

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
WILLIAM FRANCIS GALVIN
SECRETARY OF THE COMMONWEALTH

MIDDLESEX, SS

WARRANT FOR STATE ELECTION

To Lester Baker, one of the Constables of the City of Framingham,

Greetings:

In the name of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, you are hereby required to notify and warn the Inhabitants of the City of Framingham qualified to vote in Elections to vote at:

Precincts 1, 2, 3	Harmony Grove School, 169 Leland Street
Precincts 4, 5, 6	St. Tarcisius Parish Center, 562 Waverly Street
Precincts 7, 8, 9A, 9B	Keefe Tech. School 750 Winter Street
Precincts 10, 11, 15	Farley Building, 19 Flagg Drive
Precincts 12, 13, 14	Memorial Building, 150 Concord Street
Precincts 16, 17	Wesley United Parish Center, 80 Beacon Street
Precincts 18, 25, 26	Walsh Middle School, 301 Brook Street
Precincts 19, 20, 21A, 21B, 21C	Brophy School, 575 Pleasant Street
Precincts 22, 27	King School, 454 Water Street
Precincts 23, 24	Potter Road School, 492 Potter Road

ON TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 2024

From 7:00 AM to 8:00 PM to cast their votes in the State Election for the candidates of political parties for the following offices:

Electors of President and Vice President	For these United States
Senator in Congress	For this Commonwealth
Representative in Congress	Fifth District
Councillor	Second District
Senator in General Court	Middlesex and Norfolk District
Representative in General Court	Fourth, Sixth, Seventh Middlesex & 19 th Worcester Districts
Clerk of Courts	Middlesex County
Register of Deeds	Middlesex Southern District

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 1, 2024?

SUMMARY

This proposed law would specify that the State auditor has the authority to audit the legislature.

A YES VOTE would specify that the State auditor has the authority to audit the legislature.

A NO VOTE would make no change in the law relative to the State Auditor’s authority.

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 1, 2024?

SUMMARY

This proposed law would eliminate the requirement that a student pass the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) tests (or other statewide or district-wide assessments) in mathematics, science and technology, and English in order to receive a high school diploma. Instead, in order for a student to receive a high school diploma, the proposed law would require the student to complete coursework certified by the student’s district as demonstrating mastery of the competencies contained in the state academic standards in mathematics, science and technology, and English, as well as any additional areas determined by the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education.

A YES VOTE would eliminate the requirement that students pass the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) in order to graduate high school but still require students to complete coursework that meets state standards.

A NO VOTE would make no change in the law relative to the requirement that a student pass the MCAS in order to graduate high school.

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 1, 2024?

SUMMARY

The proposed law would provide Transportation Network Drivers (“Drivers”) with the right to form unions (“Driver Organizations”) to collectively bargain with Transportation Network Companies (“Companies”)- which are companies that use a digital network to connect riders to drivers for pre-arranged transportation- to create negotiated recommendations concerning wages, benefits and terms and conditions of work. Drivers would not be required to engage in any union activities. Companies would be allowed to form multi-Company associations to represent them when negotiating with Driver Organizations. The state would supervise the labor activities permitted by the proposed law and would have responsibility for approving or disapproving the negotiated recommendations. The proposed law would define certain activities by a Company or a Driver Organization to be unfair work practices. The proposed law would establish a hearing process for the state Employment Relations Board (“Board”) to follow when a Company or Driver Organization is charged with an unfair work practice. The proposed law would permit the Board to take action, including awarding compensation to adversely affected Drivers, if it found that an unfair work practice had been committed. The proposed law would provide for an appeal of a Board decision to the state Appeals Court. This proposed law also would establish a procedure for determining which Drivers are Active Drivers, meaning that they completed more than the median number of rides in the previous six months. The proposed law would establish procedures for the Board to determine that a Driver Organization

