

STATE ETHICS COMMISSION

January 1, 2004 - December 31, 2004

Twenty-Sixth Annual Report

GENERAL STATUTORY IMPLEMENTATION

The State Ethics Commission met in regular session 10 times during Calendar Year 2004 and considered issues related to all areas of its statutory mandate: financial disclosure, conflict of interest, lobbyist disclosure and conduct restrictions, local government ethics laws, school board ethics regulations, advisory opinions, enforcement matters, employee training, lobbyist training and public information activities.

For the first time since it was statutorily mandated in 1999, the Commission was able to begin in earnest to develop an electronic filing process for financial disclosure statements. The Commission contracted with The Canton Group, LLC, to develop both the electronic filing process and the electronic administrative review process. Although the statute, Md. Code Ann., State Gov't Article § 15-602(d), does not require that all filers utilize the electronic process, the Commission was hopeful that filers will embrace the new process and thus reduce the paper storage crisis in our office. Electronic filing will provide the Commission with the opportunity to engage in more directed review of the data, streamline operations and allow the Commission staff to concentrate resources on ethics training and education, advice, assistance to local governments, and enforcement. The system will be beta tested in January 2005, and it will be available for all filers by mid February 2005 for the 2004 reporting year.

As noted in the Commission's Strategic Plan, the Commission believes that increased education and training will lead to an increase in advice responsibilities and decrease the volume enforcement actions. In order to provide more meaningful training, the Commission staff has reduced the focus on large multi-agency programs and has made a concerted effort to provide training to smaller groups of employees at their particular agencies. This approach has resulted in training that addresses the specific ethical issues confronted by various State employees in the various agencies and has resulted in more active participation by the attendees. The Commission staff has provided increased informal guidance and advice to individuals who have attended training sessions. During calendar year 2004, the Commission conducted 27 general ethics training programs attended by 1,054 State employees. In addition to those sessions, 17 additional programs for agencies, boards and commissions focusing more specifically on conflicts of interest and the new electronic filing process for financial disclosure statements were attended by 524 State employees and public officials. The Commission staff also conducted five lobbying training programs attended by 206 lobbyists plus two programs focusing on forms completion that were attended by 22 individuals who were administrative staff of regulated lobbyists.

During the 2004 Maryland Legislative Session, House Bill 191 was enacted. This bill modified §15-406(b)(2) of the Public Ethics Law by requiring an aggrieved party in an enforcement action to petition either the Ethics Commission or the reviewing Circuit Court in order to obtain a stay of the Ethics Commission's order. Previously, enforcement orders issued by the Ethics Commission were stayed automatically until final disposition in the review process. The modification brings the Commission into parity with the Administrative Procedure Act contested case provisions, which also require the aggrieved party to petition either the final decision maker or the reviewing court in order to attain a stay of the order.

In June 2003, the Commission conducted a contested case hearing on charges of lobbying violations by lobbyist Bruce C. Bereano. The Commission issued its decision and public order finding a violation of §15-713(1), being engaged for lobbying purposes for contingent compensation. The request for judicial review, which Mr. Bereano filed in the Anne Arundel Circuit Court, was transferred to the Howard County Circuit Court and was heard before the Honorable Raymond Kane on June 1, 2004, Case No. 13-C-03-057038. On December 28, 2004, Judge Kane issued his decision upholding the Commission's final decision and sanction of a 10-month suspension of Mr. Bereano's lobbying registrations. Mr. Bereano noted his appeal to the Court of Special Appeals. The case is currently pending before that Court and scheduled for argument in October 2005.

On July 30, 2004, the Court of Appeals issued its opinion upholding the Anne Arundel Circuit Court's decision in favor of lobbyist, Gerard Evans, in the Commission's appeal in the case of State Ethics Commission v. Gerard E. Evans. The Court of Appeals determined that the Ethics Commission did not have the authority to revoke Mr. Evans' lobbying registration as his July 14, 2000 conviction and September 29, 2000 sentencing for mail and wire fraud relating to his lobbying activity occurred prior to the enactment of House Bill 2 (Chapter 63, Laws of 2001) (SG § 15-405(e)), which granted the Commission the right to revoke a lobbyist's registration under certain circumstances. The Court of Appeals' decision provided clarification of § 15-405(e) and discussion of legislative history and statutory interpretation pertaining to the lobbying enforcement provisions of the Public Ethics Law.

