

## FY 2012 Local Option Elections

During FY 2012, 47 local option elections were held for 36 Jurisdictions. 45 local option election issues were passed by voters, 2 failed. As a result of these elections, 18 jurisdictions became “wet” for the first time; 16 jurisdictions authorized additional sales or expanded the areas in which sales were authorized, and 2 jurisdictions retained the same wet/dry status that they had before the election.

Issues for which elections were held included the legal sale of beer and wine (2 ea.), the legal sale of beer and wine for off-premises consumption only (14 ea.), the legal sale of wine on the premises of a holder of a winery permit (1 ea.), the legal sale of all alcoholic beverages for off-premises consumption only (10 ea.), the legal sale of all alcoholic beverages, including mixed beverages (10 ea.), the legal sale of all alcoholic beverages except mixed beverages (1 ea.), and the legal sale of mixed beverages in restaurants by food and beverage certificate holders only (9 ea.). In both cases where the ballot issue failed to pass, the issue was “the legal sale of all alcoholic beverages for off-premises consumption only.”

### Elections Held November 8, 2011

*On November 8, 2011, 33 local option elections were held for 24 jurisdictions. 31 local option ballot issues were passed by voters. 2 failed. As a result of these elections 14 jurisdictions became “wet” for the first time, 8 jurisdictions authorized additional sales or expanded the areas in which sales were authorized, and 2 jurisdictions retained the same wet/dry status that they had before the election. Issues for which elections were held included: The legal sale of beer and wine (2 ea.), the legal sale of beer and wine for off-premises consumption only (10 ea.), the legal sale of wine on the premises of a holder of a winery permit (1 ea.), the legal sale of all alcoholic beverages for off-premises consumption only (6 ea.), the legal sale of all alcoholic beverages, including mixed beverages (6 ea.), the legal sale of all alcoholic beverages except mixed beverages (1 ea.), and the legal sale of mixed beverages in restaurants by food and beverage certificate holders only (7 ea.). In both cases where the ballot issue failed to pass, the issue was “the legal sale of all alcoholic beverages for off-premises consumption only.”*

An election was held for the City of Richwood, Brazoria County, on November 8, 2011, on the issue of “the legal sale of beer and wine for off-premises consumption only.” The issue PASSED by a vote of 114 FOR and 35 AGAINST. The City Richwood, Brazoria County, was “wet” only for the sale of beer for off-premises consumption before the election and after the election is now “wet” for the sale of both beer and wine for off-premises consumption.

An election was held for the City of Richwood, Brazoria County, on November 8, 2011, on the issue of “the legal sale of mixed beverages in restaurants by food and beverage certificate holders only.” The issue PASSED by a vote of 117 FOR and 31 AGAINST. The City Richwood, Brazoria County, was “wet” only for the sale of beer for off-premises consumption before the election and after the election is now “wet” for the sale of mixed beverages in restaurants with food and beverage certificates.

An election was held for the City of Caldwell, Burleson County, on November 8, 2011, on the issue of “the legal sale of all alcoholic beverages, including mixed beverages.” The issue PASSED by a vote of 132 FOR and 68 AGAINST. The City of Caldwell, Burleson County, was “wet” for the sale of all alcoholic beverages except mixed

beverages before the election and now after the election is “wet” for the sale of all alcoholic beverages including mixed beverages.

An election was held for the City of Sunnyvale, Dallas County, on November 8, 2011, on the issue of “the legal sale of beer and wine for off-premises consumption only.” The issue PASSED by a vote of 588 FOR and 547 AGAINST. The City of Sunnyvale, Dallas County, was “dry” before the election and after the election is now “wet” for the sale of beer and wine for off-premises consumption.

An election was held for the City of Aubrey, Denton County, on November 8, 2011, on the issue of “the legal sale of all alcoholic beverages for off-premises consumption only.” The issue FAILED by a vote of 56 FOR and 70 AGAINST. Before the election the City of Aubrey, Denton County, was “wet” only for the sale of beer and wine for off-premises consumption and for the sale of mixed beverages in restaurants with food and beverage certificates. After the election, the City of Aubrey remains “wet” for such sales and “dry” for all other alcoholic beverage sales.

An election was held for the City of Bruceville-Eddy, Falls and McLennan Counties, on November 8, 2011, on the issue of “the legal sale of beer and wine for off-premises consumption only.” The issue PASSED by a vote of 156 FOR and 24 AGAINST. The City of Bruceville-Eddy, Falls and McLennan Counties, was “wet” in part for the sale of beer and wine before the election and after the election is also “wet” throughout for the sale of beer and wine for off-premises consumption.

