# The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
# STATE ELECTION

## SAMPLE

BOLTON

## BALLOT

848/848

## 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

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., Millbury

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., Whately

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

WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

### REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS

FIFTH DISTRICT — Vote for ONE

NICOLA S. TSONGAS + + + + + + + + + + + + Democratic
52 Lawrence Dr., Lowell — Candidate for Re-election

JONATHAN A. GOLNIK + + + + + + + + + + + Republican
347 Elizabeth Ridge Rd., Carlisle

DALE E. BROWN + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + Liberty
11 Lemay Way, Chelmsford

ROBERT M. CLARK + + + + + + + + + + Citizen Legislator
183 Lancaster Rd., Berlin

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

WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

### COUNCILLOR

SEVENTH DISTRICT — Vote for ONE

JENNIE L. CAISSIE + + + + + + + + + + + + + Republican
53 Fort Hill Rd., Oxford

FRANCIS A. FORD + + + + + + + + + + + + + Democratic
8 Walbridge Rd., Paxton

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

WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

### SENATOR IN GENERAL COURT

WORCESTER & MIDDLESEX DISTRICT — Vote for ONE

JENNIFER L. FLANAGAN + + + + + + + + + Democratic
42 Meadowpond Townhouse, Leominster — Candidate for Re-election

NEAL ANDREW HEEREN + + + + + + + + + Republican
139 Sugar Rd., Bolton

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

WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

### REPRESENTATIVE IN GENERAL COURT

THIRD MIDDLESEX DISTRICT — Vote for ONE

KATE HOGAN + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + Democratic
36 Hastings St., Stow — Candidate for Re-election

CHUCK S. KUNIEWICH, JR. + + + + + + Independent
33 Temple Ave., Hudson

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

WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

### DISTRICT ATTORNEY

MIDDLE DISTRICT — Vote for ONE

JOSEPH D. EARLY, JR. + + + + + + + + + + Democratic
36 Blackthorn Dr., Worcester — Candidate for Re-election

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

WRITE-IN SPACE ONLY

### SHERIFF

WORCESTER COUNTY — Vote for ONE

LEWIS G. EVANGELIDIS + + + + + + + + + + Republican
215 Newell Rd., Holden

THOMAS J. FOLEY + + + + + + + + + + + + + Democratic
27 Ridgewood Rd., Worcester

KEITH E. NICHOLAS + + + + + + + + + + + + Independent
10 Lombard St., Warren

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

CONTINUED ON BACK

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** ◯

---

## 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?

**YES** ◯

**NO** ◯

---