In January 2004, Bruce Poole, who was appointed as to the State Ethics Commission on February 1, 2000, resigned his position as a Commissioner. Mr. Poole filled the position that was a nominee of the Speaker of the House. The Speaker subsequently submitted a nomination to the Governor in December 2004.

The Fiscal Year 2005 budget was approved for \$731,144 (General Funds of \$686,034 and Special Funds of \$45,110), which in June was reduced by \$35,000 for cost containment, and another \$10,654 was removed from the General Fund Allocation, leaving an actual budget allocation of \$685,490.

Advice Activities

The Maryland Public Ethics Law (§15-301 through §15-303) provides that the State Ethics Commission may issue formal advisory opinions in response to requests from officials, employees, lobbyists, and others who are subject to the Ethics Law. These formal opinions generally follow an appearance before the Commission by the requestor and are published in the Maryland Register. The Commission regulations also allow the staff and the Commission to provide informal advice. (See COMAR 19A.01.02.05). Informal advice generally results in a letter or email to the requestor that references prior opinions of the Commission addressing similar facts and issues.

The State Ethics Commission has the responsibility of interpreting the Public Ethics Law. When the Commission was first established in late 1979 most advice requests resulted in a published formal opinion. During its first full five years of operation (1980 –1984), the Commission issued a total of 205 opinions: an average of 41 per year. During the next five years (1985 – 1989) another 128 opinions were issued: an average of over 25 per year. As a result, there is a large body of published opinions available to the Commission staff to provide informal advice in response to advice requests. During the twenty-six years of its existence, the Commission has issued a total of 486 formal opinions. During the past five years the number of formal opinions has decreased to 18 while informal reviews and letter advice has increased. A major factor reducing the need for formal Commission opinions is the large number of existing opinions that can now be used for informal guidance by the Commission or staff thus expediting advice.

During Calendar-Year 2004, the Commission issued two (2) formal published opinions. One opinion addressed the application of §15-502 to the Chair of the State Information Technology Board ("Board") (Opinion No. 04-1). The Requestor was an owner of an information technology corporation that became a subcontractor on a newly awarded information technology contract with the State Department of General Services. The Requestor was a "public official" by virtue of his service on the Board, which was affiliated with the Department of Budget and Management ("DBM"). The Commission determined that given the role of DBM in the information technology procurement processes, and the statutory duties of Board, an exception could not be granted to permit continued service on the Board.

The second opinion addressed whether an employee of the Maryland Transit Administration could participate in project matters in which a party to those matters was a vendor under a general task order contract that employed the employee's son (Opinion No. 04-02). The Commission allowed the participation based on the specific circumstances of the employee's situation as permitted by §15-501. The published advisory opinions are available on the Internet through the Commission web site (<http://ethics.gov.state.md.us>) and the website of the Secretary of State, Division of State Documents (<http://www.sos.state.md.us/>).

During the year, the Commission also granted one exemption pursuant to §15-502(d) upon the recommendation of the Governor. The Commission granted an exemption to allow the Assistant Secretary, Office of Resource Conservation of the Department of Agriculture to maintain his interest in a

family farm. This was only the twenty-second (22) exemption granted in the history of the State Ethics Commission.

The Commission's informal docket, initiated in 2002, logs requests for advice that result in informal advice provided to the requestor by either the Commission staff or the Commission itself. This does not include telephone advice or answers to routine questions provided by the Commission staff. The Commission and/or the Commission staff reviewed and considered requests in the following subject areas during calendar year 2004:

| <u>Subject Matter of the Advice</u> | <u>Number of Requests</u> | | |
|--|---------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| | <u>2004</u> | <u>2003</u> | <u>2002</u> |
| Lobbying Registration, Reporting & Conduct | 11 | 18 | 53 |
| Secondary Employment Advice | 108 | 132 | 269 |
| Participation Advice | 17 | 8 | 3 |
| Procurement Restrictions | 6 | 7 | 10 |
| Post-Employment Advice | 13 | 13 | 6 |
| Gift Questions | 21 | 29 | 8 |
| Other | 44 | 35 | 28 |
| Total | 220 | 242 | 357 |

The number of informal matters has decreased each year since calendar year 2002. In 2002 a total of 357 informal matters were reviewed. The reduction is attributable, in part to a reduction in requests from lobbyists for advice (from 53 in 2002 to 18 in 2003 to 11 in 2004). During the last two months of 2001 and in early 2002, there were a significant number of advice requests addressing the implementation of HB2 (Chapter 631, Acts of 2001, effective November 1, 2001). At its meeting on February 6, 2002, the Commission considered 32 questions involving interpretation of HB2. When HB 1076 (Chapter 405, Acts of 2002) was enacted during the 2002 legislative session and signed as emergency legislation (May 6, 2002) various lobbyists sought additional informal advice. Additionally, the implementation of the Commission's Lobbyist Training Program has impacted on the number of informal requests from lobbyists, who now have the benefit of the training and an understanding of the lobbying law requirements.

