



---

## Believe It (Or Not): The Massachusetts Special Election For US Senate

---

Jonathan D. Simon<sup>1</sup>  
August 27, 2010<sup>2</sup>

### Background

On January 19<sup>th</sup>, 2010 the Commonwealth of Massachusetts held a Special Election to fill the Senate seat left open by the death of Senator Edward Kennedy. It would be difficult to overstate the political implications of this election. Because the seat was the 60<sup>th</sup> for the Democrats, it carried with it the effective balance of power in the Senate: without it, in a dramatically polarized and decidedly uncooperative political environment, the Democrats would not be able to override a GOP filibuster. As the media let Americans know, everything from the shape of healthcare policy to financial regulation, from energy and environmental policy to critical judicial appointments hung in the balance.

Just as significantly, the victory by Republican Scott Brown over supposed shoo-in Martha Coakley was taken and trumpeted as a "sign:" the political calculus for the upcoming general elections in 2010 and 2012 was instantly rewritten, with the anger and unrest that apparently produced Brown's victory establishing expectations of catastrophic losses for the Democrats in November and beyond. All in all the political impact of this single, under-the-radar state election was seismic, very nearly "presidential."

### The Electoral System

With stakes that high, citizens not only of Massachusetts but of the rest of the United States would hope to find firm basis for knowledge, as opposed to mere faith, that the votes were accurately counted as cast and that the seating of the certified winner, along with the massive implications alluded to above, at least reflected the will and intent of the voting constituency. Instead, this is what a citizen seeking such knowledge about the Massachusetts Special Election would find:

---

<sup>1</sup> Jonathan D. Simon, JD, is Executive Director of Election Defense Alliance.

<sup>2</sup> Revised October 28, 2011.

- 97% of the ballots cast were counted unobservably by optical scan equipment (“opscan”), scanning voter-marked paper ballots; 3% of the ballots cast were publicly hand-counted.<sup>3</sup>
- The opscan devices were programmable computers manufactured by two corporations, Diebold/Premier Election Solutions (“Diebold/Premier”) and Elections Systems and Software (“ES&S”), which together supply 80% of such equipment nationwide,<sup>4</sup> and 100% in Massachusetts.<sup>5</sup>
- The vast majority<sup>6</sup> of the opscan devices were programmed, distributed and serviced by the highly secretive LHS Corporation, located in Methuen, Massachusetts.
- No systematic audit of the count was performed.
- No spot-checks of the count were performed.
- There was no recount of any ballots.
- There were no exit polls performed.
- No actual ballots stored within the opscan equipment were examined or are permitted to be examined.
- No memory cards, which internally direct each opscan’s counting process and store the results, were examined or, as proprietary information belonging to their corporate programmer, are permitted to be examined.
- No computer code directing the recording and counting of ballots or the display of results was examined or, as proprietary information belonging to the programmer, is permitted to be examined.

The inquiring citizen or, for that matter, public official or candidate would unfortunately discover no information about the 97% of ballots counted by opscan equipment, other than the vote totals as displayed by that equipment after the last ballot had been scanned. That is, he or she would be reduced to 100% pure, unadulterated, blind faith that the totals displayed were accurate—fact and not fiction.

If, in fact, the vendor corporations, or any insider(s) with access to the programming and distribution processes, had chosen to serve a private political agenda rather than the public trust, there would be nothing in the official processes of voting, vote-counting, and election certification to indicate that such a breach had occurred. If, for example, certain memory cards had been programmed to tally any ballot bearing a stray mark as a vote for Candidate X, this single exploit might result in an outcome-determinative shift of votes, and no one except the programmer would ever know. Or if certain

---

<sup>3</sup> Vote counting protocols identified by Massachusetts City and Town Directory at <http://www.sec.state.ma.us/ele/electk/clkidx.htm>; election returns at <http://www.boston.com/news/special/politics/2010/senate/results.html>

<sup>4</sup> Source information at <http://www.verifiedvoting.org/verifier/>

<sup>5</sup> Of the 280 opscan communities in Massachusetts, 223 use the Diebold/Premier Accuvote-OS scanner; 56 use the Optech Eagle scanner, originally manufactured by ES&S but whose distribution was split between ES&S and the smaller vendor Sequoia Voting Systems as a result of a court order in an antitrust action; and one employs the ES&S M100 scanner. Diebold/Premier was recently sold to ES&S for the brow-raising under-price of \$5 million (about the value of one large-county voting equipment contract), and indeed the sale was nixed by the US Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, as it would have given ES&S a virtually complete vote counting monopoly in the United States. In the absence of Diebold/Premier or any other substantial competitors, however, ES&S continues to enjoy near-monopolistic market domination.

<sup>6</sup> 79.6%, or 223 of the 280 opscan communities, were serviced by LHS.

memory cards had been programmed to shift every n<sup>th</sup> vote for Candidate A to Candidate B, who but the programmer would know?

Such vulnerability to fraud has by now been well researched and documented.<sup>7</sup> Unfortunately it tends to be regarded in the abstract, a technical possibility rather than an actual menace. The thinking appears to be that, because this is America, such things simply do not happen. Let us now set aside this comforting a priori conclusion and biopsy the Massachusetts Special Election with such tools as are available.

## Our Analysis

We turn, in the absence of any direct validation of the opscan vote count, to the only ballots not counted invisibly. Just over 65,000 ballots, in 71 communities,<sup>8</sup> were counted by hand under public observation. Had these ballots been distributed randomly throughout the Commonwealth, we would expect the handcount results to fall within 1.0% of the opscan results with better than 99.9999% confidence.<sup>9</sup> Since the handcounts derive from discrete communities, however, and since Massachusetts is not politically homogeneous, an attempt must be made to quantitatively characterize and relate the two “meta-jurisdictions” which we shall call “Handcountville” (consisting of the 71 handcount communities) and “Opscanshire” (consisting of the remaining 280 opscan communities) respectively.

The first and most obvious way to relate Handcountville and Opscanshire would be by party registration. Such data is available from the Massachusetts Secretary of State, updated to October 2008.<sup>10</sup> It is given in Table 1.<sup>11</sup>

TABLE 1

Two-Party Registration - Massachusetts 2008			
Comparative Totals	GOP Reg	Dem Reg	Dem Margin
Handcount %	31.8%	68.2%	36.4%
Opscan %	23.7%	76.3%	52.6%
Differential	-8.1%	8.1%	16.2%

The two-party registration numbers paint Handcountville as significantly more Republican territory than is Opscanshire. Two-party registration is, however, a limited indicator in Massachusetts because just over half the voters in the Commonwealth (50.75%) are registered as “unenrolled” in either major

<sup>7</sup> <http://tinyurl.com/y6y5y7a>

<sup>8</sup> See fn. 1.

<sup>9</sup> See <http://www.raosoft.com/samplesize.html>

<sup>10</sup> [http://www.sec.state.ma.us/ele/elepdf/st\\_county\\_town\\_enroll\\_breakdown\\_08.pdf](http://www.sec.state.ma.us/ele/elepdf/st_county_town_enroll_breakdown_08.pdf)

<sup>11</sup> Full data presented in the Appendix.

party.<sup>12</sup> Without knowing more about the unenrolled voters in each meta-jurisdiction, reaching beyond this impression to a conclusive quantitative characterization is not feasible.

Fortunately there exist indicators other than party registration that illuminate the political characteristics of voting constituencies. Massachusetts held contests for United States Senator in each of the two past biennial elections. The results, as broken down by meta-jurisdiction, are given in Table 2.

