

STATE ELECTION NOVEMBER 2, 2010 PROCEEDINGS

Pursuant to the foregoing warrant the State Election was held on Tuesday, November 2, 2010 at the Miscoe Hill Elementary School gymnasium. Polls were open at 7:00am. Carol Cook served as Warden. Workers from opening to 5:00pm were: Ruth O’Grady, Gloria Hogarth, Martha Gebelien, Nancy Bradley, John Hogarth, and Mary Ames as clerk. The officer was Brian Massey from 6:45am- 2:00pm.

Poll workers serving from 5:00pm to 8:00pm were, Pat Ghelli, Diane Willoughby, Kathy Rich, Nancy Fleury, Tom Irons and Marilyn Walton as clerk.

Polls were closed at 8:00pm. 2534 votes cast. The final votes cast number is 2534. Results were announced at 8:30pm by Warden Carol Cook.

GOVERNOR and LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

Patrick and Murray	770
Baker and Tisei	1543
Cahill and Loscocco	183
Stein and Purcell	20
All others	1
Blanks	17

ATTORNEY GENERAL

Martha Coakley	1211
James P. McKenna	1278
Blanks	45

SECRETARY OF STATE

William Francis Galvin	1160
William C. Campbell	1183
James D. Henderson	76
Blanks	115

TREASURER

Steven Grossman	852
Karyn E. Polito	1573
Blanks	109

AUDITOR

Suzanne M. Bump	742
Mary Z. Connaughton	1475
Nathanael Alexander Fortune	94
All Others	1
Blanks	222

REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS

Richard E. Neal	949
Thomas A. Wesley	1509
All others	3
Blanks	73

COUNCILLOR

Jennie L. Caissie	1471
Francis A. Ford	749
All others	1
Blanks	313

SENATOR IN GENERAL COURT

Richard T. Moore	1246
Kimberly B. Roy	1177
Blanks	111

REPRESENTATIVE IN GENERAL COURT

John V. Fernandes	1643
All others	14
Blanks	877

DISTRICT ATTORNEY

Joseph D. Early	1516
All Others	5
Blanks	1013

SHERIFF

Lewis G. Evangelidis	1251
Thomas J. Foley	854
Keith E. Nicholas	187
Blanks	242

**BLACKSTONE VALLEY REGIONAL
SCHOOL COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

Bellingham

Joseph M. Hall	1497
All Others	4
Blanks	1033

Blackstone

William J. Pontes	1462
All Others	3
Blanks	1069

Douglas

John C. Lavin, III	1441
All others	1
Blanks	1092

Grafton

Anthony M. Yitts	1352
Blanks	1182

Hopedale

Paul M. Yanovitch	1379
Blanks	1155

Mendon

Michael D. Peterson	1537
All Others	2
Blanks	995

Milford

Arthur E. Morin, Jr.	1398
All others	1
Blanks	1135

Millbury

Chester P. Hanratty, Jr.	1303
Blanks	1231

Millville

Gerald M. Finn	1311
Blanks	1223

Northbridge

Jeff T. Koopman	1345
Blanks	1189

Sutton

Mitchell A. Intinarelli	1307
Blanks	1227

Upton

Kenneth M. Pederson, Jr.	1351
Blanks	1183

Uxbridge

James Ebbeling	902
David LeFrancois	452
Blanks	1180

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 before May 4, 2010?

SUMMARY

This proposed law would remove the Massachusetts sales tax on alcoholic beverages and alcohol, where the sale of such beverages and alcohol or their importation into the state is already subject to a separate excise tax under state law. The proposed law would take effect on January 1, 2011.

A YES VOTE would remove the state sales tax on alcoholic beverages and alcohol where their sale or importation into the state is subject to an excise tax under state law.

A NO VOTE would make no change in the state sales tax on alcoholic beverages and alcohol.

YES	1596
------------	------

NO	911
-----------	-----

BLANKS	27
---------------	----

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 4, 2010?