There was also a significant reduction in secondary employment requests from calendar year 2002. In 2002 there was a total of 269 such requests with 219 from the Department of Human Resources ("DHR"). In 2003, there were a total of 132 informal requests involving secondary employment, with 48 from the DHR. In 2004, there were a total of 108 such requests, with 40 from the DHR. The reduction in the number of secondary employment requests from DHR is probably attributable to two factors. In 2001, the Department established procedures for approval of secondary employment that were circulated to all county departments of social services and resulted in a large number of requests to the Commission to review secondary employment of employees during 2001 and 2002. Many of these reviews were for existing secondary employment situations that had not been previously reviewed. By 2003, DHR's review process had been implemented statewide and only new secondary employment situations needed to be reviewed. Additionally, DHR officials who participated in the Commission review have become sufficiently familiar with the requirements of the Ethics Law to enable them to screen situations without requiring Commission review.

A review of the informal requests received in 2003 and 2004 demonstrated an increase in the number of requests related to the application of the post-State employment provisions of the law. This is likely a reflection of the 2002 election that resulted in a change of administration and the movement of certain officials from State service.

The 108 informal secondary employment requests considered in 2004 came from the following Departments:

| <u>Department</u> | <u>Number of Requests</u> | | |
|---|---------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| | <u>2004</u> | <u>2003</u> | <u>2002</u> |
| Department of Human Resources | 40 | 48 | 219 |
| Department of Health & Mental Hygiene | 22 | 18 | 20 |
| Department of Transportation | 4 | 9 | 4 |
| Executive Department | 5 | 6 | 2 |
| Department of Agriculture | 3 | 5 | 0 |
| University System of Maryland | 2 | 5 | 2 |
| Department of Public Safety & Correctional Services | 3 | 4 | 2 |

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|----|----|----|
| Department of Natural Resources | 4 | 3 | 1 |
| Other Agencies/Departments | 25 | 34 | 19 |

The Commission staff has also provided general advice about the application of the Ethics Law in response to phone inquiries from State employees and lobbyists. During calendar year 2004, the Commission's General Counsel, Staff Counsel, and Assistant Counsel responded to more than 1,200 phone inquires.

University of Maryland Public-Private Partnership Exemptions

In 1990, the General Assembly enacted legislation allowing the University System of Maryland (USM) to grant to university faculty certain exemptions from the conflict of interest provisions of the Public Ethics Law. The exemptions were for "sponsored research and development" activities. Sponsored research and development was defined in the law as an "agreement to engage in basic or applied research or development at a public senior higher education institution, and includes transferring university-owned technology or providing services by a faculty member to entities engaged in sponsored research or development." Faculty members were not fully exempted from all Public Ethics Law requirements, and public disclosure of the interest or secondary employment was required. The institution granting the exemption was required to maintain the exemption as a public record and to file a copy with the State Ethics Commission.

In 1996, the General Assembly enacted the Public-Private Partnership Act. This law expanded the exemptions beyond faculty to include vice-presidents and presidents of institutions as well as the chancellor and vice-chancellors of the USM. The legislation also broadened the exemption from the conflict of interest provisions to include USM officials, faculty members, and employees. The USM Board of Regents and the USM institutions adopted procedures pursuant to §15-523 to allow the conflict of interest exemptions. The USM Board of Regents and seven of the affiliated institutions adopted policies, and the Commission's authority was limited to comment on the policy's conformity to Public-Private Partnership Act. The definition of "sponsored research" was expanded to include "participation in State economic development activities."

