

RESULTS OF THE VOTE AT THE STATE ELECTION

November 2, 2010

The inhabitants of the Town of Warwick, qualified to vote in elections and in town affairs, met according to the Warrant and proceeded to cast their votes as follows:

GOVERNOR and LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

Patrick & Murray	194
Baker & Tisei	103
Cahill & Loscocco	38
Stein & Purcell	9
Blank	5

ATTORNEY GENERAL

Martha Coakley	230
James P. McKenna	111
Blank	8

SECRETARY of STATE

William Francis Galvin	232
William C. Campbell	92
James D. Henderson	11
Blank	14

TREASURER

Steven Grossman	205
Karyn E. Polito	124
Blank	20

AUDITOR

Suzanne M. Bump	187
Mary Z. Connaughton	104
Nathanael Alexander Fortune	34
Blank	24

REPRESENTATIVE in CONGRESS – First District

John W. Olver	240
William L. Gunn, Jr.	90
Michael Engel	12
Blank	7

COUNCILLOR- Seventh District

Jennie L. Caissie	127
Francis A. Ford	175
Blank	47

SENATOR IN GENERAL COURT – Worcester, Hampden, Hampshire & Franklin Dist.

Stephen M. Brewer	268
Daniel D. Dubrule	74
Blank	7

REPRESENTATIVE IN GENERAL COURT – Second Franklin District

Steven E. Adam 129
Denise Andrews 191
Genevieve C. Fraser 21
Blank 8

DISTRICT ATTORNEY – Northwestern District

David E. Sullivan 269
Michael Cahillane 1
Blank 79

SHERIFF – Franklin County

Christopher J. Donelan 286
Blank 63

COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE –Franklin County

Bill Perlman 249
Margaret Sullivan 2
Blank 98

REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT – Pioneer Valley (Bernardston)

Charles Hand 184
Marsha Pratt 219
Paul W. Luther 77
Mark Maynard 1
Blank 217

REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT – Pioneer Valley (Leyden)

Margaret E. Kaepfel 227
Mary E. Glabach 198
Mark Maynard 1
Blank 272

REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT – Pioneer Valley (Northfield)

William Wahlstrom 258
Mark Maynard 1
Blank 90

REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT – Pioneer Valley (Warwick)

Mark Maynard 5
Linda Gale 3
Barbara Walker 2
Carol Foote 1
Charles Hand 1
David Young 1
Art Ratte 1
Diana Noble 1
Jim Toth 1
Brian Snell 1
Dan Dibble 1
Louise Doud 1
Heidi Gale 1
Blank 329

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.

YES	128
NO	212
Blank	9

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.

YES	120
NO	202
Blank	27

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.

YES	104
NO	234
Blank	11

A total of 349 ballots were cast (64.5% turnout). Warwick has 541 registered voters. Polls opened at 7:00 a.m. and closed at 8:00 p.m.

A true record of the ballots cast. ATTEST:

Jeannette Fellows
Town Clerk