An election was held for the City of Bruceville-Eddy, Falls and McLennan Counties, on November 8, 2011, on the issue of “the legal sale of mixed beverages in restaurants by food and beverage certificate holders only.” The issue PASSED by a vote of 149 FOR and 34 AGAINST. The City of Bruceville-Eddy, Falls and McLennan Counties, was “wet” in part for the sale of beer and wine before the election and after the election is also “wet” throughout for the sale of mixed beverages in restaurants holding food and beverage certificates.

An election was held for the City of Tioga, Grayson County, on November 8, 2011, on the issue of “the legal sale of all alcoholic beverages for off-premises consumption only.” The issue PASSED by a vote of 92 FOR and 34 AGAINST. The City of Tioga, Grayson County, was “dry” before the election and after the election is now “wet” for the sale of all alcoholic beverages for off-premises consumption.

An election was held for the City of Hamilton, Hamilton County, on November 8, 2011, on the issue of “the legal sale of all alcoholic beverages, including mixed beverages.” The issue PASSED by a vote of 395 FOR and 269 AGAINST. The City of Hamilton, Hamilton County, was “dry” for all alcoholic beverage sales before the election and after the election is now “wet” for the sale of all alcoholic beverages, including mixed beverages.

An election was held for the City of Spearman, Hansford County, on November 8, 2011, on the issue of “the legal sale of all alcoholic beverages, including mixed beverages. The issue PASSED by a vote of 359 FOR and 239 AGAINST. The City of Spearman, Hansford County, was “dry” before the election and after the election is now “wet” for the sale of all alcoholic beverages including mixed beverages.

An election was held for the City of Murchison, Henderson County, on November 8, 2011, on the issue of “the legal sale of all alcoholic beverages for off-premises consumption only. The issue FAILED by a vote of 53 FOR and 82 AGAINST. The City of Murchison, Henderson County, was “dry” for all alcoholic beverage sales before the election and after the election remains “dry.”

An election was held for the City of Granbury, Hood County, on November 8, 2011, on the issue of “the legal sale of beer and wine.” The issue PASSED by a vote of 221 FOR and 89 AGAINST. Before the election, the City of Granbury, Hood County, was “wet” throughout for the sale of mixed beverages in restaurants with food and beverage certificates and “wet” in part for the sale of all alcoholic beverages for off-premises consumption only. After the election, the City of Granbury is now also “wet” throughout for the sale of beer and wine.

An election was held for the City of Wolfe City, Hunt County, on November 8, 2011, on the issue of “the legal same of all alcoholic beverages for off-premises consumption only.” The issue PASSED by a vote of 113 FOR and 79 AGAINST. The City of Wolfe City, Hunt County, was “dry” before the election and is now “wet” for the sale of all alcoholic beverages for off-premises consumption.

An election was held for the City of Alvarado, Johnson County, on November 8, 2011, on the issue of “the legal sale of all alcoholic beverages for off-premises consumption only.” The issue PASSED by a vote of 91 FOR and 41 AGAINST. The City of Alvarado, Johnson County, was “dry” before the election and after the election is now “wet” for the sale of all alcoholic beverages for off-premises consumption.

An election was held for the City of Alvarado, Johnson County, on November 8, 2011, on the issue of “the legal sale of mixed beverages in restaurants by food and beverage certificate holders only.” The issue PASSED by a vote of 96 FOR and 32 AGAINST. The City of Alvarado, Johnson County, was “dry” before the election and after the election is now “wet” for the sale of mixed beverages by restaurants holding food and beverage certificates.

An election was held for the City of Grandview, Johnson County, on November 8, 2011, on the issue of “the legal sale of beer and wine for off-premises consumption only.” The issue PASSED by a vote of 115 FOR and 77 AGAINST. The City of Grandview, Johnson County, was “dry” before the election and after the election is now “wet” for the sale of beer and wine for off-premises consumption.

An election was held for the City of Joshua, Johnson County, on November 8, 2011, on the issue of “the legal sale of beer and wine for off-premises consumption only.” The issue PASSED by a vote of 279 FOR and 97 AGAINST. The City of Joshua, Johnson County, was “dry” before the election and after the election is now “wet” for the sale of beer and wine for off-premises consumption.

