

Town of Becket

557 Main Street, Becket, MA 01223

ph: 413-623-8934

fx: 413-623-6036

State Election Results 11/2/10

	VOTES	610	Ballots Cast
Governor and Lieutenant Governor <i>(Vote for One)</i>			
Patrick and Murray	376		
Baker and Tisei	177		
Cahill and Loscocco	41		
Stein and Purcell	7		
All Other Votes	3		
Blank Votes	6		
TOTAL VOTES	610		
Attorney General <i>(Vote for One)</i>			
Martha Coakley	405		
James P. McKenna	197		
All Other Votes	0		
Blank Votes	8		
TOTAL VOTES	610		
Secretary of State <i>(Vote for One)</i>			
William Francis Galvin	397		
William C. Campbell	181		
James D. Henderson	16		
All Other Votes	1		
Blank Votes	15		
TOTAL VOTES	610		
Treasurer <i>(Vote for One)</i>			
Steven Grossman	367		
Karen E. Polito	221		
All Other Votes	1		
Blank Votes	21		
TOTAL VOTES	610		
Auditor <i>(Vote for One)</i>			
Suzanne M. Bump	339		
Mary Z. Connaughton	223		
Nathanael Alexander Fort	24		
All Other Votes	1		
Blank Votes	23		
TOTAL VOTES	610		
Representative in Congress, First District <i>(Vote for One)</i>			
John W. Olver	383		
William L. Gunn, JR.	193		
Michael Engel	27		
All Other Votes			
Blank Votes	7		
TOTAL VOTES	610		
Councillor, Eighth District <i>(Vote for One)</i>			

Thomas T. Merrigan	354		
Michael Franco	212		
All Other Votes	0		
Blank Votes	44		
TOTAL VOTES	610		
Senator in General Court, Berkshire, Hampshire & Franklin District <i>(Vote for One)</i>			
Benjamin Brackett Downing	469		
All Other Votes	6		
Blank Votes	135		
TOTAL VOTES	610		
Representative in General Court, Second Berkshire District <i>(Vote for One)</i>			
	Michael F. Case	239	
	Paul W. Mark	327	
	Stefan G. Racz	20	
	All Other Votes	1	
	Blank Votes	23	
	TOTAL VOTES	610	
	District Attorney, Berkshire District <i>(Vote for One)</i>		
	David F. Capeless	445	
	All Other Votes	9	
	Blank Votes	156	
	TOTAL VOTES	610	
	Sheriff, Berkshire County <i>(Vote for One)</i>		
	Thomas N. Bowler	478	
	All Other Votes	5	
	Blank Votes	127	
	TOTAL VOTES	610	
	Regional School Committee Becket <i>(Vote for One)</i>		
	Michael Falk	461	
	All Other Votes	3	
	Blank Votes	146	
	TOTAL VOTES	610	
	Regional School Committee Cummington <i>(Vote for One)</i>		
	Sean	401	

	Nyhan		
	All Other Votes	2	
	Blank Votes	207	
	TOTAL VOTES	610	
Regional School Committee Dalton (Vote for not more than FOUR)			
		Billie J. Henderson	292
		Michael J. Hopper	274
		George Desmarais	273
		All Other Votes	9
		Blank Votes	1592
		TOTAL VOTES	2440
		Regional School Committee Hinsdale (Vote for One)	
		Shawn Armocost	382
		All Other Votes	0
		Blank Votes	228
		TOTAL VOTES	610
		QUESTION 1 (Law Proposed by Initiative Petition)	
		<p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>A NO VOTE would make no change in the state sales tax on alcoholic beverages and alcohol.</i></p>	
	Yes	237	
	No	361	
	Blanks	12	
	TOTAL VOTES	610	
	QUESTION 2 (Law Proposed by Initiative Petition)		
<p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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</i></p>			

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.

Yes	212		
No	364		
Blanks	34		
TOTAL VOTES	610		
QUESTION 3 (Law Proposed by Initiative Petition)			

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	221		
No	377		
Blanks	12		
TOTAL VOTES	610		
QUESTION 4 (This Question is Not Binding)			

Shall the state representative from this district be instructed to support legislation that would establish health care as a human right regardless of age, state of health or employment status, by creating a single payer health insurance system like Medicare that is comprehensive, cost effective, and publicly provided to all residents of Massachusetts?

Yes	400		
No	168		
Blanks	42		
TOTAL VOTES	610		
Town of Becket, Total Registered Voters:	1476		
Ballots cast:	610		
Percent Voting	41%		