

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
WILLIAM FRANCIS GALVIN
SECRETARY OF THE COMMONWEALTH

WARRANT FOR STATE ELECTION
NOVEMBER 6, 2018

PLYMOUTH, SS.

To the Constables of the Town of Middleborough

GREETINGS:

In the name of the Commonwealth, you are hereby required to notify and warn the inhabitants of said city or town who are qualified to vote in Primaries to vote at:

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Precinct 1 | Oak Point Club House 202 Oak Point Drive |
| Precincts 2, 4, 6 | Middleborough High School Gymnasium 71 East Grove Street (Route 28) |
| Precinct 3 | South Middleborough Fire Station 566 Wareham Street (Route 28) |
| Precinct 5 | Leonard E. Simmons Senior Multi Service Center 558 Plymouth Street |

on **TUESDAY, THE SIXTH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2018**, from 7:00 A.M. to 8:00 P.M. for the following purpose:

To cast their votes in the State Election for the candidates for the following offices and questions:

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| SENATOR IN CONGRESS | FOR THIS COMMONWEALTH |
| GOVERNOR and LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR | FOR THIS COMMONWEALTH |
| ATTORNEY GENERAL | FOR THIS COMMONWEALTH |
| SECRETARY OF STATE | FOR THIS COMMONWEALTH |
| TREASURER AND RECEIVER GENERAL | FOR THIS COMMONWEALTH |
| AUDITOR..... | FOR THIS COMMONWEALTH |
| REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS..... | NINTH DISTRICT |
| COUNCILLOR..... | FIRST DISTRICT |
| SENATOR IN GENERAL COURT | FIRST PLYMOUTH & BRISTOL DISTRICT |
| REPRESENTATIVE IN GENERAL COURT..... | SECOND PLYMOUTH DISTRICT |
| REPRESENTATIVE IN GENERAL COURT..... | TWELFTH PLYMOUTH DISTRICT |
| REPRESENTATIVE IN GENERAL COURT..... | TWELFTH BRISTOL DISTRICT |
| DISTRICT ATTORNEY | PLYMOUTH DISTRICT |
| CLERK OF COURTS | PLYMOUTH COUNTY |
| REGISTER OF DEEDS | PLYMOUTH DISTRICT |
| COUNTY COMMISSIONER..... | PLYMOUTH COUNTY |

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 2, 2018?

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 units 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 urgent non-stable patients per nurse; 3 urgent stable patients per nurse; or 5 non-urgent stable patients per nurse;
- In units 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 complaint or a violation 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 VOTE would 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.

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 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 demographic 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 constitutional 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 on 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.

QUESTION 3: 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 July 7, 2016?

SUMMARY

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.


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

Given under our hands this 1ST day of October, 2018.

Diane C. Stewart



John M. Knowlton




Leilani Dalpe
Board of Selectmen
Town of Middleborough



Neil D. Rosenthal

Allin John Frawley

Pursuant to the instructions contained in the above Warrant, I have notified and warned all inhabitants of said Town of Middleborough, qualified to vote as expressed in said Warrant, to meet at the time and place for the purpose specified by causing an attested copy of the same to be published in the Middleborough Gazette on the 11TH day of October, 2018, that date being more than seven days before the time specified for said Election.



Joseph M. Perkins, Police Chief