The records filed by the institutions with the Commission reflect a total of 76 faculty exemptions granted by university presidents between 1996 and 2003. These included exemptions at the University of Maryland at Baltimore (UMB), University of Maryland at Baltimore County (UMBC), and the University of Maryland Biotechnology Institute. During calendar year 2004, USM institutions granted an additional 19 individual faculty members an exemption. The exemptions were from the following institutions:

| <u>Institution</u> | <u>No. Of Exemptions</u> |
|--|--------------------------|
| University of Maryland, Baltimore | 5 |
| University of Maryland, Baltimore County | 1 |
| University of Maryland, College Park | 13 |
| Total Faculty Exemptions | 19 |

In some instances the individual faculty member has had more than one interest exempted. For example, in February 2004 the President exempted a faculty member for his interests in two separate private entities. As reported in the State Ethics Commission Annual Report for 2002, there has been only one Board of Regents exemption for a university president in the history of the program. Pursuant to §15-523(c)(1) each exemption requires a disclosure to the State Ethics Commission and is required to be maintained as a public record at the educational institution.

Financial Disclosure

The financial disclosure program continued to process the identification of those required to file, provide technical assistance to filers, and monitor compliance with the Law. In accordance with Public Ethics Law § 15-103, the Commission reviewed a large number of requests by various agencies to add or delete positions from the financial disclosure filing list, and the net result was an increase in the number of filers from approximately 9,006 in 2003 to approximately 12,170 in 2004.

In accordance with Public Ethics Law §§ 15-103 and 209, the Commission made decisions concurred in by the Department of Budget and Management regarding the status as "executive units" of

newly created boards and commissions and considered and acted upon requests by a number of boards and commissions to be exempted from the requirement to file financial disclosure statements. In recent years there has been a substantial increase in the number of boards, commissions, task forces, and technical advisory groups created by the General Assembly.

Currently there are more than 12,000 State and public officials required to file financial disclosure forms, and the number of filers continues to grow. Individuals who are public officials only as a result of their participation on boards or commissions are required to file a limited form of financial disclosure (form #2). The Commission staff conducts compliance reviews of financial disclosure statements and notifies filers of identifiable errors or omissions, and it pursues enforcement actions against those who fail to file. During 2004, Commission staff reviewed more than 2000 financial disclosure forms for reporting year 2003.

The Commission also has the responsibility for the financial disclosure program for appointees to executive boards or commissions who seek limited conflict of interest exemptions from the appointing authority, sometimes referred to as "Time of Appointment Exemptions." Board or commission members must file a request for the "time of appointment" exemptions with the Commission, the appointing authority, and the Senate, if Senate approval is required for the appointment. The request forms publicly disclose existing conflicts and will exempt the individuals only from those conflicts that are disclosed on the forms. The Commission staff coordinates this process with the appointing authority, reviews the forms and, throughout the year, assists a large number of appointees in completing the disclosures forms. In 2004, the Commission processed 223 Time-of-Appointment Forms.

Under its 1999 mandate to develop electronic filing for financial disclosure statements, Public Ethics Law § 15-602(d), the Commission must develop procedures under which a statement may be filed electronically and without additional cost to the individual who files the statement. The Commission worked with the Canton Group, its contractor, to develop an electronic process that will be available for the filing of 2004 Financial Disclosure Statements.

In working with the Governor's IT staff and others suggested by them, the Commission staff have become aware of some changes to the financial disclosure form that will be necessary in order to attain the accurate, efficient and effective collection of financial disclosure information. For example, where the written form asks for "amount of consideration paid" for interests in real property, in order to avoid inadvertent mistakes permitted by "free writing," a range of consideration paid that the filer will highlight from "drop-down boxes." Thus, the filer will choose between boxes that contain choices such as "under \$50,000; \$50,000 to \$99,999; \$100,000 to \$250,000, etc.." In this way, the information required by Public Ethics Law § 15-607 will be obtained and eliminate the likelihood of typographical mistakes that could be misleading. Additional modifications in the method of obtaining the required information will be required in order effectuate the transition from paper to electronic reporting. The Commission has determined that such changes will provide sufficient information and meet the statutory requirements of the financial disclosure section of the Public Ethics Law as set forth in § 15-607.

The increase in the number of filers together with the filers' participation in equity investment and other financial interests has created a resource crisis within the Commission staff in reviewing the statements. The Commission lacks sufficient staff to sort, file and review more than 10,000 annual financial disclosure reports, and it lacks sufficient space and resources to store at least six years of financial disclosure reports for each filer. Absent any foreseeable increase in staff and space, the Commission must put forth its efforts to develop an electronic filing process that will meet the statutory requirements of § 15-607 and which will be embraced by filers with confidence. The Commission's next Annual Report will contain facts and figures to assess the success of the electronic filing project.

