RECORD
STATE ELECTION
NOVEMBER 08, 2016

In accordance with the foregoing warrant the inhabitants of the Town of Granby qualified to vote in elections and primaries met in the East Meadow School at 393 East State Street, in the Town of Granby on Tuesday, the Eighth day of November, 2016 and voted as follows:

ELECTORS OF PRESIDENT & VICE PRESIDENT - VOTE ONE

	PRECINCT 1	PRECINCT 2	TOTAL
CLINTON & KAINE- (D)	949	702	1651
JOHNSON & WELD- (L)	98	75	173
STEIN & BARAKA-(J)	50	43	93
TRUMP & PENCE- (R)	809	890	1699
WRITE IN'S	0	2	2
Precinct 2-Evan McMcMullin-2			
ALL OTHERS Precinct 1- Bernie Sanders-12 Precinct 2- Bernie Sanders-12	12	12	24
BLANKS	53	48	91
TOTAL VOTES CAST	1971	1770	3741

REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS- Vote for One

First District

	PRECINCT 1	PRECINCT 2	TOTAL
RICHARD E. NEAL-(D) 36 Atwater Ter., Springfield Candidate for Re-election	1248	1031	2279
FREDERICK O. MAYOCK-(U) 83 Yorktown Dr., Springfield	412	411	823
THOMAS T. SIMMONS-(L) 72 Main St. Shelburne	153	186	339
WRITE IN'S	0	0	0
Precinct 2- ALL OTHERS	0	0	0
BLANKS	158	142	300
TOTAL VOTES CAST	1971	1770	3741

COUNCILLOR- Vote for One
Eighth District

	PRECINCT 1	PRECINCT 2	TOTAL
MARY E. HURLEY-(D) 15 Fields Dr., East Longmeadow	1405	1163	2568
WRITE IN'S	0	0	0
ALL OTHERS	0	0	0
BLANKS	566	607	1173
TOTAL VOTES CAST	1971	1770	3741

SENATOR IN GENERAL COURT- Vote for One
First Hampden & Hampshire District

	PRECINCT 1	PRECINCT 2	TOTAL
ERIC P. LESSER-(D) 28 Edson St., Longmeadow Candidate for Re-election	1023	782	1805
JAMES CHIP HARRINGTON- (R) 122 Overlook Dr., Ludlow	823	876	1699
WRITE IN'S	0	0	0
ALL OTHERS	0	0	0
BLANKS	125	112	237
TOTAL VOTES CAST	1971	1770	3741

REPRESENTATIVE IN GENERAL COURT- Vote for One
Precinct 1- Third Hampshire District
Precinct 2- Second Hampshire District

	PRECINCT 1	PRECINCT 2	TOTAL
Solomon Israel Goldstein-Rose-(D) 16 Poet's Corner Amherst **Precinct-1**	1282		1282
JOHN W. SCIBAK-(D) 12 Hillside Ave, South Hadley Candidate for Re-nomination **Precinct-2**		1156	1156
WRITE IN'S Pct 1-Bonnie MacCracken Pct 2	1	0	1
ALL OTHERS	0	0	0

Record of the November 8, 2016 State Election Cont'd

BLANKS	688	614	1302
TOTAL VOTES CAST	1971	1770	3741

**As of 2012 Granby became two Precincts this changed the Representative in General Court to two different districts.*
Precinct 1 remained the same -Third Hampshire District and Precinct 2- is in the Second Hampshire district Granby has two Representatives.

SHERIFF- Vote for One
Hampshire County

	PRECINCT 1	PRECINCT 2	TOTAL
PATRICK J. CAHILLANE-(D) 116 Florence St., Northampton	1033	835	1868
DAVID F. ISAKSON-(R) 95 Richview Ave., South Hadley	785	782	1567
WRITE IN'S	0	0	0
ALL OTHERS	0	0	0
BLANKS	153	153	306
TOTAL VOTES CAST	1971	1770	3741

You may vote for every position on the Pathfinder Regional Technical School District Committee, regardless of where of you reside in the District.

REGIONAL VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL SCHOOL COMMITTEE- Vote for One
Pathfinder (4Year) Belchertown

	PRECINCT 1	PRECINCT 2	TOTAL
FRANCESCO DELL'OLIO 281 Chauncey Walker St.. Belchertown	1278	1041	2319
WRITE IN'S Precinct-1-Lee Anne Becker-1 Precinct 2 Alfred Newuman-1 Chutela-1	1	2	3
ALL OTHERS	0	0	0
BLANKS	692	727	1419
TOTAL VOTES CAST	1971	1770	3741

REGIONAL VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL SCHOOL COMMITTEE- Vote for One
Pathfinder (4Year) Oakham