has signed authorizations from at least five percent of Active Drivers, entitling the Driver Organization to a list of Active Drivers; to designate a Driver Organization as the exclusive bargaining representative for all Drivers based on signed authorizations from at least twenty-five percent of Active Drivers; to resolve disputes over exclusive bargaining status, including through elections; and to decertify a Driver Organization from exclusive bargaining status. A Driver Organization that has been designated the exclusive bargaining representative would have the exclusive right to represent the Drivers and to receive voluntary membership dues deductions. Once the Board determined that a Driver Organization was the exclusive bargaining representative for all Drivers, the Companies would be required to bargain with that Driver Organization concerning wages, benefits and terms and conditions of work. Once the Driver Organization and Companies reached agreement on wages, benefits, and the terms and conditions of work, that agreement would be voted upon by all Drivers who has completed at least 100 trips the previous quarter. If approved by a majority of votes cast, the recommendations would be submitted to the state Secretary of Labor for approval and if approved, would be effective for three years. The proposed law would establish procedures for the mediation and arbitration if the Driver Organization and Companies failed to reach agreement within a certain period of time. An arbitrator would consider factors set forth in the proposed law, including whether the wages of Drivers would be enough so that Drivers would not need to rely upon any public benefits. The proposed law also sets out procedures for the Secretary of Labor's review and approval of recommendations negotiated by a Driver Organization and the Companies and for judicial review of the Secretary's decision. The proposed law states that neither its provisions, an agreement nor a determination by the Secretary would be able to lessen labor standards established by other laws. If there were any conflict between the proposed law and existing Massachusetts labor relations law, the proposed law would prevail. The Board would make rules and regulations as appropriate to effectuate the proposed law. The proposed law states that, if any of its parts were declared invalid, the other parts would stay in effect.

A YES VOTE would provide transportation network drivers the option to form unions to collectively bargain with transportation network companies regarding wages, benefits, and terms and conditions of work

A NO VOTE would make no change in the law relative to the ability of transportation network drivers to form unions.

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 before May 1, 2024?

SUMMARY

This proposed law would allow persons aged 21 and older to grow, possess, and use certain natural psychedelic substances in certain circumstances. The psychedelic substances allowed would be two substances found in mushrooms (psilocybin and psilocyn) and three substances found in plants (dimethyltryptamine, mescaline, and ibogaine). These substances could be purchased at an approved location for use under the supervision of a licensed facilitator. This proposed law would otherwise prohibit any retail sale of natural psychedelic substances. This proposed law would also provide for the regulation and taxation of these psychedelic substances. This proposed law would license and regulate facilities offering supervised use of these psychedelic substances and provide for the taxation of proceeds from those facilities' sales of psychedelic substances. It would also allow persons aged 21 and older to grow these psychedelic substances in a 12-foot by 12-foot area at their home and use these psychedelic substances at their home. This proposed law would authorize persons aged 21 or older to possess up to one gram of psilocybin, one gram of psilocyn, one gram of dimethyltryptamine, 18 grams of mescaline, and 30 grams of ibogaine ("personal use amount"), in addition to whatever they might grow at their home, and to give away up to the personal use amount to a person aged 21 or over. This proposed law would create a Natural Psychedelic Substances Commission of five members appointed by the Governor, Attorney General, and