TABLE 2

Comparative Totals	US Senate - 2008			US Senate - 2006		
	Beatty-R	Kerry-D	Kerry Margin	Chase-R	Kennedy-D	Kennedy Margin
Handcount %	31.5%	68.5%	37.0%	31.1%	68.9%	37.8%
Opscan %	32.0%	68.0%	36.0%	30.5%	69.5%	39.0%
Handcount-Opscan Disparity	0.5%	-0.5%	1.0%	-0.6%	0.6%	-1.2%

In each of these statewide senatorial elections, Handcountville and Opscanshire exhibited virtual political congruence, much as we would expect if indeed Handcountville votes were a random sample of the state as a whole, establishing baseline expectations for the political divisions of the two meta-jurisdictions in similar contests such as the 2010 Massachusetts Special Election. In fact, when we combine the vote totals for the previous two Senate elections (2006 and 2008), we find exact congruence between the voters of Handcountville and Opscanshire, as shown in Table 3.

TABLE 3

Combined Vote For US Senate 2006 and 2008			
Comparative Totals	GOP	Dem	Dem Margin
Handcount %	31.3%	68.7%	37.4%
Opscan %	31.3%	68.7%	37.4%
Handcount-Opscan Disparity	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

When we turn to the 2010 Special Election, however, we find a radically different comparative outcome. The results of the Brown-Coakley contest, as broken down by meta-jurisdiction, are given in Table 4.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>12</sup> [http://www.sec.state.ma.us/ele/elepdf/st\\_county\\_town\\_enroll\\_breakdown\\_08.pdf](http://www.sec.state.ma.us/ele/elepdf/st_county_town_enroll_breakdown_08.pdf)

<sup>13</sup> The percentages exclude, for clarity, the Libertarian Party candidate, who received less than 1% of the vote, and whose inclusion does not appreciably affect the results.

TABLE 4

US Senate - 2010 (Special)			
Comparative Totals	Brown-R	Coakley-D	Brown Margin
Handcount %	48.6%	51.4%	-2.8%
Opscan %	52.6%	47.4%	5.2%
Handcount-Opscan Disparity	4.0%	-4.0%	8.0%

Where votes were observably counted by hand, the Democrat Martha Coakley defeated the Republican Scott Brown by a margin of 2.8%; where votes were counted unobservably and secretly by machine, Brown defeated Coakley by a margin of 5.2%.

There is no evidence that this whopping marginal disparity of 8.0% is attributable to divergent political leanings of the two meta-jurisdictions. In fact there is strong evidence to the contrary: as the previous two Senate contests and what we can glean from party registration indicate, Handcountville is no more Democratic, and likely less so, than Opscanshire. Nor is there reason to suspect a demographic bias as cause: Handcountville consists primarily of small rural communities; Coakley, born and raised in the northwestern part of Massachusetts, had spent the past 30 years since graduation from Boston University Law School as a Boston-based, big-city attorney and prosecutor, serving from 1999 to 2007 as high-profile District Attorney of Middlesex County, home to 54 communities of which only four are in Handcountville.

Nonetheless it is incumbent upon our analysis to consider what would be the last-standing “benign” explanation for the handcount-opscan disparity and Coakley’s Handcountville victory: that Handcountville impounds relatively more western towns near Coakley’s old “home base,” and that her Handcountville victory therefore reflects nothing more insidious than a “favorite daughter” phenomenon at work. Fortunately for our analysis, Coakley ran statewide for Attorney General in 2006, allowing us to assess whether Coakley enjoys “favorite daughter” status in Handcountville. The contest, against a Cambridge-based opponent, was, like the senatorial elections of 2006 and 2008, not sufficiently competitive to be a rational target for manipulation. The results are given below in Table 5:<sup>14</sup>

TABLE 5

Massachusetts Attorney General - 2006			
Comparative Totals	Coakley-D	Frisoli-R	Coakley Margin
Handcount %	72.6%	27.4%	45.2%
Opscan %	73.0%	27.0%	46.0%
Handcount-Opscan Disparity	0.4%	-0.4%	0.8%

<sup>14</sup> Full returns at [http://www.boston.com/news/special/politics/2006\\_elections/general\\_results/attorney\\_general.html](http://www.boston.com/news/special/politics/2006_elections/general_results/attorney_general.html), as referenced by Kathy Dopp of <http://electionmathematics.org>.

We observe that in 2006, her only other statewide election, Martha Coakley performed just as well in Opscanshire as she did in Handcountville; in fact, she ran slightly better in the opscan communities. There was no “favorite daughter” phenomenon, no regional effect, and no Coakley advantage in the handcount jurisdictions. There was also, given the 45% margin, no incentive to manipulate and nothing at all to be gained from a “small” shift of votes on the order of the 5% shift sufficient to reverse the outcome of the 2010 Special Election.

The handcount vs. opscan disparity in the 2010 Special Election for Senate in Massachusetts stands as an unexplained anomaly of dramatic numerical proportions. We stated at the outset of our analysis that if the handcounted ballots had been distributed randomly throughout the Commonwealth, we would expect the handcount results to fall within 1.0% of the opscan results with better than 99.9999% confidence. The odds of an 8.0% marginal disparity would be beyond astronomical. We have now further established that the handcount “sample” is, for comparison purposes “better” than random: that is, based on demographics and voting patterns, the handcount voters would be more likely than the opscan voters to vote for Brown. The odds therefore of an 8.0 marginal disparity in the other direction would be, and there is no better way to say this, beyond beyond astronomical. Statisticians never say “impossible” but that is, for all earthly intents and purposes, what it is.

It remains to be noted that, as with the prior Coakley statewide race, neither the 2006 nor the 2008 Senate election which preceded it—and which we have presented as baseline contests—was competitive enough to invite manipulation: the risk entailed in shifting a net of 36% of the votes statewide is prohibitive;<sup>15</sup> and a shift in, say, the 5 – 10% range would not alter the outcome and would therefore garner no reward. Such was not the case with the Brown-Coakley contest, where the risk-reward ratio was extremely favorable: a net shift of a mere 5% of the machine-counted votes would be sufficient to reverse the outcome. As seismic as the Brown victory was, it was numerically plausible enough to pass the smell test, rendering the risk minimal. The reward, as noted at the beginning, was politically astronomical.

### Not A Fluke

Should it be objected that this election somehow constitutes an isolated instance perhaps influenced by unperceived but legitimate factors peculiar to its particular terrain and moment in time, we may expand our inquiry to a neighboring time and a neighboring venue where, fortunately, both opscan and hand counting also continue to coexist. The state of New Hampshire also uses computerized voting equipment manufactured by Diebold/Premier, and is also serviced exclusively by LHS Corporation. In the 2008 general election we find Obama running significantly better in Handcountville, NH than in Opscanshire, NH—a disparity that increases to alarming proportions when party registration data is used to normalize the two meta-jurisdictions, as presented in Table 6.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> While such a massive shift of votes is technically feasible, the election result would not begin to pass the smell test, opening computerized electoral manipulation to intense scrutiny and undermining the entire enterprise nationwide.

<sup>16</sup> Full data for New Hampshire is too extensive for inclusion in the Appendix; it is compiled from the NH Secretary of State website, at <http://www.sos.nh.gov/general2008/index.htm>

TABLE 6

New Hampshire Statewide Vote For President 2008 Relative to Party Registration

New Hampshire Statewide E2008	Dem	Rep	Total
Opscan Presidential Vote	54.51%	45.49%	100.00%
Opscan Registered Voters	50.00%	50.00%	100.00%
Opscan vs. Party-Registration Differential	4.51	-4.51	0
Handcount Presidential Vote	56.51%	43.49%	100.00%
Handcount Registered Voters	46.69%	53.31%	100.00%
Handcount vs. Party-Registration Differential	9.82	-9.82	0
Handcount vs. Opscan Relative To Party Registration	5.31	-5.31	10.62

We see that Obama ran 4.51% ahead of (and McCain a corresponding 4.51% behind) two-party registration numbers in opscan jurisdictions but 9.82% ahead of two-party registration numbers in handcount jurisdictions. The normalized net disparity is 10.62%, comparable in eye-popping magnitude to the 8.0% disparity observed in the Massachusetts Special election.

