









**REGIONAL TECHNICAL SCHOOL COMMITTEE**

BLACKSTONE VALLEY (4 YEARS) MILLVILLE

Vote for ONE

Blanks	450	681	559	501	765	679	787	4422
<b>GERALD M. FINN</b> 47 Grove St., Millville Candidate for Re-Election	530	708	546	523	810	666	796	4579
Write-in	5	3	3	5	9	11	8	44
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>985</b>	<b>1392</b>	<b>1108</b>	<b>1029</b>	<b>1584</b>	<b>1356</b>	<b>1591</b>	<b>9045</b>
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9045

**REGIONAL TECHNICAL SCHOOL COMMITTEE**

BLACKSTONE VALLEY (4 YEARS) NORTHBRIDGE

Vote for ONE

Blanks	448	678	566	495	765	682	787	4421
<b>JEFF T. KOOPMAN</b> 440 Quaker St., Northbridge Candidate for Re-Election	533	710	541	528	809	658	795	4574
Write-in	4	4	1	6	10	16	9	50
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>985</b>	<b>1392</b>	<b>1108</b>	<b>1029</b>	<b>1584</b>	<b>1356</b>	<b>1591</b>	<b>9045</b>
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9045

**REGIONAL TECHNICAL SCHOOL COMMITTEE**

BLACKSTONE VALLEY (4 YEARS) SUTTON

Vote for ONE

Blanks	443	660	561	492	767	686	796	4405
<b>MITCHELL A. INTINARELLI</b> 7 Burke Ln, Sutton Candidate for Re-Election	539	727	544	530	808	661	784	4593
Write-in	3	5	3	7	9	9	11	47
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>985</b>	<b>1392</b>	<b>1108</b>	<b>1029</b>	<b>1584</b>	<b>1356</b>	<b>1591</b>	<b>9045</b>
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9045

**REGIONAL TECHNICAL SCHOOL COMMITTEE**

BLACKSTONE VALLEY (4 YEARS) UPTON

Vote for ONE

Blanks	446	674	562	493	765	678	785	4403
<b>KENNETH M. PEDERSEN, JR.</b> 45 Main St., Upton Candidate for Re-Election	535	713	544	529	809	667	793	4590
Write-in	4	5	2	7	10	11	13	52
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>985</b>	<b>1392</b>	<b>1108</b>	<b>1029</b>	<b>1584</b>	<b>1356</b>	<b>1591</b>	<b>9045</b>
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9045

**REGIONAL TECHNICAL SCHOOL COMMITTEE**

BLACKSTONE VALLEY (4 YEARS) UXBRIDGE

Vote for ONE

Blanks	445	659	549	493	758	658	796	4358
<b>JAMES EBBELING</b> 24 Sylvan Rd., Uxbridge	357	474	376	352	537	464	529	3089
<b>DAVID LeFRANCOIS</b> 218 Mill St., Uxbridge	180	254	181	178	282	222	260	1557
Write-in	3	5	2	6	7	12	6	41
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>985</b>	<b>1392</b>	<b>1108</b>	<b>1029</b>	<b>1584</b>	<b>1356</b>	<b>1591</b>	<b>9045</b>
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9045

Total Registered Voters 16,771  
 Total ballots cast: 9,045  
 Percentage of ballots cast: **53.9%**

# The Commonwealth of Massachusetts

## STATE ELECTION

### OFFICIAL BALLOT

Tuesday, November 2, 2010

PRECINCT	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	TOTAL
<b>TOTAL VOTES CAST</b>	<b>985</b>	<b>1392</b>	<b>1108</b>	<b>1029</b>	<b>1584</b>	<b>1356</b>	<b>1591</b>	<b>9045</b>

### 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.

QUESTION 1:	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	
Blanks	63	75	81	43	104	44	19	<b>429</b>
YES	567	812	647	596	939	811	982	<b>5354</b>
NO	355	505	380	390	541	501	590	<b>3262</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>985</b>	<b>1392</b>	<b>1108</b>	<b>1029</b>	<b>1584</b>	<b>1356</b>	<b>1591</b>	<b>9045</b>
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<b>9045</b>

### 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.

QUESTION 2:	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	
Blanks	100	128	115	85	164	96	74	<b>762</b>
YES	417	618	493	433	715	609	759	<b>4044</b>
NO	468	646	500	511	705	651	758	<b>4239</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>985</b>	<b>1392</b>	<b>1108</b>	<b>1029</b>	<b>1584</b>	<b>1356</b>	<b>1591</b>	<b>9045</b>
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<b>9045</b>