An election was held for the City of Joshua, Johnson County, on November 8, 2011, on the issue of “the legal sale of mixed beverages in restaurants by food and beverage certificate holders only.” The issue PASSED by a vote of 283 FOR and 93 AGAINST. The City of Joshua, Johnson County, was “dry” before the election and after the election is now “wet” for the sale of mixed beverages by restaurants holding food and beverage certificates.

An election was held for the City of Joshua, Johnson County, on November 8, 2011, on the issue of “the legal sale of wine on the premises of a holder of winery permit.” The issue PASSED by a vote of 285 FOR and 91 AGAINST. The City of Joshua, Johnson County, was “dry” before the election and after the election is now “wet” for the sale of wine on the premises of the holder of a winery permit.

An election was held for the City of Forney, Kaufman County, on November 8, 2011, on the issue of “the legal sale of beer and wine for off-premises consumption only.” The issue PASSED by a vote of 949 FOR and 569 AGAINST. The City of Forney, Kaufman County, was “dry” before the election and after the election is now “wet” for the sale of beer and wine for off-premises consumption.

An election was held for the City of Oakwood, Leon County, on November 8, 2011, on the issue of “the legal sale of all alcoholic beverages, including mixed beverages. The issue PASSED by a vote of 58 FOR and 27 AGAINST. The City of Oakwood, Leon County was “dry” before the election and after the election is now “wet” for the sale of all alcoholic beverages including mixed beverages.

An election was held for the City of Leroy, McLennan County, on November 8, 2011, on the issue of “the legal sale of all alcoholic beverages except mixed beverages.” The issue PASSED by a vote of 25 FOR and 6 AGAINST. The City of Leroy, Hamilton County was “wet” only for the sale of beer before the election and after the election is now “wet” for the sale of all alcoholic beverages except mixed beverages.

An election was held for Justice of the Peace Precinct 2, Montague County, on November 8, 2011, on the issue of “the legal sale of beer and wine.” The issue PASSED by a vote of 2,012 FOR and 924 AGAINST. Justice of the Peace Precinct 2, Montague County, was “dry” before the election and after the election is now “wet” for the sale of beer and wine.

An election was held for Justice of the Peace Precinct 2, Montague County, on November 8, 2011, on the issue of “the legal sale of all alcoholic beverages for off-premises consumption only.” The issue PASSED by a vote of 1,901 FOR and 1,006

AGAINST. Justice of the Peace Precinct 2, Montague County, was “dry” before the election and after the election is now “wet” for the sale of all alcoholic beverages for off-premises consumption.

An election was held for Justice of the Peace Precinct 2, Montague County, on November 8, 2011, on the issue of “the legal sale of mixed beverages in restaurants by food and beverage certificate holders only.” The issue PASSED by a vote of 2,002 FOR and 917 AGAINST. Justice of the Peace Precinct 2, Montague County, was “dry” before the election and after the election is now “wet” for the sale of mixed beverages by restaurants holding food and beverage certificates.

An election was held for the City of Magnolia, Montgomery County, on November 8, 2011, on the issue of “the legal sale of all alcoholic beverages, including mixed beverages.” The issue PASSED by a vote of 96 FOR and 59 AGAINST. The City of Magnolia, Montgomery County, was “wet” for the sale of beer and wine for off-premises consumption before the election and also wet in part for all other sale of alcoholic beverages. After the election, the City of Magnolia, Montgomery County, is now “wet” throughout for all alcoholic beverage sales including mixed beverages.

An election was held for the City of Matador, Motley County, on November 8, 2011, on the issue of “the legal sale of all alcoholic beverages, including mixed beverages.” The issue PASSED by a vote of 150 FOR and 64 AGAINST. The City of Matador, Motley County, was “dry” before the election and after the election is now “wet” for the sale of all alcoholic beverages including mixed beverages.

An election was held of the City of Vidor, Orange County, on November 8, 2011, on the issue of “the legal sale of beer and wine for off-premises consumption only.” The issue PASSED by a vote of 890 FOR and 817 AGAINST. The City of Vidor, Orange County, was “dry” before the election and after the election is now “wet” for the sale of beer and wine for off-premises consumption only.

An election was held of the City of Vidor, Orange County, on November 8, 2011, on the issue of “the legal sale of mixed beverages in restaurants by food and beverage certificate holders only.” The issue PASSED by a vote of 925 FOR and 763 AGAINST. The City of Vidor, Orange County, was “dry” before the election and after the election is now “wet” for the sale of mixed beverages in restaurants with food and beverage certificates.

