

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS TOWN OF LYNNFIELD, NOVEMBER 2, 2010, STATE ELECTION									
Pursuant to the foregoing warrant, the inhabitants of the Town of Lynnfield, qualified to vote in elections appeared at the Lynnfield High School, 275 Essex St. to cast their ballot for candidates and offices of their choice listed below. A total of <u>5652</u> voters cast their votes on November 2, 2010 from 7:00 a.m. through 8:00 p.m.									
TOTAL REGISTERED VOTERS PRECINCT 1:					2268				
TOTAL REGISTERED VOTERS PRECINCT 2:					2403				
TOTAL REGISTERED VOTERS PRECINCT 3:					1994				
TOTAL REGISTERED VOTERS PRECINCT 4:					2328				
TOTAL REGISTERED VOTERS FOR LYNNFIELD:					8993				
TOTAL VOTES CAST P1:(regular, 80 Absentee; provisional)					1499				
TOTAL VOTES CAST P2: (regular, 69 absentee, provisional)					1486				
TOTAL VOTES CAST P3:(regular, 51 Absentee; provisional)					1171				
TOTAL VOTES CAST P4: (regular, 86 absentee, provisional)					1496				
			% of Turnout			63.00%			
<u>OFFICE</u>					<u>Prec. 1</u>	<u>Prec. 2</u>	<u>Prec. 3</u>	<u>Prec. 4</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
<u>GOVERNOR AND LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR</u>									
Patrick and Murray- Democratic				413	446	384	387	1630	
Baker and Tisei- Republican				1012	942	722	1038	3714	
Cahill and Loscocco - Independent				63	76	52	55	246	
Stein and Purcell - Green-Rainbow				9	7	7	6	29	
Write ins				0	0	0	2	2	
Blanks				2	15	6	8	31	
Total				1499	1486	1171	1496	5652	
<u>Attorney General</u>									
Martha Coakley, Democratic, <i>Candidate for Re-Election</i>				724	771	604	652	2751	
James B. McKenna, Republican				750	678	536	808	2772	
Write ins				1	1	0	1	3	
Blanks				24	36	31	35	126	
Total				1499	1486	1171	1496	5652	
<u>Secretary Of State</u>									
William Francis Galvin, Democrat <i>Candidate for Re-Election</i>				712	751	614	645	2722	
William C. Campbell, Republican				706	640	479	764	2589	
James D. Henderson, Unenrolled				21	23	19	17	80	
Write ins				0	0	0	1	1	
Blanks				60	72	59	69	260	
Total				1499	1486	1171	1496	5652	
<u>Treasurer</u>									
Steven Grossman, Democrat				519	563	461	503	2046	
Karyn E. Polito, Republican				924	863	664	931	3382	
Write ins				0	1	0	1	2	
Blanks				56	59	46	61	222	
Total				1499	1486	1171	1496	5652	
<u>Auditor</u>									
Suzanne M. Bump, Democrat				415	441	362	372	1590	
Mary Z. Connaughton, Republican				918	860	654	958	3390	
Nathanael Alexander Fortune, Green-Rainbow,				48	44	52	42	186	
Write ins				0	0	0	1	1	
Blanks				118	141	103	123	485	
Total				1499	1486	1171	1496	5652	

<u>Representative In Congress</u>								
John F. Tierney, Democrat,			617	634	527	558	2336	
<i>Candidate for Re-Election</i>								
Bill Hudak - Republican			821	776	590	885	3072	
Write ins			0	0	0	0	0	
Blanks			61	76	54	53	244	
Total			1499	1486	1171	1496	5652	
<u>Councillor</u>								
Paul A. Caruccio, Republican			701	634	451	722	2508	
Terrence W. Kennedy, Democrat			609	665	556	593	2423	
Scott C. Crabtree, Independent			61	48	66	44	219	
Andrew W. Mostone, Unenrolled			9	15	16	15	55	
Write ins			0	0	1	1	2	
Blanks			119	124	81	121	445	
Total			1499	1486	1171	1496	5652	
<u>Senator In General Court</u>								
Katherine M. Clark, Democrat,			520	555	444	455	1974	
Craig Spadafora, Republican			901	850	655	954	3360	
Write ins			1	0	0	1	2	
Blanks			77	81	72	86	316	
Total			1499	1486	1171	1496	5652	
<u>Representative In General Court</u>								
Bradley H. Jones, Jr., Republican			1187	x	897	1182	3266	
<i>Candidate for Re-Election</i>								
Mark V. Falzone, Democrat			x	655	x	x	655	
<i>Candidate for Re-Election</i>								
Donald H. Wong, Republican			x	785	x	x	785	
Write ins			11	0	6	6	23	
Blanks			301	46	268	308	923	
Total			1499	1486	1171	1496	5652	
<u>District Attorney</u>								
Jonathan W. Blodgett, Democrat,			887	884	738	856	3365	
<i>Candidate for Re-Election</i>								
Write ins			6	6	4	7	23	
Blanks			606	596	429	633	2264	
Total			1499	1486	1171	1496	5652	
<u>Sheriff</u>								
Frank G. Cousins Jr., Republican			996	971	767	1004	3738	
<i>Candidate for Re-Election</i>								
Damian M. Anketell, Democrat			308	305	244	267	1124	
Kevin J. Leach, Independent			68	76	56	91	291	
Write ins			0	0	0	0	0	
Blanks			127	134	104	134	499	
Total			1499	1486	1171	1496	5652	
			QUESTION #1					
LAW PROPOSED BY AN 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?						
	PREC 1	PREC 2	PREC 3	PREC 4	TOTAL			
YES	949	937	710	929	3525			
NO	526	522	439	530	2017			
BLANKS	24	27	22	37	110			
TOTAL	1499	1486	1171	1496	5652			
			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 #2					
LAW PROPOSED BY AN 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?						
	PREC 1	PREC 2	PREC 3	PREC 4	TOTAL			
YES	745	816	558	755	2874			
NO	671	601	563	641	2476			
BLANKS	83	69	50	100	302			
TOTAL	1499	1486	1171	1496	5652			
			SUMMARY					
<p>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.</p>								
<p>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).</p>								
<p>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.</p>								
<p>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.</p>								
<p>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 for 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.</p>								
<p>The proposed law stated that if any of its parts are declared invalid, the other parts would stay in effect.</p>								
<p>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.</p>								
<p>A NO VOTE would make no change in the state law allowing issuance of such a comprehensive permit.</p>								
			QUESTION #3					
LAW PROPOSED BY AN INITIATIVE PETITION								
		Do you approve of a law summarized below, on which no vote was taken by the Senate or House of Representatives before May 4, 2010?						
	PREC 1	PREC 2	PREC 3	PREC 4	TOTAL			
YES	803	814	629	825	3071			
NO	676	656	526	634	2492			
BLANKS	20	16	16	37	89			
TOTAL	1499	1486	1171	1496	5652			
			SUMMARY					
<p>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 1st 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.</p>								

The proposed law provides that if the 3% rates would not produce enough revenue 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 monies due the Commonwealth for sales, storage, use or other consumption of tangible personal property or service 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.								
A TRUE COPY ATTEST:								
AMY K. SUMMERS, CMC								
LYNNFIELD TOWN CLERK								