charges, is sensitive to the particular health needs of all, and is efficient in containing its cost; and whose yearly expenditure does not exceed the proportion of the Gross National Product spent on health care in the immediately preceding fiscal year?

QUESTION 8
THIS QUESTION IS NONBINDING

Shall the Commonwealth of Massachusetts urge the President of the United States and the United States Congress to enact a national acid rain control program which would require a fifty percent reduction in total national sulfur dioxide emissions by the year nineteen hundred and ninety-five and which would allocate the required reductions in sulfur dioxide emissions, and the costs of achieving those reductions, equitably among the states?

YES	
NO	

QUESTION 9

Shall the Town of Sudbury be allowed to exempt from the provisions of Proposition Two and One-half, so-called, the amounts required to pay for a bond issue necessary to purchase a swimming facility?

YES	
NO	

Middlesex: ss.

I have served this warrant by posting attested, printed copies thereof at the Town Hall and such other places as the Selectmen deem appropriate, but not less than three in each precinct, and not less than a total of twelve in the Town, at least seven days before the time appointed for said election.

, 1986

Constable of Sudbury