Furthermore, in New Hampshire as in Massachusetts, we were fortunate to have a noncompetitive contest which can, as do the 2006 and 2008 Senate and the 2006 Attorney General contests in Massachusetts, function as a baseline for comparison. The results for the 2008 New Hampshire gubernatorial contest are presented in Table 7.

TABLE 7

New Hampshire Statewide Vote For Governor 2008			
	Lynch-D	Kenney-R	Lynch Margin
Handcount %	71.76%	28.24%	43.52%
Opscan %	71.76%	28.24%	43.52%
Handcount-Opscan Disparity	0.00	0.00	0.00

Once again we find that, in a noncompetitive contest, the handcount and opscan jurisdictions exhibit political congruence (in this case, exact congruence to the second percentage decimal place), where in a presumptively competitive contest (the Presidential race), we find a glaring disparity.

Conclusion

It may fairly be objected that none of this numerical or “circumstantial” evidence, however strong, proves that computerized fraud has taken place or that the Massachusetts Special Election was “stolen,” and we readily agree. To furnish such proof, beyond not just a reasonable doubt but any shred of

doubt, we would need access to either memory cards, the code that actually ran in the opscans on Election Day, and/or the actual voter-marked ballots (chain of custody of course preserved), all of which are conveniently off-limits to inquiry. For anyone wondering, though, how much trust to place in privatized, concealed, and computerized vote counting—past, present and future—we suggest that the MA Special numbers scream for themselves.

And as numbers as implausible as these continue to rear their heads in high-stakes elections throughout the United States—invariably revealing a shift of votes in the same direction, whether measured against exit polls, pre-election polls, or observable vote counts<sup>17</sup>—we ask how the prevailing and irrational level of trust in invisible, unobservable vote counting can be maintained? We further ask how we can continue to employ a system that keeps software, code, memory cards, and all key aspects of the vote counting process secret, and relegates anyone seeking evidence of electoral validity to such an indirect quest for comparisons and baselines and numerical fingerprints as we have been obliged to undertake.

We return to the Massachusetts Special Election, which has not only dramatically altered the balance of power in Washington but has indeed ushered in a dramatically altered set of political expectations going forward into the critical elections of 2010 and 2012, as the hyper-polarization of American politics continues.<sup>18</sup> We cannot say with 100% certainty that the 97% of votes counted on optical scanners were subject to manipulation. But we can fairly ask: “What evidence exists that they were not?”

We have found none—no checks, audits, ballot inspections, hand tallies, exit polls, memory card or computer code examinations. Not a thing beyond pure faith that the corporations (and we have, for the purposes of this analysis, ignored their documented and self-proclaimed partisan proclivities) and insiders charged with the secret, unobservable counting of 97% of the votes in Massachusetts, have

---

<sup>17</sup> See generally, Charnin R, *Proving Election Fraud*, AuthorHouse, Bloomington, IN ([www.authorhouse.com](http://www.authorhouse.com)) 2010; Miller MC Ed., *Loser Take All: Election Fraud and the Subversion of Democracy 2000-2008*, Ig Publishing, Brooklyn, NY ([www.igpub.com](http://www.igpub.com)) 2008; Freeman S, Bleifuss J, *Was The 2004 Presidential Election Stolen, Seven Stories Press, New York, (www.sevenstories.com)* 2006; Simon J, O'Dell B, *Landslide Denied: Exit Polls vs. Vote Count 2006*, ([http://electiondefensealliance.org/landslide\\_denied\\_exit\\_polls\\_vs\\_vote\\_count\\_2006](http://electiondefensealliance.org/landslide_denied_exit_polls_vs_vote_count_2006)); Simon J, O'Dell B, Tavis D, Mitteldorf J, *Fingerprints of Election Theft: Were Competitive Contests Targeted*, ([http://electiondefensealliance.org/fingerprints\\_election\\_theft](http://electiondefensealliance.org/fingerprints_election_theft)) 2007. Note particularly the rightward or “red” shift measured in the presidential election of 2008, which—though it was, as a result of the Republican freefall following the late-September crash of the markets and the general economy, insufficient to alter the outcome—was in fact of a magnitude even greater than that measured in 2004. The election of Barack Obama, contrary to the general impression, was thus anything but an “all clear” with respect to computerized electoral manipulation. It must further be noted, however, that exit polls and tracking polls alike are now weighted according to demographics drawn largely if not exclusively from prior election exit polls that were distorted rightward when “adjusted” to match official vote tallies. Thus, because vote counts were treated as sacrosanct, and all currently employed demographic baselines “tuned” to those red-shifted numbers, prior electoral manipulation clears the path for ongoing and future electoral manipulation by red-shifting the baselines against which such manipulation might be measured. With pre-election polls and exit polls so corrupted to oversample to the right, the telltale disparities between these previously reliable baselines and the vote counts disappear (making manipulated elections appear to be in line with expectations), and comparison between computer and hand counts survives as the sole reliable resource for numerical forensic investigation.

<sup>18</sup> It is easy enough to see how capacity to manipulate would lead to hyper-polarization: as victory becomes a given, the player is incentivized to make that victory mean more by moving further and further from the center; this appears to be what is occurring on a systemic level, and accounts at least in part for the bizarre politics of the computerized voting era. To wit, with rigged elections, it is not necessary to “move to the center” to win; but this newfound “freedom to be radical” is, alas, one-sided, and that is precisely the political dynamic we are witnessing unfold.



decided to honor the public trust at the expense of any other personal, economic, or political agenda of their own or of anyone who would seek to influence them. In an age of steroids and hGH, credit default swaps, Ponzi schemes, and massive institutional frauds coupled with hyper-partisan, true-believer politics, such “faith” amounts to little more than rank denial.

Nor, in the final analysis, is it evident to us that additional layers of technology would ultimately suffice to thwart a determined electoral manipulator—and, given the massive stakes in a politically polarized 21<sup>st</sup> Century America, we must anticipate the highest level of determination to bring about desired outcomes by any and all means. We have seen exit polls discredited, audits (Ohio 2004, e.g.) gamed, chains of ballot custody observed in the breach. Perhaps most critically, as long as it takes an expert to implement, or indeed to comprehend, a security protocol, every non-expert citizen is left on the outside looking in, never receiving knowledge, as opposed to mere assurance, that the bedrock protocol of his or her democracy has not been corrupted. Only transparency, visible and observable counting by humans or non-programmable devices<sup>19</sup> at every step—which is just as feasible today as it was a mere generation ago<sup>20</sup>—can bestow that knowledge.

Computers can help us in many ways and will continue to play a major role in our lives, periodic glitches, hacks, and meltdowns notwithstanding. But to blindly and needlessly entrust our nation’s elections—particularly its federal elections which so directly determine our national direction—to private, corporate and, it must be said, partisan enterprises operating and calculating in secret beyond our capacity to observe and validate, is, to put it with the bluntness this emergency demands, collective insanity.

---

<sup>19</sup> E.g., lever machines, in which each aspect of counting can be monitored.

<sup>20</sup> Using a parametric tool developed by Dave Berman, it has been shown that handcounting all contests for federal office (the maximum number of such races on any ballot is three) would require citizen participation averaging one hour per voter lifetime (one four-hour shift for which each citizen would have a one in four chance of being selected during his or her life), a civic obligation far less onerous than jury duty.