SUMMARY

This proposed law would repeal an existing state law that allows a qualified organization wishing to build government-subsidized housing that includes low- or moderate-income units to apply for a single comprehensive permit from a city or town’s zoning board of appeals (ZBA), instead of separate permits from each local agency or official having jurisdiction over any aspect of the proposed housing. The repeal would take effect on January 1, 2011, but would not stop or otherwise affect any proposed housing that had already received both a comprehensive permit and a building permit for at least one unit.

Under the existing law, the ZBA holds a public hearing on the application and considers the recommendations of local agencies and officials. The ZBA may grant a comprehensive permit that may include conditions or requirements concerning the height, site plan, size, shape, or building materials of the housing. Persons aggrieved by the ZBA’s decision to grant a permit may appeal it to a court. If the ZBA denies the permit or grants it with conditions or requirements that make the housing uneconomic to build or to operate, the applicant may appeal to the state Housing Appeals Committee (HAC).

After a hearing, if the HAC rules that the ZBA’s denial of a comprehensive permit was unreasonable and not consistent with local needs, the HAC orders the ZBA to issue the permit. If the HAC rules that the ZBA’s decision issuing a comprehensive permit with conditions or requirements made the housing uneconomic to build or operate and was not consistent with local needs, the HAC orders the ZBA to modify or remove any such condition or requirement so as to make the proposal no longer uneconomic. The HAC cannot order the ZBA to issue any permit that would allow the housing to fall below minimum safety standards or site plan requirements. If the HAC rules that the ZBA’s action was consistent with local needs, the HAC must uphold it even if it made the housing uneconomic. The HAC’s decision is subject to review in the courts.

A condition or requirement makes housing “uneconomic” if it would prevent a public agency or non-profit organization from building or operating the housing except at a financial loss, or it would prevent a

limited dividend organization from building or operating the housing without a reasonable return on its investment.

A ZBA’s decision is “consistent with local needs” if it applies requirements that are reasonable in view of the regional need for low- and moderate-income housing and the number of low-income persons in the city or town, as well as the need to protect health and safety, promote better site and building design, and preserve open space, if those requirements are applied as equally as possible to both subsidized and unsubsidized housing. Requirements are considered “consistent with local needs” if more than 10% of the city or town’s housing units are low- or moderate-income units or if such units are on sites making up at least 1.5% of the total private land zoned for residential, commercial, or industrial use in the city or town. Requirements are also considered “consistent with local needs” if the application would result, in any one calendar year, in beginning construction of low- or moderate-income housing on sites making up more than 0.3% of the total private land zoned for residential, commercial, or industrial use in the city or town, or on ten acres, whichever is larger.

The proposed law states that if any of its parts were declared invalid, the other parts would stay in effect.

A YES VOTE would repeal the state law allowing the issuance of a single comprehensive permit to build housing that includes low- or moderate-income units.

A NO VOTE would make no change in the state law allowing issuance of such a comprehensive permit.

YES	1378
NO	1036
BLANKS	120

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 before May 4, 2010?

SUMMARY

This proposed law would reduce the state sales and use tax rates (which were 6.25% as of September 2009) to 3% as of January 1, 2011. It would make the same reduction in the rate used to determine the amount to be deposited with the state Commissioner of Revenue by non-resident building contractors as security for the payment of sales and use tax on tangible personal property used in carrying out their contracts.

The proposed law provides that if the 3% rates would not produce enough revenues to satisfy any lawful pledge of sales and use tax revenues in connection with any bond, note, or other contractual obligation, then the rates would instead be reduced to the lowest level allowed by law.

The proposed law would not affect the collection of moneys due the Commonwealth for sales, storage, use or other consumption of tangible personal property or services occurring before January 1, 2011.

The proposed law states that if any of its parts were declared invalid, the other parts would stay in effect.

A YES VOTE would reduce the state sales and use tax rates to 3%.

A NO VOTE would make no change in the state sales and use tax rates.

YES	1268
NO	1236
BLANKS	30

A true copy. Attest:

Margaret Bonderenko
Town Clerk