An election was held for Justice of the Peace Precinct 1, Parker County, on November 8, 2011, on the issue of “the legal sale of beer and wine for off-premises consumption only.” The issue PASSED by a vote of 613 FOR and 381 AGAINST. Before the election, Justice of the Peace Precinct 1, Parker County, was “wet” in part for the sale of all alcoholic beverages for off-premises consumption and for the sale of mixed beverages in restaurants with food and beverage certificates. After the election, Justice of the Peace Precinct 1, Parker County is now also “wet” throughout for the sale of beer and wine for off-premises consumption.

An election was held for the City of Henderson, Rusk County, on November 8, 2011, on the issue of “the legal sale of beer and wine for off-premises consumption only.” The issue PASSED by a vote of 1,391 FOR and 1,153 AGAINST. The City of Henderson, Rusk County, was “dry” before the election and after the election is now “wet” for the sale of beer and wine for off-premises consumption.

An election was held for the City of Henderson, Rusk County, on November 8, 2011, on the issue of “the legal sale of mixed beverages in restaurants by food and beverage certificate holders only.” The issue PASSED by a vote of 1,495 FOR and 1,042 AGAINST. The City of Henderson, Rusk County, was “dry” before the election and after the election is now “wet” for the sale of mixed beverages in restaurants with food and beverage certificates.

An election was held for the City of Rhome, Wise County, on November 8, 2011, on the issue of “the legal sale for beer and wine for off-premises consumption only. The issue PASSED by a vote of 56 FOR and 7 AGAINST. Before the election, the City of Rhome, Wise County, was, as a result of annexations after a previous election, “wet” only in part for the sale of all alcoholic beverages including mixed beverages. After the election, the City of Rhome, Wise County, remained “wet” in part for all alcoholic beverage sale, including mixed beverages, and became “wet” throughout for the sale of beer and wine for off-premises consumption.

## **Election Held May 12, 2012**

*On May 12, 2012, 14 local option elections were held for 12 jurisdictions. All 14 local option ballot issues were passed by voters, none failed. As a result of these elections 4 jurisdictions became “wet” for the first time, and 8 jurisdictions authorized additional sales or expanded the areas in which sales were authorized. Issues for which elections were held included: The legal sale of beer and wine for off-premises consumption only (4 ea.), the legal sale of all alcoholic beverages for off-premises consumption only (4 ea.), the legal sale of all alcoholic beverages, including mixed beverages (4 ea.), and the legal sale of mixed beverages in restaurants by food and beverage certificate holders only (2 ea.).*

An election was held for the City of Rusk, Cherokee County, on May 12, 2012, on the issue “the legal sale of all alcoholic beverages for off-premises consumption only.” The issue PASSED by a vote of 252 FOR and 164 AGAINST. The City of Rusk, Cherokee County, was “wet” for the sale of beer and wine for off-premises consumption and for the sale of mixed beverages in restaurants by food and beverage certificate holders before the election and after the election remains “wet” for such sales and is also now “wet” for the sale of distilled spirits for off-premises consumption.

An election was held for the City of Muenster, Cooke County, on May 12, 2012, on the issue of “the legal sale of all alcoholic beverages, including mixed beverages.” The issue PASSED by a vote of 96 FOR and 43 AGAINST. The City of Muenster, Cooke County, was “wet” in large part for all alcoholic beverage sales, including mixed beverages, before the election, and after the election is “wet” throughout for such sales.

An election was held for the City of Ferris, Dallas and Ellis Counties, on May 12, 2012 on the issue of “the legal sale of beer and wine for off-premises consumption only.” The issue PASSED by a vote of 200 FOR and 56 AGAINST. The City of Ferris, Dallas and Ellis Counties was “dry” before the election and after the election is now “wet” for the sale of beer and wine for off-premises consumption.

An election was held for the City of Ferris, Dallas and Ellis Counties, on May 12, 2012 on the issue of “the legal sale of mixed beverages in restaurants by food and beverage certificate holders only.” The issue PASSED by a vote of 184 FOR and 72 AGAINST. The City of Ferris, Dallas and Ellis Counties was “dry” before the election and after the election is now “wet” for the sale of mixed beverages in restaurants by holders of food and beverage certificates.