Appendix: Massachusetts Election and Registration Data By Opscan/Handcount Jurisdictions

Opscan City/Town	2010 Special Election			Registration (2008)			2008 Senate			2006 Senate		
	Brown (GOP)	Coakley (Dem)	Total	GOP	Dem	Total	Beatty (GOP)	Kerry (Dem)	Total	Chase (GOP)	Kennedy (Dem)	Total
Abington	4,158	2,088	6,246	1149	3097	4246	3,003	4,608	7,611	2115	3625	5740
Acton	3,896	5,371	9,267	1693	3886	5579	3,376	7,633	11,009	2430	5851	8281
Acushnet	2,138	1,627	3,765	557	2991	3548	1,524	3,571	5,095	965	2908	3873
Adams	748	1,650	2,398	482	2207	2689	661	3,191	3852	454	2254	2708
Agawam	6,726	3,660	10,386	3161	6259	9420	4,999	8,415	13,414	3808	6329	10137
Amesbury	3,480	2,543	6,023	1643	3406	5049	2,850	5,139	7,989	2019	3815	5834
Amherst	1,180	6,547	7,727	1076	9343	10419	1,141	10,727	11,868	852	7123	7975
Andover	8,336	5,900	14,236	3905	6170	10075	7,055	10,286	17,341	5190	7824	13014
Arlington	6,845	13,284	20,129	2337	14602	16939	5,532	18,556	24,088	4211	15327	19538
Ashburnham	1,574	866	2,440	609	1039	1648	1,288	1,860	3,148	907	1408	2315
Ashland	3,467	2,897	6,364	1316	3062	4378	2,702	5,289	7,991	1907	4004	5911
Athol	2,105	1,171	3,276	914	1645	2559	1,644	2,783	4,427	1154	2028	3182
Attleboro	8,598	4,819	13,417	3397	6946	10343	6,133	11,670	17,803	4679	8015	12694
Auburn	4,036	2,406	6,442	1360	3590	4950	3,137	5,157	8,294	2141	4120	6261
Avon	1,155	706	1,861	289	1062	1351	841	1,410	2,251	590	1182	1772
Ayer	1,467	989	2,456	617	1183	1800	1,255	1,905	3,160	841	1493	2334
Barnstable	12,331	7,543	19,874	5836	8242	14078	10,940	13,145	24,085	7732	12040	19772
Barre	1,263	728	1,991	506	913	1419	1,023	1,476	2,499	711	1230	1941
Becket	225	384	609	151	358	509	223	658	881	155	418	573
Bedford	2,900	2,976	5,876	1332	2612	3944	2,499	4,531	7,030	1822	3719	5541
Belchertown	2,749	2,629	5,378	1344	2880	4224	2,222	4,950	7,172	1598	3898	5496
Bellingham	4,090	2,179	6,269	1395	3034	4429	2,964	4,887	7,851	2110	3649	5759
Belmont	4,405	6,528	10,933	1601	5870	7471	3,740	9,201	12,941	3084	7631	10715
Berkley	1,614	746	2,360	521	983	1504	1,152	1,799	2,951	820	1290	2110
Bernardston	378	445	823	188	287	475	314	846	1,160	277	623	900
Beverly	8,400	6,735	15,135	3074	7145	10219	6,566	12,850	19,416	4938	10168	15106
Billerica	9,583	4,972	14,555	2973	7662	10635	7,387	10,873	18,260	5209	8077	13286
Blackstone	2,102	1,052	3,154	638	1814	2452	1,439	2,543	3,982	1056	1839	2895
Bolton	1,362	995	2,357	653	675	1328	1,147	1,579	2,726	882	1241	2123
Boston	46,468	105,289	151,757	27541	209710	237251	35,952	180,527	216,479	23008	124397	147405
Bourne	5,134	2,807	7,941	2080	3027	5107	4,536	5,097	9,633	3102	4486	7588
Boxborough	1,087	1,141	2,228	471	853	1324	959	1,728	2,687	716	1311	2027
Boxford	2,837	1,239	4,076	1420	974	2394	2,408	2,277	4,685	1910	1814	3724
Boylston	1,321	729	2,050	461	629	1090	1,098	1,409	2,507	784	1136	1920
Braintree	9,312	5,606	14,918	2912	9640	12552	6,868	10,795	17,663	4803	9020	13823
Brewster	2,730	2,416	5,146	1500	2081	3581	2,790	3,518	6,308	2019	3146	5165
Bridgewater	6,138	2,794	8,932	2047	4227	6274	4,646	6,651	11,297	3149	4908	8057
Brockton	9,634	11,761	21,395	4612	26316	30928	7,466	24,003	31,469	5594	16132	21726
Brookfield	813	430	1,243	309	516	825	684	943	1,627	508	776	1284
Brookline	5,217	15,264	20,481	3277	20020	23297	4,365	21,796	26,161	2994	16525	19519
Buckland	263	522	785	114	329	443	199	778	977	194	599	793
Burlington	5,640	3,658	9,298	1761	5181	6942	4,659	7,438	12,097	3290	5879	9169
Cambridge	4,921	27,268	32,189	3280	37822	41102	4,596	38,828	43,424	3309	28253	31562
Canton	5,770	3,787	9,557	1921	5325	7246	4,275	7,144	11,419	2860	5768	8628
Carver	3,222	1,611	4,833	1175	2189	3364	2,416	3,242	5,658	1739	2569	4308
Charlton	3,458	1,271	4,729	1599	2097	3696	2,728	3,331	6,059	1916	2419	4335
Chatham	2,179	1,488	3,667	1389	1161	2550	2,256	2,355	4,611	1713	2111	3824
Chelmsford	9,417	5,688	15,105	3178	5897	9075	7,861	10,450	18,311	5621	8575	14196
Chelsea	1,501	2,562	4,063	807	7053	7860	1,209	5,595	6,804	827	3905	4732
Chicopee	8,339	7,043	15,382	3759	14751	18510	6,148	15,230	21,378	5004	11258	16262
Clinton	2,724	1,661	4,385	1015	3383	4398	2,051	3,927	5,978	1356	2943	4299
Cohasset	2,401	1,419	3,820	1197	1199	2396	1,959	2,458	4,417	1446	2030	3476
Concord	3,271	5,445	8,716	1860	4319	6179	3,093	6,975	10,068	2312	5920	8232
Dalton	845	1,423	2,268	575	1407	1982	792	2,581	3,373	574	1798	2372
Danvers	6,347	3,651	9,998	2256	4270	6526	5,115	8,163	13,278	3788	6454	10242
Dartmouth	5,812	5,110	10,922	2243	8903	11146	4,597	10,989	15,586	3071	7763	10834
Dedham	5,979	4,647	10,626	1680	6163	7843	4,326	7,703	12,029	3042	6583	9625