Lobbyist Disclosure and Regulation

During the lobbying year ending October 31, 2004, 2,555 lobbying registrations were filed with the Commission. This represents an increase of 120 registrations from the 2,435 that filed in 2003. Seven hundred fifty-five lobbyists registered for 1,059 employers. (Some employers have more than one lobbyist and many lobbyists have more than one employer.) This compares to 724 lobbyists who registered on behalf of 1056 employers in 2003. Although the largest number of lobbyists is registered during the legislative session, registrations begin and end at various times throughout the lobbying year, which begins on November 1 and ends on October 31 of the following year. Most persons registered to lobby had a single registration representing one employer. However, 144 lobbyists had two or more registrations during this time period; 94 registrants had four or more employers; and 69 lobbyists had eight or more employers. The Ethics Commission staff monitors lobbyist registration, reporting, conduct,

and certain aspects of campaign finance activity.

The \$38,556,789 in lobbying expenditures reported for the period ending October 31, 2004, represents an increase of \$8,060,080 from the previous year. Lobbyists' compensation continued to increase. Lobbying expenditures have very significantly increased since the \$2,864,454 reported expenditures in 1979; the first year the Ethics Commission administered the filing program. Expenditures for gifts and entertainment in 2004 increased from \$1,488,646 to \$2,128,770. The amount for food and beverages, other than special categories, increased from \$4,178 to \$4,493. The amount in this category was dramatically lower than the \$416,924 reported in this category for 1992, reflecting the stronger disclosure laws of that year. Entertainment at legislative organization meetings resulted in \$16,519 in lobbyists' expenditures. Lobbyists' expenditures for special events increased from \$1,404,028 in 2003 to \$2,060,647 in 2004, a substantial increase from the \$245,288 reported for special events in 1994. Under current law, special events include events to which all members of the General Assembly, either house, standing committees, or geographic delegations are invited. There were 126 "all members" of the General Assembly events reported in 2004 totaling \$1,072,303, an increase over the \$784,069 spent for the previous year. The total expenditure for special events may be misleading, as the reporting requirement is for the total cost of the event rather than funds expended directly on General Assembly members. There were 94 events reported for the House of Delegates Standing Committees and 83 for the Senate Standing Committees. The total of 177 committee events was higher than the 157 events in 2003. The most entertained committee in the House of Delegates was the Health, Government and Operations Committee with 28 events. The least entertained Standing Committee in the House was the Ways and Means Committee with 10 events. In the Senate, the most entertained committee was the Finance Committee with 26 events and the least entertained committee was the Education, Health and Environmental Affairs Committee with 16 events. The regional delegations with the most events reported were the Montgomery County Delegation and Prince George's County Delegation, with 21 events each.

A detailed analysis of special events spending is contained in Appendix C of this report. Lobbyists are also required to file gift reports naming individuals receiving tickets or other gifts above certain thresholds. Five lobbyists filed 5 gift reports in 2004 compared to 13 in 2003. Gift reports may name one or more gift recipients. Gift reports tend to be concentrated among the higher spending employers. New gift limitations, effective October 1, 1999, and the fact that gift reports are no longer required in some situations have resulted in the very substantial decline in gift reports.

For the year 2004, 196 lobbyist employers reported total lobbying expenditures of \$50,000 or more, and 388 lobbyist employers reported total expenditures of \$25,000 or more. This compares to 344 employers reaching \$25,000 in expenditures in 2003. One hundred sixteen individual lobbyists, registered on behalf of one or more employers, reported \$50,000 or more in compensation for services as compared to 104 in 2003. Sixty-four lobbyists reported compensation of \$100,000 or more compared with 59 in 2003. There is a growing trend toward firms employing several lobbyists, ranging from groups within large law firms to government relations groups unassociated with the practice of law. In 2004, four fee-earning firms earned over \$1,000,000. This information is outlined in Appendix D.

Examples of topic areas involving large total employer expenditures during the reporting period included business, utilities, racing, labor, health, banking, energy, communications, technology, attorneys, real estate, construction and insurance. Employer lobbying spending continues to increase. In 1988, only 5 employers spent over \$100,000 on lobbying. In 1999, 35 employers exceeded \$100,000. Lists of those employers spending \$25,000 or more and those lobbyists reporting \$50,000 or more in compensation are included in Appendices A and B of this report.