An election was held for the City of Bartonville, Denton County, on May 12, 2012, on the issue of “the legal sale of all alcoholic beverages for off-premises consumption only.” The issue PASSED by a vote of 127 FOR and 57 AGAINST. The City of Bartonville, Denton County, was “wet” only for the sale of beer and wine for off-premises consumption before the election and after the election is now “wet” for the sale of all alcoholic beverages for off-premises consumption.

An election was held for the City of Trenton, Fannin County, on May 12, 2012, on the issue of “the legal sale of all alcoholic beverages, including mixed beverages.” The issue PASSED by a vote of 87 FOR and 64 AGAINST. The City of Trenton, Fannin County was “dry” before the election and after the election is now “wet” for the sale of all alcoholic beverages, including mixed beverages.

An election was held for the City of Kyle, Hays County, on May 12, 2012, on the issue of “the legal sale of all alcoholic beverages, including mixed beverages.” The issue PASSED by a vote of 496 FOR and 93 AGAINST. Before the election, the City of Kyle, Hays County, was “wet” for the sale of all alcoholic beverages for off-premises consumption and for the sale of mixed beverages in restaurants by food and beverage certificate holders only. Now after the election, the City of Kyle, Hays County, is “wet” for the sale of all alcoholic beverages, including mixed beverages.”

An election was held for the City of Heath, Kaufman and Rockwall Counties, on May 12, 2012, on the issue of “the legal sale of beer and wine for off-premises consumption only.” The issue PASSED by a vote of 961 FOR and 538 AGAINST. The City of Heath, Kaufman and Rockwall Counties, was “dry” for all alcoholic beverage sales before the election and after the election is now “wet” for the sale of beer and wine for off-premises consumption.

An election was held for the City of Knox City, Knox County, on May 12, 2012, on the issue of “the legal sale of beer and wine for off-premises consumption only.” The issue PASSED by a vote of 92 FOR and 62 AGAINST. The City of Knox City, Knox County, was “dry” for all alcoholic beverage sales before the election and after the election is now “wet” for the sale of beer and wine for off-premises consumption.”

An election was held for the City of Mineral Wells, Palo Pinto and Parker Counties, on May 12, 2012, on the issue of “the legal sale of all alcoholic beverages for off-premises consumption only.” The issue PASSED by a vote of 880 FOR and 375 AGAINST. The City of Mineral Wells, Palo Pinto and Parker Counties, was “wet” for the sale of beer before the election and after the election remains “wet” for the sale of beer and is also now “wet” throughout for the sale of all alcoholic beverages for off-premises consumption only.

An election was held for the City of Hudson Oaks, Parker County, on May 12, 2012, on the issue of “the legal sale of all alcoholic beverages including mixed beverages.” The issue PASSED by a vote of 110 FOR and 24 AGAINST. Before the election the City of Hudson Oaks, Parker County, was “wet” in part for the sale of all alcoholic beverages for off-premises consumption and “wet” throughout for the sale of beer and wine for off-premises consumption. After the election, the City of Hudson Oaks, Parker County is “wet” throughout for the sale of all alcoholic beverages, including mixed beverages.

An election was held for the City of Pantego, Tarrant County, on May 12, 2012, on the issue “the legal sale of all alcoholic beverages for off-premises consumption only.” The issue PASSED by a vote of 153 FOR and 66 AGAINST. The City of Pantego, Tarrant County, was “wet” for the sale of mixed beverages, beer for both on and off premises consumption, and wine for off-premises consumption before the election, and after the election is “wet” for on-premises sales of beer and mixed beverages and for the sale of all alcoholic beverages for off-premises consumption.

An election was held for the City of Saginaw, Tarrant County, on May 12, 2012, on the issue of “the legal sale of beer and wine for off-premises consumption only.” The issue PASSED by a vote of 205 FOR and 101 AGAINST. The City of Saginaw, Tarrant County, was “wet” in part for the sale of all alcoholic beverages, including mixed beverages, before the election, and after the election remains “wet” in part for previously authorized sales, but is now “wet” throughout for the sale of beer and wine for off-premises consumption.

An election was held for the City of Saginaw, Tarrant County, on May 12, 2012, on the issue of “the legal sale of mixed beverages in restaurants by food and beverage certificate holders only.” The issue PASSED by a vote of 213 FOR and 94 AGAINST. The City of Saginaw, Tarrant County, was “wet” in part for the sale of all alcoholic beverages, including mixed beverages, before the election, and after the election remains “wet” in part for previously authorized sales, but is now “wet” throughout for the sale of mixed beverages in restaurants by food and beverage certificate holders.