Deerfield	853	1,482	2,335	408	1116	1524	668	2,217	2,885	553	1756	2309
Dennis	4,358	3,131	7,489	1930	3013	4943	4,195	4,972	9,167	3034	4754	7788
Dighton	1,770	829	2,599	586	1271	1857	1,253	2,076	3,329	852	1477	2329
Douglas	2,440	840	3,280	1087	1229	2316	1,960	2,112	4,072	1209	1548	2757
Dover	1,888	1,058	2,946	1098	757	1855	1,588	1,676	3,264	1234	1411	2645
Dracut	7,658	3,166	10,824	2252	6746	8998	6,066	7,895	13,961	3839	6155	9994
Dudley	2,515	1,125	3,640	849	2143	2992	1,904	2,860	4,764	1208	2142	3350
Dunstable	968	502	1,470	368	421	789	813	936	1,749	591	730	1321
Duxbury	4,982	2,674	7,656	2545	2236	4781	4,211	4,778	8,989	3068	3947	7015
E. Bridgewater	3,849	1,583	5,432	1382	2265	3647	2,894	3,836	6,730	2039	2863	4902
East Brookfield	645	245	890	235	355	590	522	576	1,098	347	447	794
Eastham	1,473	1,540	3,013	745	1235	1980	1,514	2,146	3,660	1104	1913	3017
Easthampton	2,493	3,708	6,201	1027	4117	5144	2,014	6,255	8,269	1629	4583	6212
E Longmeadow	4,294	2,091	6,385	2139	3201	5340	3,408	4,563	7,971	2544	3321	5865
Easton	5,931	3,350	9,281	2506	4153	6659	4,667	6,592	11,259	3306	5259	8565
Edgartown	771	1,002	1,773	508	1094	1602	742	1,594	2,336	511	1181	1692
Erving	208	296	504	110	253	363	181	566	747	117	401	518
Everett	3,798	4,245	8,043	975	9970	10945	2,829	9,188	12,017	2068	7115	9183
Fairhaven	3,045	2,834	5,879	877	3965	4842	2,295	5,664	7,959	1458	4473	5931
Fall River	7,489	10,341	17,830	3436	28731	32167	5,453	23,123	28,576	3902	16745	20647
Falmouth	8,041	7,133	15,174	3631	7828	11459	7,212	11,502	18,714	5132	9845	14977
Fitchburg	5,574	3,783	9,357	2305	7529	9834	4,338	9,133	13,471	3084	6949	10033
Foxborough	4,821	2,465	7,286	1733	2851	4584	3,482	5,053	8,535	2528	4230	6758
Framingham	9,149	10,329	19,478	3798	13373	17171	7,283	18,191	25,474	5316	13855	19171
Franklin	8,828	4,470	13,298	3078	4744	7822	6,214	9,598	15,812	4165	7009	11174
Freetown	2,220	1,189	3,409	711	1768	2479	1,717	2,723	4,440	1066	2000	3066
Gardner	3,271	2,441	5,712	1362	4222	5584	2,566	5,278	7,844	1822	4163	5985
Georgetown	2,311	1,239	3,550	1065	1394	2459	1,958	2,552	4,510	1419	1874	3293
Gill	226	398	624	99	319	418	185	672	857	152	494	646
Gloucester	5,522	5,553	11,075	2208	6056	8264	4,277	10,098	14,375	3265	8275	11540
Grafton	4,372	2,442	6,814	1821	2849	4670	3,523	4,985	8,508	2381	3755	6136
Granby	1,512	1,044	2,556	685	1173	1858	1,237	2,112	3,349	982	1548	2530
Great Barrington	591	2,025	2,616	439	1824	2263	514	3,015	3,529	487	2295	2782
Greenfield	1,992	3,835	5,827	1243	3831	5074	1,612	6,233	7,845	1372	4940	6312
Groton	2,663	2,132	4,795	1285	1690	2975	2,313	3,383	5,696	1684	2703	4387
Groveland	1,980	991	2,971	788	1118	1906	1,625	2,032	3,657	1207	1611	2818
Hadley	936	1,407	2,343	383	1393	1776	703	2,206	2,909	600	1683	2283
Halifax	2,147	992	3,139	786	1322	2108	1,645	2,168	3,813	1167	1787	2954
Hamilton	2,319	1,381	3,700	1358	1024	2382	1,947	2,512	4,459	1534	1946	3480
Hanover	4,731	1,895	6,626	1422	2332	3754	3,581	4,099	7,680	2599	3463	6062
Hanson	3,067	1,254	4,321	1015	1626	2641	2,297	2,847	5,144	1627	2357	3984
Hardwick	586	377	963	206	459	665	472	841	1,313	348	716	1064
Harvard	1,305	1,568	2,873	643	1019	1662	1,217	2,046	3,263	920	1841	2761
Harwich	3,597	2,635	6,232	1937	2561	4498	3,702	4,010	7,712	2575	3800	6375
Hatfield	652	875	1,527	212	958	1170	513	1,498	2,011	431	1203	1634
Haverhill	11,069	7,259	18,328	4830	12691	17521	8,745	16,347	25,092	6133	11210	17343
Hingham	6,800	4,416	11,216	2976	4101	7077	5,448	7,394	12,842	3781	6036	9817
Holbrook	2,402	1,527	3,929	771	2521	3292	1,824	3,257	5,081	1334	2634	3968
Holden	5,396	2,864	8,260	2101	2795	4896	4,273	5,559	9,832	3114	4642	7756
Holland	631	299	930	274	377	651	491	722	1,213	370	477	847
Holliston	3,725	2,921	6,646	1532	2850	4382	2,857	4,974	7,831	542	919	1461
Holyoke	3,771	4,869	8,640	2101	11486	13587	3,159	10,754	13,913	2519	7433	9952
Hopedale	1,619	997	2,616	503	895	1398	1,209	1,999	3,208	883	1630	2513
Hopkinton	4,123	2,600	6,723	1954	2266	4220	3,354	4,599	7,953	2343	3530	5873
Hubbardston	1,388	607	1,995	467	524	991	1,137	1,213	2,350	844	1031	1875
Hull	2,409	2,037	4,446	841	2801	3642	1,868	3,719	5,587	1227	3099	4326
Ipswich	3,604	2,604	6,208	1589	2226	3815	2,973	4,712	7,685	2222	3863	6085
Kingston	3,576	1,701	5,277	1454	2188	3642	2,802	3,555	6,357	1962	2935	4897
Lakeville	3,248	1,259	4,507	1245	1497	2742	2,631	2,731	5,362	1784	2156	3940
Lancaster	1,860	1,012	2,872	748	965	1713	1,545	1,903	3,448	1158	1409	2567
Lanesborough	399	654	1,053	221	646	867	346	1,202	1,548	169	807	976
Lawrence	3,331	6,449	9,780	2980	21254	24234	2,792	14,641	17,433	2235	8680	10915
Lee	704	1,272	1,976	348	1165	1513	616	2,203	2,819	476	1591	2067

