

**The Commonwealth of Massachusetts**  
**STATE ELECTION**

**Northfield, Massachusetts**  
**November 2, 2010**

At the time and place set forth in the warrant, the polls were opened at 7:00 a.m. One thousand two hundred and forty seven votes were cast with the following results:

**GOVERNOR and LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR**

*Vote for One*

Patrick and Murray	Democratic	722
Baker and Tisei	Republican	364
Cahill and Loscocco	Independent	112
Stein and Purcell	Green-Rainbow	40
Blank		9
Write-in		0
All Others		0

**ATTORNEY GENERAL**

*Vote for One*

Martha Coakley	Democratic	820
James P. McKenna	Republican	402
Blank		25
Write-in		0
All Others		0

**SECRETARY of STATE**

*Vote for One*

William Francis Galvin	Democratic	806
William C. Campbell	Republican	347
James D. Henderson	Unenrolled	40
Blank		54
Write-in		0
All Others		0

**TREASURER**

*Vote for One*

Steven Grossman	Democratic	734
Karyn E. Polito	Republican	457
Blank		56
Write-in		0
All Others		0

**AUDITOR**

Vote for One

Suzanne M. Bump	Democratic	662
Mary Z. Connaughton	Republican	380
Nathanael Alexander Fortune	Green-Rainbow	122
Blank		83
Write-in		0
All Others		0

**REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS**

First District

Vote for One

John W. Olver	Democratic	807
William L. Gunn Jr.	Republican	373
Michael Engel	Independent	50
Blank		16
Write-in		0
All Others		1

**COUNCILLOR**

Eight District

Vote for One

Thomas T. Merrigan	Democratic	872
Michael Franco	Republican	320
Blank		54
Write-in		0
All Others		1

**SENATOR IN GENERAL COURT**

Hampshire & Franklin District

Vote for One

Stanley C. Rosenberg	Democratic	996
Blank		249
Write-in		0
All Others		2

**REPRESENTATIVE IN GENERAL COURT**

Second Berkshire District

Vote for One

Michael F. Case	Republican	398
Paul W. Mark	Democratic	671
Stefan G. Racz	Non-Party	123
Blank		55
Write-in		0
All Others		0

**DISTRICT ATTORNEY**

Northwestern District

Vote for One

David E. Sullivan	Democratic	965
Blank		277
Write-in		0
All Others		5

**SHERIFF**

Franklin County

Vote for One

Christopher J. Donelan	Democratic	997
Blank		247
Write-in		0
All Others		3

**COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENT EXECUTIVE  
COMMITTEE**

Franklin County

Vote for One

Bill Perlman		877
Blank		367
Write-in		0
All Others		3

**REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT**

Bernardston

Vote for not more than Two                      4 year

Charles Hand		512
Marsha Pratt		800
Paul W. Luther		339
Blank		841
Write-ins		0
All Others		2

**REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT**

Leyden

Vote for Not more than Two

Margaret E. Kaepple		686
Mary E. Glabach		794
Blank		1014
Write-in		0
All Others		0

**REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT**

Northfield

Vote for One                      4 year

William S. Wahlstrom	951
Blank	294
Write-in	0
All Others	2

**REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT**

Warwick

Vote for One                      4 year

Blank	1230
Write-in	6
All Others	11

Mark Maynard

**Question #1**

**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	408
No	793
Blank	46

**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	356
No	810
Blank	81

### 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	356
No	846
Blank	45

### Question #4

#### THIS QUESTION IS NOT BINDING

Shall the state representative from this district be instructed to support legislation that would establish health care as a human right regardless of age, state of health or employment status, by creating a single payer health insurance system like Medicare that is comprehensive, cost effective, and publicly provided to all residents of Massachusetts?

Yes	745
No	377
Blank	125

The polls were closed at 8:00 p.m