The following expenditure data summarizes lobbying expenditures for the last three lobbying years:

| | <u>10/31/04</u> | <u>10/31/03</u> | <u>10/31/02</u> |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 1. Expenditures for meals and beverages for officials or employees or their immediate families. | \$ 4,493 | \$ 4,178 | \$ 1,690 |
| 2. Expenditures for special events, including parties, dinners, athletic events, entertainment, and other functions to which all members of the General Assembly, either house thereof, or any standing committee thereof were | | | |

| | | | |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| invited. (Date, location, group benefited, and total expense for each event are also reported.) | \$ 2,060,647 | \$ 1,404,028 | \$ 1,115,206 |
| 3. Expenses for food, lodging, and scheduled entertainment of officials and employees and spouses for a meeting given in return for participation in a panel or speaking engagement at the meeting. | \$ 26,283 | \$ 18,524 | \$ 5,702 |
| 4. Expenditures for food and beverages at approved legislative organizational meetings. | \$ 16,519 | \$ 15,787 | \$ 12,298 |
| 5. Expenses for a ticket or free admission to attend charitable, cultural or political events where all members of a legislative unit are invited. | \$ 4,350 | \$ 4,708 | \$ 15,320 |
| 6. Gifts to or for officials or employees or their immediate families (not included in B-1 through B-5). | \$ 16,478 | \$ 41,421 | \$ 14,564 |
| <u>Subtotal of items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6</u> | <u>\$2,128,770</u> | <u>\$1,488,646</u> | <u>\$1,164,780</u> |
| 7. Total compensation paid to registrant (not including sums reported in any other section). | \$32,832,105 | \$25,367,757 | \$22,461,621 |
| 8. Salaries, compensation and reimbursed expenses for staff of the registrant. | \$ 980,177 | \$ 889,332 | \$ 898,943 |
| 9. Office expenses not reported in items 5 and 6. | \$ 1,146,653 | \$ 841,415 | \$ 829,315 |
| 10. Cost of professional and technical research and assistance not reported in items 5 and 6. | \$ 334,780 | \$ 635,491 | \$ 310,151 |
| 11. Cost of publications which expressly encourage persons to communicate with officials or employees. | \$ 465,458 | \$ 771,743 | \$ 434,924 |
| 12. Fees and expenses paid to witnesses. | \$ 122,810 | \$ 4,685 | \$ 28,541 |
| 13. Other expenses. | \$ 546,036 | \$ 497,650 | \$ 561,032 |
| <u>Total of items 1 through 13</u> | <u>\$38,556,789</u> | <u>\$30,496,719</u> | <u>\$26,689,307</u> |

(NOTE: At the time the Annual Report was compiled, some lobbyist expenditure information may have been subject to adjustment based on the staff review program.)

Enforcement Activities

In calendar year 2004, the Commission issued fifty-six complaints. Three complaints involved conflict of interest issues, forty-three involved financial disclosure issues, and ten involved lobbying issues. The Commission also closed forty-six complaints during 2004. Thirty-five complaints were closed when the Commission accepted a cure proposal from the complaints' respondents, fourteen Stipulations of Settlement were accepted by the Commission, three complaints were dismissed after a preliminary investigation and one complaint was closed for other reasons. The Commission collected \$4650.00 in payments to the State of Maryland through the Stipulations of Settlement accepted in 2004.

At the end of 2004, the Commission had fourteen pending complaints under investigation. The pending complaints included four conflict of interest matters and ten financial disclosure matters.

The Ethics Law provides that any person may file a complaint with the Commission. Complaints filed with the Commission must be signed under oath and allege a violation of the Ethics Law by a person subject to the law. The Commission may file a complaint on its own initiative, and, at its discretion, may proceed with a preliminary inquires of potential Ethics Law violations.

The Commission divides preliminary matters into two categories: Preliminary Consideration Matters and Preliminary Inquiry Matters, the latter of which involves more extensive investigation. In 2004, the Commission opened ninety-six Preliminary Consideration Matters, including fifty-nine conflict of interest matters, thirty-three lobbyist matters and four financial disclosure matters. The Commission entered into twelve Late Filing Agreements with lobbyists during 2004, resulting in payments of \$3250.00 to the State of Maryland. The Commission closed ninety-seven Preliminary Consideration Matters in 2004.

The Commission opened twenty-three Preliminary Inquiry Matters in 2004. Twenty-two of the 2004 Preliminary Inquiry Matters involved conflict of interest issues and one involved lobbying issues. In 2004, the Commission closed nineteen Preliminary Inquiry Matters, including a few pending matters from 1999, 2000, 2001 and 2002.