Leicester	2,682	1,320	4,002	825	2408	3233	2,036	3,110	5,146	1437	2488	3925
Lenox	594	1,532	2,126	492	1629	2121	570	2,288	2,858	482	1867	2349
Leominster	8,127	4,707	12,834	3070	8126	11196	6,203	11,024	17,227	4344	8658	13002
Lexington	4,953	9,375	14,328	2362	8534	10896	4,292	12,707	16,999	3362	10315	13677
Lincoln	899	1,928	2,827	571	1535	2106	797	2,484	3,281	644	2047	2691
Littleton	2,389	1,859	4,248	874	1465	2339	1,902	3,019	4,921	1390	2358	3748
Longmeadow	4,196	3,158	7,354	2732	3975	6707	3,387	5,660	9,047	2637	4375	7012
Lowell	10,548	9,547	20,095	4877	21505	26382	8,308	20,962	29,270	5389	14845	20234
Ludlow	4,159	2,768	6,927	1643	6155	7798	3,048	6,141	9,189	2337	4395	6732
Lunenburg	2,890	1,530	4,420	1225	1523	2748	2,303	3,113	5,416	1741	2458	4199
Lynn	8,595	9,791	18,386	3217	23178	26395	6,384	21,713	28,097	4381	15406	19787
Lynnfield	4,010	1,620	5,630	1765	2005	3770	3,195	3,425	6,620	2281	2875	5156
Malden	5,945	7,794	13,739	2017	13819	15836	4,629	14,542	19,171	3118	10477	13595
Manchester	1,494	1,189	2,683	841	841	1682	1,265	1,980	3,245	1029	1588	2617
Mansfield	5,909	3,045	8,954	2275	3778	6053	4,134	6,714	10,848	2939	5114	8053
Marblehead	5,285	4,657	9,942	2519	4108	6627	4,364	7,529	11,893	3271	6260	9531
Marion	1,332	1,002	2,334	783	896	1679	1,235	1,740	2,975	934	1469	2403
Marlborough	6,817	5,037	11,854	2683	6350	9033	5,377	10,002	15,379	3885	7529	11414
Marshfield	7,677	3,895	11,572	2509	4848	7357	5,895	7,889	13,784	3970	6436	10406
Mashpee	3,835	2,313	6,148	1636	2715	4351	3,409	4,225	7,634	2317	3534	5851
Mattapoisett	1,834	1,317	3,151	744	1180	1924	1,544	2,260	3,804	1163	1989	3152
Maynard	2,131	2,231	4,362	750	2311	3061	1,707	3,671	5,378	1281	3078	4359
Medfield	3,842	2,276	6,118	1462	1749	3211	2,877	3,989	6,866	2126	3303	5429
Medford	8,381	11,415	19,796	2610	16588	19198	6,669	18,643	25,312	4648	14208	18856
Medway	3,641	2,044	5,685	1258	2101	3359	2,702	3,971	6,673	1976	3095	5071
Melrose	6,085	5,861	11,946	2447	7166	9613	4,858	9,531	14,389	3556	7955	11511
Mendon	1,750	792	2,542	734	825	1559	1,371	1,668	3,039	1003	1323	2326
Merrimac	1,651	1,042	2,693	672	1026	1698	1,378	1,985	3,363	996	1603	2599
Methuen	9,171	4,837	14,008	4022	12023	16045	7,413	12,249	19,662	5362	8457	13819
Middleborough	6,158	2,615	8,773	2169	3472	5641	4,685	5,884	10,569	3058	4352	7410
Middleton	2,412	1,081	3,493	812	1249	2061	1,840	2,266	4,106	1372	1959	3331
Millford	5,432	3,561	8,993	1747	5375	7122	4,046	7,508	11,554	2673	5854	8527
Millbury	3,125	1,655	4,780	984	2718	3702	2,435	3,809	6,244	1614	2861	4475
Millis	2,430	1,383	3,813	815	1469	2284	1,691	2,621	4,312	1255	2189	3444
Milton	6,347	6,436	12,783	1647	8795	10442	4,669	9,912	14,581	3303	8851	12154
Monson	1,933	1,258	3,191	843	1737	2580	1,527	2,587	4,114	1146	1879	3025
Nahant	880	877	1,757	264	1012	1276	697	1,464	2,161	527	1260	1787
Nantucket	2,032	2,139	4,171	1360	2293	3653	1,717	3,981	5,698	1171	2759	3930
Natick	6,954	7,208	14,162	2786	7811	10597	5,417	11,495	16,912	3887	9317	13204
Needham	6,894	7,654	14,548	2907	7321	10228	5,097	11,315	16,412	3854	9539	13393
New Bedford	7,828	11,754	19,582	3482	28625	32107	6,137	25,505	31,642	4023	19204	23227
Newburyport	4,174	4,266	8,440	1700	4058	5758	3,385	6,933	10,318	2370	5543	7913
Newton	11,352	23,456	34,808	4642	25873	30515	8,717	33,116	41,833	5819	26949	32768
Norfolk	3,308	1,394	4,702	1255	1307	2562	2,341	2,707	5,048	1705	2185	3890
North Adams	965	2,854	3,819	696	3168	3864	812	4,755	5,567	625	3322	3947
Northampton	2,447	9,415	11,862	994	10066	11060	2,060	13,074	15,134	1668	10048	11716
North Andover	7,018	3,826	10,844	3090	4545	7635	6,035	8,236	14,271	4381	5787	10168
N. Attleboro	7,778	3,018	10,796	3313	4262	7575	5,337	7,890	13,227	3799	5332	9131
Northborough	3,816	2,486	6,302	1582	2268	3850	3,210	4,479	7,689	2251	3722	5973
Northbridge	3,987	1,638	5,625	1844	2448	4292	3,351	3,754	7,105	2217	2866	5083
N. Brookfield	1,225	528	1,753	477	749	1226	973	1,230	2,203	739	994	1733
Northfield	508	744	1,252	231	505	736	409	1,238	1,647	341	934	1275
North Reading	4,373	2,135	6,508	1687	2804	4491	3,393	4,632	8,025	2477	3523	6000
Norton	4,424	2,209	6,633	1636	2687	4323	3,343	5,023	8,366	2296	3629	5925
Norwell	3,485	1,680	5,165	1543	1829	3372	2,848	3,182	6,030	2066	2699	4765
Norwood	6,568	4,532	11,100	2040	7029	9069	4,740	8,661	13,401	3458	7316	10774
Oak Bluffs	732	1,177	1,909	359	1120	1479	660	1,869	2,529	429	1461	1890
Orange	1,416	869	2,285	642	1113	1755	1,166	1,949	3,115	874	1392	2266
Orleans	1,961	1,705	3,666	1313	1323	2636	1,981	2,461	4,442	1577	2122	3699
Otis	283	265	548	154	280	434	267	517	784	266	410	676
Oxford	3,151	1,439	4,590	1070	2538	3608	2,388	3,635	6,023	1731	2813	4544
Palmer	2,524	1,622	4,146	1033	2580	3613	1,867	3,549	5,416	1463	2665	4128
Paxton	1,331	687	2,018	453	821	1274	1,012	1,376	2,388	731	1203	1934

