

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts STATE ELECTION

OFFICIAL ABSENTEE BALLOT


NATICK
Pars. 6, 7, 9

884/884

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 2010

William Francis Galvin
SECRETARY OF THE
COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Sample

To vote for a candidate, connect the arrow  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 connect the arrow.

GOVERNOR AND LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

Vote for ONE

PATRICK and MURRAY +Democratic

BAKER and TISEI +Republican

CAHILL and LOSCOCCO +Independent

STEIN and PURCELL +Green-Rainbow

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.

WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

ATTORNEY GENERAL

Vote for ONE

MARTHA COAKLEY +Democratic
46 Coolidge Rd., Medford
Candidate for Re-election

JAMES P. MCKENNA +Republican
28 Miles St., Milbury

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.

WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

SECRETARY OF STATE

Vote for ONE

WILLIAM FRANCIS GALVIN +Democratic
46 Lake St., Boston
Candidate for Re-election

WILLIAM C. CAMPBELL +Republican
45 Arlington Rd., Woburn

JAMES D. HENDERSON +Unenrolled
38 Brandymeade Cir., Stow

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.

WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

TREASURER

Vote for ONE

STEVEN GROSSMAN +Democratic
30 Huntington Rd., Newton

KARYN E. POLITO +Republican
11 Coachman Ridge Rd., Shrewsbury

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.

WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

AUDITOR

Vote for ONE

SUZANNE M. BUMP +Democratic
409 North Plain Rd., Great Barrington

MARY Z. CONNAUGHTON +Republican
1 Tomkins Ln., Framingham

NATHANAEL ALEXANDER FORTUNE +Green-Rainbow
152 Westbrook Rd., Whitely

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.

WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS

SEVENTH DISTRICT Vote for ONE

EDWARD J. MARKEY +Democratic
7 Townsend St., Malden
Candidate for Re-election

GERRY DEMBROWSKI +Republican
6 Marilyn Ct., Woburn

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.

WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

COUNCILLOR

SECOND DISTRICT Vote for ONE

KELLY A. TIMILTY +Democratic
103 Brookdale Ave., Dedham
Candidate for Re-election

STEVEN M. GLOVSKY +Republican
36 Shaw Dr., Weyland

RICHARD MITCHELL +Unenrolled
204 East Central St., Natick

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.

WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

SENATOR IN GENERAL COURT

NORFOLK, BRISTOL & MIDDLESEX DISTRICT Vote for ONE

RICHARD J. ROSS +Republican
415 Franklin St., Wrentham
Candidate for Re-election

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.

WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

REPRESENTATIVE IN GENERAL COURT

FIFTH MIDDLESEX DISTRICT Vote for ONE

DAVID PAUL LINSKY +Democratic
66 Rathbun Rd., Natick
Candidate for Re-election

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.

WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

DISTRICT ATTORNEY

NORTHERN DISTRICT Vote for ONE

GERARD T. LEONE, JR. +Democratic
171 Ash St., Hopkinton
Candidate for Re-election

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.

WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

SHERIFF

MIDDLESEX COUNTY Vote for ONE

JAMES V. DIPAOLO +Democratic
181 Kimball St., Malden
Candidate for Re-election

MICHAEL S. TRANCHITA, SR. +Unenrolled
69 Harvard St., Winchester

DO NOT VOTE IN THIS SPACE.
USE BLANK LINE BELOW FOR WRITE-IN.

WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

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 

NO 

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 uneconomical to build or to operate, the applicant may appeal to the state Housing Appeals Committee (HAC).

CONTINUED ON BACK

VOTE BOTH SIDES

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 ←

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.

YES ←

NO ←

V 811

SAMPLE