

**TOWN OF SOUTHWICK**

**UNOFFICIAL RESULTS OF THE STATE ELECTION  
TUESDAY NOVEMBER 2, 2010**

**UNOFFICIAL RESULTS**

	Party	Inc.	PCT 1	PCT 2	PCT 3	TOTALS
<b>GOVERNOR &amp; LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR</b>						
BLANKS			10	10	12	32
PATRICK & MURRAY	D		374	266	404	1044
BAKER & TISEI	R	X	773	434	724	1931
CAHILL & LOSCOCCO	I		154	121	157	432
STEIN & PURCELL	GR		26	15	22	63
WRITE IN			3	0	1	4
TOTALS			1340	846	1320	3506
<b>ATTORNEY GENERAL</b>						
BLANKS			23	9	30	62
MARTHA COAKLEY	D		510	374	568	1452
JAMES P. MCKENNA	R	X	807	461	721	1989
WRITE IN			0	2	1	3
TOTALS			1340	846	1320	3506
<b>SECRETARY OF STATE</b>						
BLANKS			49	28	54	131
WILLIAM FRANCIS GALVIN	D		518	373	563	1454
WILLIAM C. CAMPBELL	R	X	722	410	662	1794
JAMES D. HENDERSON	U		51	33	39	123
WRITE IN			0	2	2	4
TOTALS			1340	846	1320	3506
<b>TREASURER</b>						
BLANKS			55	26	60	141
STEVEN GROSSMAN	D		442	341	478	1261
KARYN E. POLITO	R	X	842	477	778	2097
WRITE IN			1	2	4	7
TOTALS			1340	846	1320	3506

**TOWN OF SOUTHWICK**

**UNOFFICIAL RESULTS OF THE STATE ELECTION  
TUESDAY NOVEMBER 2, 2010**

**UNOFFICIAL RESULTS**

	Party	Inc.	PCT 1	PCT 2	PCT 3	TOTALS
<b>AUDITOR</b>						
BLANKS			83	38	95	216
SUZANNE M. BUMP	D		419	308	423	1150
MARY Z. CONNAUGHTON	R	X	773	449	743	1965
NATHANAEL ALEXANDER FORTUNE	GR		65	49	56	170
WRITE IN			0	2	3	5
TOTALS			1340	846	1320	3506

<b>REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS</b>						
BLANKS			25	10	33	68
JOHN W. OLVER	D		499	389	573	1461
WILLIAM L. GUNN, JR.	R	X	738	397	640	1775
MICHAEL ENGEL	I		76	49	74	199
WRITE IN			2	1	0	3
TOTALS			1340	846	1320	3506

<b>COUNCILLOR</b>						
BLANKS			107	46	111	264
THOMAS T. MERRIGAN	D		408	324	449	1181
MICHAEL FRANCO	R	X	825	474	755	2054
WRITE IN			0	2	5	7
TOTALS			1340	846	1320	3506

<b>SENATOR IN GENERAL COURT</b>						
BLANKS			199	130	208	537
MICHAEL R. KNAPIK	R	X	1136	705	1102	2943
WRITE IN			5	11	10	26
TOTALS			1340	846	1320	3506

**TOWN OF SOUTHWICK**

**UNOFFICIAL RESULTS OF THE STATE ELECTION  
TUESDAY NOVEMBER 2, 2010**

**UNOFFICIAL RESULTS**

	Party	Inc.	PCT 1	PCT 2	PCT 3	TOTALS
<b><u>REPRESENTATIVE IN GENERAL COURT</u></b>						
BLANKS			28	12	32	72
ROSEMARY SANDLIN	D		394	300	431	1125
NICHOLAS A. BOLDYGA	R	X	756	414	706	1876
ANTHONY C. BONAVIDA	U		161	119	148	428
WRITE IN			1	1	3	5
TOTALS			1340	846	1320	3506

<b><u>DISTRICT ATTORNEY</u></b>						
BLANKS			55	24	38	117
STEPHEN J. BUONICONTI	D		375	304	421	1100
MARK G. MASTROIANNI	I	X	906	516	860	2282
WRITE IN			4	2	1	7
TOTALS			1340	846	1320	3506

<b><u>SHERIFF</u></b>						
BLANKS			403	172	348	923
MICHAEL J. ASHE, JR.	D	X	911	654	947	2512
WRITE IN			26	20	25	71
TOTALS			1340	846	1320	3506

<b><u>QUESTION #1</u></b>						
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?						
<b>SUMMARY</b>						
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.						
<b>A YES VOTE</b>						
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.						
<b>A NO VOTE</b>						
WOULD MAKE NO CHANGE IN THE STATE SALES TAX ON ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES AND ALCOHOL.						
BLANKS			25	17	35	77
YES		X	780	469	684	1933
NO			535	360	601	1496
			1340	846	1320	3506

**TOWN OF SOUTHWICK**

**UNOFFICIAL RESULTS OF THE STATE ELECTION  
TUESDAY NOVEMBER 2, 2010**

**UNOFFICIAL RESULTS**

**Party Inc. PCT 1 PCT 2 PCT 3 TOTALS**

**QUESTION #2**

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 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 if 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.

<b>BLANKS</b>		<b>84</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>232</b>
<b>YES</b>		<b>595</b>	<b>359</b>	<b>471</b>	<b>1425</b>
<b>NO</b>	x	<b>661</b>	<b>439</b>	<b>749</b>	<b>1849</b>
		<b>1340</b>	<b>846</b>	<b>1320</b>	<b>3506</b>

**TOWN OF SOUTHWICK**

**UNOFFICIAL RESULTS OF THE STATE ELECTION  
TUESDAY NOVEMBER 2, 2010**

**UNOFFICIAL RESULTS**

<b>QUESTION #3</b>	<b>Party</b>	<b>Inc.</b>	<b>PCT 1</b>	<b>PCT 2</b>	<b>PCT 3</b>	<b>TOTALS</b>
--------------------	--------------	-------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	---------------

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.

<b>BLANKS</b>			<b>26</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>YES</b>	x		<b>729</b>	<b>432</b>	<b>653</b>	<b>1814</b>
<b>NO</b>			<b>585</b>	<b>397</b>	<b>640</b>	<b>1622</b>
			<b>1340</b>	<b>846</b>	<b>1320</b>	<b>3506</b>
<b>VOTER REGISTRATION 10/13/2010</b>			<b>2315</b>	<b>1703</b>	<b>2208</b>	<b>6226</b>
<b>TOTAL VOTED NOVEMBER 2, 2010</b>			<b>1340</b>	<b>846</b>	<b>1320</b>	<b>3506</b>
<b>% VOTED NOVEMBER 2, 2010</b>			<b>57.88%</b>	<b>49.68%</b>	<b>59.78%</b>	<b>56.31%</b>

**A TRUE COPY ATTEST:**

**Michelle L. Hill**