Peabody	11,440	7,619	19,059	2950	11750	14700	8,401	16,517	24,918	5952	13775	19727
Pelham	126	596	722	52	538	590	99	749	848	83	620	703
Pembroke	5,134	2,424	7,558	1761	3169	4930	3,924	5,129	9,053	2649	4284	6933
Pepperell	3,279	1,607	4,886	1476	1791	3267	2,871	3,077	5,948	1940	2458	4398
Pittsfield	3,803	8,990	12,793	3173	13468	16641	3,493	15,829	19,322	2644	11301	13945
Plainville	2,469	971	3,440	890	1282	2172	1,629	2,362	3,991	1151	1745	2896
Plymouth	14,276	7,989	22,265	5457	9593	15050	11,248	16,279	27,527	7842	12820	20662
Princeton	1,165	681	1,846	457	492	949	929	1,143	2,072	717	956	1673
Quincy	15,607	13,330	28,937	6812	27789	34601	12,187	24,784	36,971	7903	19986	27889
Randolph	3,699	5,996	9,695	1277	9632	10909	2,962	10,783	13,745	2116	7970	10086
Raynham	3,574	1,687	5,261	1301	2345	3646	2,739	3,893	6,632	1812	2783	4595
Reading	6,225	4,659	10,884	2777	5640	8417	4,953	8,110	13,063	3475	6290	9765
Rehoboth	3,080	1,538	4,618	1381	1547	2928	2,301	3,509	5,810	1674	2343	4017
Revere	5,785	5,021	10,806	1837	12513	14350	3,027	7,916	10,943	2911	8552	11463
Richmond	220	499	719	137	369	506	167	740	907	165	610	775
Rochester	1,671	776	2,447	700	766	1466	1,332	1,568	2,900	909	1287	2196
Rockland	4,253	2,231	6,484	1231	3349	4580	3,188	4,943	8,131	2235	4222	6457
Rowley	1,845	893	2,738	722	816	1538	1,515	1,748	3,263	1102	1392	2494
Rutland	2,307	1,029	3,336	873	1159	2032	1,852	2,132	3,984	1242	1702	2944
Salem	5,726	6,650	12,376	2074	10717	12791	4,589	13,485	18,074	3283	10099	13382
Salisbury	1,927	1,061	2,988	758	1582	2340	1,472	2,476	3,948	945	1880	2825
Sandwich	6,625	3,416	10,041	3080	3582	6662	5,637	6,134	11,771	3948	5247	9195
Saugus	6,315	3,587	9,902	1641	6203	7844	4,787	7,827	12,614	3280	6452	9732
Scituate	5,584	3,474	9,058	2282	3689	5971	4,629	5,945	10,574	3300	5045	8345
Seekonk	3,133	1,911	5,044	968	2137	3105	2,152	4,625	6,777	1862	3307	5169
Sharon	3,536	4,461	7,997	1020	4237	5257	2,540	6,969	9,509	1710	5796	7506
Shelburne	263	588	851	141	414	555	224	885	1,109	199	694	893
Sherborn	1,269	1,061	2,330	648	769	1417	1,016	1,557	2,573	820	1322	2142
Shrewsbury	7,867	5,242	13,109	3646	6559	10205	6,463	10,327	16,790	4489	8157	12646
Somerset	3,706	3,553	7,259	1176	5556	6732	2,483	6,956	9,439	1916	5163	7079
Somerville	5,462	16,965	22,427	2128	24456	26584	4,287	26,182	30,469	3010	18416	21426
Southampton	1,533	1,052	2,585	556	1002	1558	1,245	1,919	3,164	991	1459	2450
Southborough	2,689	1,845	4,534	1252	1617	2869	2,224	3,222	5,446	1626	2609	4235
Southbridge	2,271	1,748	4,019	1132	4590	5722	1,765	4,643	6,408	1254	3584	4838
South Hadley	3,434	3,227	6,661	1333	3721	5054	2,726	5,756	8,482	2115	4373	6488
Southwick	2,469	1,074	3,543	1540	1642	3182	2,085	2,432	4,517	1570	1718	3288
Spencer	2,727	1,237	3,964	978	2235	3213	2,120	3,134	5,254	1477	2398	3875
Springfield	10,630	17,610	28,240	7734	44148	51882	8,082	37,165	45,247	6771	24036	30807
Sterling	2,569	1,174	3,743	1000	1122	2122	2,174	2,260	4,434	1532	1772	3304
Stockbridge	224	672	896	188	655	843	203	984	1,187	181	770	951
Stoneham	5,473	3,634	9,107	1711	5445	7156	4,123	7,279	11,402	2918	5909	8827
Stoughton	5,616	4,466	10,082	1601	6423	8024	4,127	8,704	12,831	2828	6977	9805
Stow	1,789	1,595	3,384	744	1123	1867	1,472	2,320	3,792	1096	1916	3012
Sturbridge	2,454	1,350	3,804	1139	1712	2851	2,077	2,776	4,853	1754	1876	3630
Sudbury	4,078	4,291	8,369	2113	3403	5516	3,376	6,384	9,760	2420	5171	7591
Sunderland	410	842	1,252	211	940	1151	347	1,400	1,747	268	1003	1271
Sutton	2,931	1,136	4,067	937	1279	2216	2,411	2,540	4,951	1607	2090	3697
Swampscott	3,222	3,121	6,343	1136	3538	4674	2,382	5,369	7,751	1612	4449	6061
Swansea	3,297	2,449	5,746	1194	4103	5297	2,365	5,578	7,943	1732	3936	5668
Taunton	8,925	6,586	15,511	2746	11856	14602	6,169	14,698	20,867	4196	10643	14839
Templeton	1,814	886	2,700	600	1180	1780	1,403	2,046	3,449	990	1660	2650
Tewksbury	7,353	3,381	10,734	2315	6234	8549	6,094	8,636	14,730	4189	6958	11147
Tisbury	579	1,172	1,751	335	1108	1443	536	1,746	2,282	409	1266	1675
Topsfield	1,993	1,117	3,110	905	809	1714	1,709	1,852	3,561	1371	1589	2960
Townsend	2,618	1,092	3,710	1046	1116	2162	2,345	2,433	4,778	1549	1753	3302
Tyngsborough	3,186	1,452	4,638	1077	1964	3041	2,581	3,204	5,785	1713	2479	4192
Upton	2,125	1,138	3,263	821	1037	1858	1,714	2,175	3,889	1139	1656	2795
Uxbridge	3,690	1,651	5,341	1428	2300	3728	3,049	3,736	6,785	1886	2778	4664
Wakefield	6,815	4,411	11,226	2139	5674	7813	5,024	8,378	13,402	3717	6996	10713
Wales	441	244	685	171	278	449	365	547	912	293	415	708
Walpole	7,604	3,565	11,169	2294	4381	6675	5,379	7,438	12,817	3800	6076	9876
Waltham	8,546	8,523	17,069	3490	12770	16260	6,614	16,042	22,656	4488	11554	16042
Ware	1,785	1,127	2,912	722	2151	2873	1,345	2,847	4,192	978	2158	3136
Wareham	4,628	3,128	7,756	1752	4190	5942	3,726	6,549	10,275	2497	5076	7573

Warren	986	594	1,580	401	875	1276	876	1,280	2,156	589	1043	1632
Watertown	4,520	7,301	11,821	1839	10292	12131	3,560	11,638	15,198	2654	9092	11746
Wayland	2,915	3,597	6,512	1412	2952	4364	2,358	5,385	7,743	1833	4389	6222
Webster	2,977	1,541	4,518	1256	3633	4889	2,204	3,976	6,180	1516	2862	4378
Wellesley	5,922	5,934	11,856	3716	5672	9388	4,689	8,732	13,421	3586	7299	10885
Wenham	1,184	674	1,858	771	552	1323	1,036	1,185	2,221	784	963	1747
Westborough	3,831	3,009	6,840	2127	3135	5262	3,337	5,234	8,571	2295	4137	6432
West Boylston	2,044	1,133	3,177	664	1054	1718	1,645	2,146	3,791	1203	1769	2972
W.Bridgewater	2,211	842	3,053	865	1156	2021	1,718	1,973	3,691	1251	1514	2765
W.Brookfield	907	523	1,430	397	605	1002	750	1,112	1,862	537	879	1416
Westfield	7,772	4,542	12,314	4675	7390	12065	6,376	9,846	16,222	4784	7081	11865
Westford	5,930	3,887	9,817	2352	3548	5900	5,010	6,881	11,891	3639	5396	9035
Westminster	2,202	1,021	3,223	899	1134	2033	1,809	2,243	4,052	1323	1818	3141
West Newbury	1,281	906	2,187	696	821	1517	1,105	1,506	2,611	869	1170	2039
Weston	2,794	2,424	5,218	1620	2018	3638	2,406	3,743	6,149	1873	3078	4951
Westport	3,203	2,898	6,101	1385	4674	6059	2,314	5,632	7,946	1753	3994	5747
W.Springfield	5,102	3,145	8,247	2587	5716	8303	4,059	7,241	11,300	3141	5068	8209
West Tisbury	347	1,033	1,380	164	881	1045	336	1,437	1,773	235	1138	1373
Westwood	4,465	2,953	7,418	1731	2810	4541	3,465	4,766	8,231	2511	4097	6608
Weymouth	15,093	8,104	23,197	3690	12254	15944	9,736	16,532	26,268	6741	15438	22179
Whitman	3,724	1,683	5,407	1090	2546	3636	2,780	4,053	6,833	1888	3198	5086
Wilbraham	4,237	2,216	6,453	2302	3125	5427	3,363	4,498	7,861	2726	3479	6205
Williamsburg	355	895	1,250	170	710	880	318	1,255	1,573	268	979	1247
Williamstown	612	2,100	2,712	444	2060	2504	629	2,929	3,558	502	2294	2796
Wilmington	6,225	3,057	9,282	1959	4531	6490	4,706	6,609	11,315	3180	5353	8533
Winchendon	1,908	986	2,894	955	1571	2526	1,560	2,415	3,975	1122	1829	2951
Winchester	5,248	4,876	10,124	2388	4692	7080	4,407	7,344	11,751	3433	6253	9686
Winthrop	3,596	2,902	6,498	1086	5167	6253	2,715	5,693	8,408	1865	4578	6443
Woburn	8,363	5,635	13,998	2668	9686	12354	6,592	11,369	17,961	4654	9239	13893
Worcester	17,889	19,861	37,750	9980	46395	56375	14,285	41,839	56,124	9478	31155	40633
Wrentham	3,880	1,414	5,294	1454	1664	3118	2,523	3,287	5,810	1842	2553	4395
Yarmouth	6,496	4,390	10,886	299	998	1297	6,221	7,221	13,442	4343	6632	10975
OpSCAN	1,137,568	1,025,433	2,163,001	473,760	1,526,771	2,000,531	897,035	1,903,983	2,801,018	638,712	1,454,240	2,092,952
Total	52.59%	47.41%	100.00%	23.68%	76.32%	100.00%	32.03%	67.97%	100.00%	30.52%	69.48%	100.00%

