

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts

STATE ELECTION

total voted 2903
total voters 3955
1052

OFFICIAL

DOVER

1453/1453

Melvin Francis Belloni
SECRETARY OF THE
COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

BALLOT

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 2010

To vote for a candidate, fill in the oval to the right of the candidate's name. To vote for a person not on the ballot, write that person's name and residence in the blank space provided and fill in the oval.

**GOVERNOR AND
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR**

Vote for ONE

PATRICK and MURRAY+Democratic 1013

BAKER and TISEI+Republican 1778

CAHILL and LOSCOCCO+Independent 96

STEIN and PURCELL+Cross-Balot 21

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.
BANKS 14
WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY 1

ATTORNEY GENERAL

Vote for ONE

MARTHA COAKLEY+Democratic 1368
48 Condit St., Westford
Candidate for the election

JAMES P. MCKENNA+Republican 1475
29 Wino St., Milbury

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.
BANKS 60
WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY 0

SECRETARY OF STATE

Vote for ONE

WILLIAM FRANCIS GALVIN+Democratic 1302
48 Lake St., Boston
Candidate for the election

WILLIAM C. CAMPBELL+Republican 390
45 Arlington St., Woburn

JAMES D. HENDERSON+Unaffiliated 52
22 Brandywine Ct., Shaw

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.
BANKS 158
WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY 1

TREASURER

Vote for ONE

STEVEN GROSSMAN+Democratic 1135
20 Huntington Rd., Needham

KARYN E. POLITO+Republican 1614
11 Goodman Ridge Rd., Chatham

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.
BANKS 122
WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY 2

AUDITOR

Vote for ONE

SUZANNE M. BUMP+Democratic 764
49 North Park Rd., Great Barrington

MARY Z. CONNAUGHTON+Republican 1817

NATHANIEL ALEXANDER FORTUNE+Cross-Balot 80
152 Westbrook Rd., Woburn

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.
BANKS 270
WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY 2

REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS

FOURTH DISTRICT Vote for ONE

BARNEY FRANK+Democratic 1004
274 Green St., Newton
Candidate for the election

SEAN DM BIELAT+Republican 1843
22 James St., Brookline

SUSAN F. ALLEN+Independent 18
132 Westbourne Ter., Brookline

DONALD M. JORDAN+Tax Reform Independent 9
270th St., Weymouth

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.
BANKS 25
WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY 1

COUNCILLOR

SECOND DISTRICT Vote for ONE

KELLY A. TIMILTY+Democratic 1018
103 Brookside Ave., Dedham
Candidate for the election

STEVEN M. GLOVSKY+Republican 1488
35 Shaw St., Weymouth

RICHARD MITCHELL+Unaffiliated 111
204 East Center St., Matta

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.
BANKS 283
WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY 3

SENATOR IN GENERAL COURT

BRETT & NORFOLK DISTRICT Vote for ONE

JAMES E. TIMILTY+Democratic 1529
6 South St., Weymouth

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.
BANKS 1321
WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY 53

REPRESENTATIVE IN GENERAL COURT

THIRTIETH NORFOLK DISTRICT Vote for ONE

DENISE C. GARLICK+Democratic 1004
22 Broad Pond Ln., Weymouth

JOHN P. O'LEARY+Republican 1721
26 Emerald Rd., Weymouth

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.
BANKS 176
WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY 2

DISTRICT ATTORNEY

NORFOLK DISTRICT Vote for ONE

MICHAEL W. MORRISSEY+Democratic 888
111 Lansdowne St., Quincy

JOHN F. COFFEY+Independent 1627
57 Parker Rd., Weymouth

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.
BANKS 354
WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY 4

SHERIFF

NORFOLK COUNTY Vote for ONE

MICHAEL G. BELLOTTI+Democratic 1109
20 Bowers Rd., Quincy
Candidate for the election

WILLIAM J. FARRETTA+Republican 1467
28 Hunt Rock Rd., Weymouth

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.
BANKS 326
WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY 1

COUNTY COMMISSIONER

NORFOLK COUNTY Vote for ONE

PETER H. COLLINS+Democratic 1439
27 Harbor View Pkwy., Milis

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.
BANKS 1417
WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY 47

**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.

1438 YES
1270 NO

QUESTIONS CONTINUED ON BACK
Blanks 195

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.

1580 YES

Blanks 153 1170 NO

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.

1438 YES

Blanks 63 1402 NO

QUESTION 4

THIS QUESTION IS NOT BINDING

Shall the state representative from this district be instructed to vote in favor of legislation that would allow the state to regulate the taxation, cultivation, and sale of marijuana to adults?

1343 YES

Blanks 286 1274 NO