Treasurer which would administer the law governing the use and distribution of these psychedelic substances. The Commission would adopt regulations governing licensing qualifications, security, recordkeeping, education and training, health and safety requirements, testing, and age verification. This proposed law would also create a Natural Psychedelic Substances Advisory Board of 20 members appointed by the Governor, Attorney General, and Treasurer which would study and make recommendations to the Commission on the regulation and taxation of these psychedelic substances. This proposed law would allow cities and towns to reasonably restrict the time, place, and manner of the operation of licensed facilities offering psychedelic substances, but cities and towns could not ban those facilities or their provision of these substances. The proceeds of sales of psychedelic substances at licensed facilities would be subject to the state sales tax and an additional excise tax of 15 percent. In addition, a city or town could impose a separate tax of up to two percent. Revenue received from the additional state excise tax, license application fees, and civil penalties for violations of this proposed law would be deposited in a Natural Psychedelic Substances Regulation Fund and would be used, subject to appropriation, for administration of this proposed law. Using the psychedelic substances as permitted by this proposed law could not be a basis to deny a person medical care or public assistance, impose discipline by a professional licensing board, or enter adverse orders in child custody cases absent clear and convincing evidence that the activities created an unreasonable danger to the safety of a minor child. This proposed law would not affect existing laws regarding the operation of motor vehicles while under the influence, or the ability of employers to enforce workplace policies restricting the consumption of these psychedelic substances by employees. This proposed law would allow property owners to prohibit the use, display, growing, processing, or sale of these psychedelic substances on their premises. State and local governments could continue to restrict the possession and use of these psychedelic substances in public buildings or at schools. This proposed law would take effect on December 15, 2024.

A YES VOTE would allow persons over age 21 to use certain natural psychedelic substances under licensed supervision and to grow and possess limited quantities of those substances in their home and would create a commission to regulate those substances.

A NO VOTE would make no change in the law regarding natural psychedelic substances.

QUESTION 5: 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 1, 2024?

SUMMARY

The proposed law would gradually increase the minimum hourly wage an employer must pay a tipped worker, over the course of five years, on the following schedule:

- To 64% of the state minimum wage on January 1, 2025;
- To 73% of the state minimum wage on January 1, 2026;
- To 82% of the state minimum wage on January 1, 2027;
- To 91% of the state minimum wage on January 1, 2028; and
- To 100% of the state minimum wage on January 1, 2029

The proposed law would require employers to continue to pay tipped workers the difference between the state minimum wage and the total amount a tipped worker receives in hourly wages plus tips through the end of 2028. The proposed law would also permit employers to calculate this difference over the entire weekly or bi-weekly payroll period. The requirement to pay this difference would cease when the required hourly wage for tipped workers would become 100% of the state minimum wage on January 1, 2029.

Under the proposed law, if an employer pays its workers an hourly wage that is at least the state minimum wage, the employer would be permitted to administer a “tip pool” that combines all the tips given by customers to tipped workers and distributes them among all the workers, including non-tipped workers.

A YES VOTE would increase the minimum hourly wage an employer must pay a tipped worker to the full state minimum wage implemented over five years, at which point employers could pool all tips and distribute them to all non-management workers.

A NO VOTE would make no change in the law governing tip pooling or the minimum wage for tipped workers.

And you are directed to serve this Warrant by posting copies of said Warrant on the City of Framingham website or the City Clerk's Office in said Framingham seven days before the date of the city election. Hereof fail not to make the return of this Warrant with your doings thereon to the City Clerk at the time and place of said city election.

Given under our hands this _____ day of _____ in the year Two Thousand and Twenty Four.

**CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF FRAMINGHAM**

Philip R. Ottaviani, Jr., District 6 Councilor, Chair

Tracey Bryant, District 9 Councilor, Vice Chair

George P. King, Jr. At Large Councilor

Janet Leombruno, At Large Councilor

Christine A. Long, District 1 Councilor

Brandon F. Ward, District 2 Councilor

Adam C. Steiner, District 3 Councilor

Michael P. Cannon, District 4 Councilor

Noval A. Alexander, District 5 Councilor

Leora Mallach, District 7 Councilor

Leslie White Harvey, District 8 Councilor

MIDDLESEX, SS.

Framingham, MA

_____, 2024

By virtue of this warrant, I have notified the inhabitants of the City of Framingham to meet as within directed by posting a true and attested copy of the same in the City Clerk's Office or on the City of Framingham website at least seven days before the date of said election, namely on or before October 29, 2024.

Lester Baker, Constable

A True Copy Attest

Lisa A. Ferguson, City Clerk