All enforcement payments collected through Stipulations of Settlement or Late Filing Agreements were deposited in the State's general fund and cannot be used by the Commission.

The Commission's appeal in *State Ethics Commission v. Evans* was completed in 2004. The Commission revoked the respondent's lobbying registrations pursuant to § 15-405(e) of the Public Ethics Law in 2002. The respondent requested judicial review in the Circuit Court for Anne Arundel County, which reversed the Commission's Order. The Commission filed an appeal with the Court of Special Appeals. The Court of Appeals, on its own motion, removed the case from the Court of Special Appeals and scheduled arguments in the case for May 6, 2004. The Court of Appeals affirmed the Circuit Court's decision in favor of Mr. Evans on July 30, 2004.

State Ethics Commission v. Bereano is currently on appeal in Maryland Court of Special Appeals. The respondent appealed the Commission's June 2003 Order suspending his lobbying registrations for a period of ten months and seeking a fine of \$5,000 for a knowing and willful violation of § 15-713(1) of the Ethics Law. The respondent originally requested judicial review of the Commission's Order in the Circuit Court for Anne Arundel County, but the Administrative Judge of the Circuit Court for Anne Arundel County transferred the matter to the Circuit Court for Howard County. The Circuit Court for Howard County affirmed the Commission's Order on December 28, 2004. Mr. Bereano appealed the Circuit Court's decision and arguments are scheduled in the Court of Special Appeals in October 2005.

Local Government Ethics Laws

The Ethics Law requires Maryland counties and cities to enact local laws similar to the State Law. In addition to the requirement that counties and cities enact ethics laws, the General Assembly amended the Law in 1983 to require local school boards either to promulgate ethics regulations similar to the State Law or be covered by county ethics laws. As part of its responsibilities, the Commission staff reviewed proposed draft revisions to ethics laws for Baltimore City, 4 counties, and 5 municipalities during 2004. Two county Boards of Education submitted proposed revisions to their ethics regulations. Additionally, the staff reviewed proposed changes to the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission Ethics Regulations. The Commission formally approved revisions to the Baltimore City, the Town of Cheverly, Mt. Airy, and St. Mary's Ethics Ordinances. The Commission also formally approved revisions to the Harford County and the Allegany County Boards of Education Ethics Regulations. Criteria for evaluating similarity to the State Law are defined in Commission regulations. Municipalities, based on size and other factors, may be exempted from all or part of the requirement, though an exemption may be granted only in response to a written request.

The Commission also received and reviewed reports from Prince George's County and Montgomery County regarding special land use ethics reports required in those jurisdiction (See §15-829 through §15-841).

As discussed in the Commission's Annual Report for 2003, the Commission and Commission staff continue to consider and evaluate the impact of the Court of Appeals' opinion in *Seipp v. Baltimore City Board of Elections*, 377Md.362, 833 A.2d 551 (2003) on its local government and school board regulations.

Educational and Informational Activities

The Commission staff has been active in providing formal training to State employees, lobbyists and local jurisdictions. The training has involved advising and assisting employees, officials, candidates and lobbyists on completion of forms, and providing training related to the conflict of interest provisions of the Public Ethics Law. The Commission staff has assisted local government and school board officials in drafting their ethics laws and regulations. The staff has also provided technical advice to local government ethics boards. Legislation passed in 1999 requires new financial disclosure filers to receive 2 hours of Ethics Law training (§15-205(d)). The Commission began implementation of this mandate in calendar year 2000. During calendar year 2004, the Commission staff conducted 18 training sessions for State employees at various locations throughout the State. The Commission provided training to a total of 1,178 employees and public officials.

The Commission has placed an increasing emphasis on training smaller groups of employees and officials and has done so within the employees' agencies. In this way, those attending the training sessions participate more, and the training can be tailored to address the concerns of the various employees in the context of their work experiences. Additionally, the Commission staff has provided training to agency leadership and to various boards and commissions that support agency work. The Commission staff has received very positive response to the training. The training consists of a PowerPoint presentation, interactive lecture, and supplemental documents that provide resource material. The training commitments have placed a significant burden on the Commission's staff, as each training session requires that at least one, and many times two, of the professional staff make the presentations, which causes a shortage of professional staff available in the office to respond to telephone and "other" inquiries in the office. Funding for an additional professional position that could assist with the training or be available in the office would increase the Commission staff's effectiveness in providing the type of training and advice that could result in a reduction of our enforcement responsibilities. The Commission staff has found that the expanded training programs have resulted in a significant increase in the number of telephone and email requests for guidance from employees who have attended the sessions.