### Handcount

City/Town	Registration (2008)			Beatty			Chase			Kennedy		
	Brown (GOP)	Coakley (Dem)	Total	GOP	Dem	Total	(GOP)	(Dem)	Total	(GOP)	(Dem)	Total
Alford	68	157	225	43	149	192	56	253	309	57	187	244
Aquinnah	42	149	191	15	129	144	35	257	292	15	197	212
Ashby	949	475	1,424	327	418	745	795	946	1,741	586	716	1302
Ashfield	212	670	882	113	403	516	172	891	1,063	154	711	865
Berlin	825	538	1,363	277	379	656	663	873	1,536	499	740	1239
Blandford	343	196	539	175	165	340	280	350	630	217	259	476
Brimfield	995	489	1,484	430	589	1019	833	1,028	1,861	660	767	1427
Carlisle	1,215	1,442	2,657	600	941	1541	1,104	1,963	3,067	834	1673	2507
Charlemont	176	278	454	81	197	278	161	476	637	135	342	477
Cheshire	436	740	1,176	223	676	899	363	1,389	1,752	307	988	1295
Chester	292	194	486	150	207	357	242	378	620	170	280	450
Chesterfield	242	264	506	108	190	298	223	439	662	174	303	477
Chilmark	141	364	505	74	366	440	156	527	683	113	451	564
Clarksburg	186	395	581	96	241	337	160	684	844	141	477	618
Colrain	249	401	650	112	282	394	206	644	850	163	445	608
Conway	303	685	988	164	594	758	241	928	1,169	199	755	954
Cummington	130	306	436	57	161	218	123	385	508	79	303	382
Egremont	172	445	617	121	342	463	144	650	794	137	513	650
Essex	1,023	685	1,708	538	572	1110	827	1,243	2,070	663	1008	1671
Florida	125	144	269	43	125	168	99	281	380	64	193	257
Goshen	204	244	448	99	195	294	172	392	564	125	302	427
Gosnold	29	18	47	17	14	31	33	44	77	21	37	58
Granville	472	207	679	230	177	407	391	407	798	315	277	592
Hampden	1,511	754	2,265	749	819	1568	1,149	1,585	2,734	980	1190	2170
Hancock	118	158	276	56	116	172	106	262	368	77	183	260

Hawley	63	63	126	27	32	59	57	106	163	42	87	129
Heath	123	203	326	50	147	197	120	289	409	86	241	327
Hinsdale	285	415	700	161	400	561	260	751	1,011	185	483	668
Hudson	4,181	3,068	7,249	1501	3061	4562	3,252	5,945	9,197	2210	4535	6745
Huntington	467	346	813	178	282	460	358	650	1,008	298	436	734
Leverett	164	779	943	108	691	799	143	1,031	1,174	130	802	932
Leyden	116	211	327	89	131	220	107	331	438	77	269	346
Middlefield	113	126	239	73	94	167	80	194	274	77	135	212
Millville	799	323	1,122	200	408	608	565	873	1,438	359	588	947
Monroe	19	20	39	6	9	15	21	38	59	13	29	42
Montague	985	1,895	2,880	466	1997	2463	741	3,317	4,058	575	2517	3092
Monterey	102	296	398	102	309	411	103	442	545	109	323	432
Montgomery	267	123	390	91	91	182	223	232	455	173	178	351
Mt Washington	21	62	83	12	45	57	20	93	113	14	64	78
New Ashford	39	68	107	9	33	42	33	102	135	25	67	92
New Braintree	285	169	454	78	137	215	195	320	515	164	254	418
New Marlborough	227	366	593	147	297	444	173	601	774	167	442	609
Newbury	2,048	1,414	3,462	838	1136	1974	1707	2367	4,074	1275	2014	3289
New Salem	195	259	454	114	185	299	176	401	577	141	324	465
Oakham	645	281	926	180	216	396	498	555	1,053	372	419	791
Peru	125	162	287	69	139	208	111	317	428	79	175	254
Petersham	357	306	663	144	201	345	324	455	779	251	384	635
Phillipston	467	235	702	131	204	335	343	543	886	266	410	676
Plainfield	91	213	304	38	114	152	79	285	364	62	217	279
Plympton	951	444	1,395	297	353	650	750	845	1,595	546	760	1306
Provincetown	238	1,344	1,582	102	1699	1801	247	2,002	2,249	162	1778	1940
Rockport	1,667	1,879	3,546	614	1363	1977	1,345	3,040	4,385	1048	2601	3649
Rowe	89	97	186	39	72	111	84	162	246	68	119	187
Royalston	298	213	511	112	141	253	227	397	624	158	297	455
Russell	379	195	574	210	216	426	302	435	737	239	303	542
Sandisfield	146	150	296	70	192	262	105	301	406	81	190	271
Savoy	104	131	235	42	95	137	73	279	352	49	163	212
Sheffield	448	822	1,270	365	644	1009	374	1,381	1,755	355	946	1301
Shirley	1,525	868	2,393	494	879	1373	1,288	1,658	2,946	879	1364	2243
Shutesbury	158	771	929	93	653	746	133	1,015	1,148	110	844	954
Tolland	158	56	214	78	67	145	113	140	253	105	75	180
Truro	396	673	1,069	142	631	773	332	1,029	1,361	254	950	1204
Tyringham	82	131	213	37	90	127	66	194	260	41	148	189
Warwick	123	207	330	67	138	205	98	323	421	88	231	319
Washington	91	160	251	32	141	173	66	260	326	64	186	250
Wellfleet	596	1,075	1,671	299	998	1297	587	1,491	2,078	426	1246	1672
Wendell	79	338	417	33	225	258	58	446	504	44	367	411
W. Stockbridge	165	473	638	92	394	486	123	706	829	136	523	659
Westhampton	429	414	843	141	240	381	326	695	1,021	298	546	844
Whately	305	420	725	154	355	509	246	674	920	198	575	773
Windsor	141	252	393	66	157	223	118	398	516	108	292	400
Worthington	229	335	564	112	253	365	208	476	684	170	390	560
Handcount	31,439	33,249	64,688	13401	28802	42203	25692	55860	81,552	19662	43584	63246
Total	48.60%	51.40%	100.00%	31.75%	68.25%	100.00%	31.50%	68.50%	100.00%	31.09%	68.91%	100.00%

Comparative Totals	2010 Special Election		Registration (2008)			2008 Senate		2006 Senate				
	Brown	Coakley	GOP	Dem	Beatty	Kerry	Chase	Kennedy				
Handcount	48.6%	51.4%	31.8%	68.2%	31.5%	68.5%	31.1%	68.9%				
Opscan	52.6%	47.4%	23.7%	76.3%	32.0%	68.0%	30.5%	69.5%				
Disparity	4.0%	-4.0%	8.0%	-8.1%	8.1%	-16.2%	0.5%	-0.5%	1.0%	-0.6%	0.6%	-1.1%