		PRECINCT 1	PRECINCT 2	TOTAL
WRITE IN'S		4	4	8
Precinct 1-	Lee Graves-1 Carrie Catulippo-1 Bob Becker-1 Adam Boissineau-1			
Precinct 2-	J. Biarra-1 Philip Kras- 1 Mary McDowell –1 Elizabeth Laguerre-1			
ALL OTHERS		0	0	0
BLANKS		1967	1766	3733
TOTAL VOTES CAST		1971	1770	3741

REGIONAL VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL SCHOOL COMMITTEE- Vote for One
Pathfinder (4Year) Palmer

	PRECINCT 1	PRECINCT 2	TOTAL
DAVID DROZ 114 Mason St. Palmer Candidate for Re-election	797	633	1430
CARRIE A. LaTULIPE 110 Griffin St, Palmer	416	160	576
WRITE IN'S	0	1	1
Precinct 1			
Precinct 2- Liu Lee Lha-1			
ALL OTHERS	0	0	0
BLANKS	758	976	1734
TOTAL VOTES CAST	1971	1770	3741

REGIONAL VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL SCHOOL COMMITTEE- Vote for One

Pathfinder (4Year) Warren

	PRECINCT 1	PRECINCT 2	TOTAL
WRITE IN'S	2	6	8

Precinct 1- Kathy Viranos-1
A. Boissoneault-1

Precinct 2- Joe Cerniawski-1
Jim Pietras- 1
Gregg Leonard-1
S. Tankian-1
Jason Lagerrer, Sr.-1
Faith Bergeron- 1

ALL OTHERS	0	0	0
BLANKS	1969	1764	3733
TOTAL VOTES CAST	1971	1770	3741

QUESTIONS

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.

	PRECINCT 1	PRECINCT 2	TOTAL
Question 1-YES	664	613	1277
Question 1-NO	1221	1080	2301
Question 1-Blanks	86	77	163
Question 1-TOTAL	1971	1770	3741

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 ycai. 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.

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.

	PRECINCT 1	PRECINCT 2	TOTAL
Question 2-YES	603	535	1138
Question 2-NO	1335	1197	2532
Question 2-Blanks	33	38	71
Question 2-TOTAL	1971	1770	3741

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.

	PRECINCT 1	PRECINCT 2	TOTAL
Question 3-YES	1466	1297	2763
Question 3-NO	460	437	897
Question 3-Blanks	45	36	81
Question 3-TOTAL	1971	1770	3741

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.

	PRECINCT 1	PRECINCT 2	TOTAL
Question 4-YES	1078	863	1941
Question 4-NO	863	826	1689
Question 4-Blanks	30	81	111
Question 4-TOTAL	1971	1770	3741

QUESTION 5
THIS QUESTION IS NOT BINDING
Hampshire Third District
PRECINCT 1-only

Shall the state representative from this district be instructed to vote in favor of legislation that lowers the drinking age to age 19 for wines and malt beverages and maintains the drinking age at 21 for all other alcoholic beverages?

A YES VOTE **you are in favor of this question** ***A NO VOTE*** **you are not in favor of this question**

	PRECINCT 1
Question 5-YES	545
Question 5-NO	1312
Question 5-Blanks	114
Question 5-TOTAL	1971

Record of the November 8, 2016 State Election Cont'd

The polls opened at 7:00 a.m. and closed at 8:00 p.m. This was the first year in the Commonwealth that we held Early Voting. Early voting will take place every biennial election next time will be November of 2018. Early Voting was held from October 24- November 4, and 1,447 voters voted Early, that's 31 % of our registered voters. Those that voted Early were very positive on this new system, and many stated they liked the fact of not having to wait in line.

On Election Day the election workers worked very hard to run this election as smoothly as possible. Although 31 % had already voted Early the lines were steady throughout the day, the amount that showed up on Nov 8th was 2,294 voters, it was nice to see so many voters come out to support their candidates and the questions.

At the close of voter registration (October 19, 2016), the town had 4,662 registered voters (263 are Inactive voters). The percentage of voters who voted in this election was 80.5%. Out of those that voted 150 were processed as absentee ballots, and there were fourteen provisional ballots filed, two of the provisional ballots filed qualified to be counted in the final tally.

At a meeting of the Board of Registrars held on Friday, November 18, 2016 with members Patricia Banas, Jeanne Crosby, Jeanne Merrill, and Katherine A. Kelly-Regan, Clerk, the Board had one overseas Federal Write in Absentee Ballot (FWAB), that required to be reviewed to see if it would qualified to be counted in the final election tally.
After observing the ballot application, it was determined by the Board of Registrars that this overseas application did not qualify due to the fact there was no proof of a residency listed on the application.

The ballot was null and void and was not counted to the final tally. The Board of Registrars determined that the final count for this November 8, 2016, Presidential Election was 3,741 voters.

I certify that all ballots cast for candidates and the questions in this Presidential Election held on November 08, 2016 have been counted and recorded in accordance with the law.

Respectfully submitted,

Katherine A. Kelly-Regan
Town Clerk, CMMC