In accordance with § 15-205(e) of the Public Ethics Law, which mandates the Ethics Commission to provide a training course for regulated lobbyists and prospective regulated lobbyists at least twice each year, the Commission staff provided training to 197 lobbyists during calendar year 2004.

Part of the Commission's public information activity involves distribution of lists of registered lobbyists and provision of assistance to persons inspecting various forms filed with the Commission. The Commission's staff distributes, through interagency mail, a special two-page summary of ethics

requirements and other applicable memoranda to State agency managers. In order to ensure adequate public access to the Commission's memoranda, the Commission staff posts them on our web site, <http://ethics.gov.state.md.us>, and distribute them to agencies for distribution to their employees. On a limited basis, the Commission is also distributing another pamphlet covering ethics requirements for part-time members of State boards and commissions. The staff provides a memoranda on lobbying laws relating to private colleges, lobbyist political activity, and a memorandum regarding adjustments to the procurement ethics provisions by request and on its web site. The Commission staff has also developed a special memorandum to advise potential new members of boards and commissions of the impact of the Ethics Law.

The Ethics Commission maintains a complete and up-to-date home page on the Internet. The home page directs users to the Annual Report, special explanatory memoranda, and a bi-monthly bulletin, downloadable forms for lobbying and State employees and Public Officials, the State vendor list, the Public Ethics Law and Formal Advisory Opinions. Another feature is an ethics question of the month, which answers hypothetical questions based on past Commission opinions. The Internet provides a cost effective mechanism for providing ethics information and training to those covered by the Ethics Law and public access to ethics information. The Commission is hopeful that it will eventually have sufficient funds to update its web software to include an interactive dialogue with users enabling it to respond to questions on-line, provide educational programming on-line, and allow users to navigate the site with more ease.

2004 LEGISLATION REPORT

Automatic Stay of Enforcement Actions

House Bill 191 was enacted and modified § 15-406(b)(2) of the Public Ethics Law by requiring an aggrieved party in an enforcement action to petition either the Ethics Commission or the reviewing Circuit Court in order to obtain a stay of the Ethics Commission's order. Previously, enforcement orders issued by the Ethics Commission were stayed automatically until final disposition in the review process. The modification brings the Commission into parity with the Administrative Procedure Act contested case provisions, which also require the aggrieved party to petition either the final decision maker or the reviewing court in order to attain a stay of the order.

Financial Disclosure

Delegate Warren Miller filed several bills to modify the financial disclosure provisions of the Public Ethics Law. HB 608 was enacted and modified Schedule H of the Annual Financial Disclosure Statement by requiring the filer to report any earned income by dependent children only if the source of that income resulted from employment with or ownership of an entity that did business with or was regulated by the filer's agency.

LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

Proposed Changes To The *Financial Disclosure* (Subtitle 6) Provisions

In the coming year, the Commission will continue to focus its attention on several of the financial disclosure provisions in subtitle 6 of the Public Ethics Law. Now that the State Ethics Commission has had 25 years of experience, it has had the opportunity to review the reporting requirements and recognize those areas, which appear to be the root of most conflicts, and those areas, which, since the Commission's inception, have not caused any discernable problems. Additionally, the law in other areas has developed so there are additional retirements and deferred compensation plans that should be included in the exemption granted to 401K and 501K plans.

With electronic filing being implemented, the Commission has reviewed the filing requirements, and it has concluded that some discreet changes in requests for information would be helpful in simplifying the reporting requirements without jeopardizing the benefits of public disclosure.

- New officials should file a financial disclosure statement covering their holdings as of the time they come into their position rather than for the previous calendar year.

- In the 1999 Session of the General Assembly, the Harford County Liquor Board and its employees were placed under the authority of the State Ethics Commission. However, the employees of the Board, regardless of salary or duties, were excluded from financial disclosure requirements. This general exclusion should be withdrawn to make the disclosure requirements for these employees the same as other employees subject to the State Ethics Law.
- Disclosure of interests in all State deferred compensation plans should be added to the exemption now provided for those who have interests in 401 and 501 plans (§ 15-102(t)(2)(iv)). The exemption is warranted as the State provides a discreet list of investments into which employees may invest, and there is no latitude for the employee to select investments other than those provided by the State.
- Consideration should be given to eliminating the need for reporting of investment in any mutual fund in which there are more than 25 members on the basis that the employee has no control over the trading of the individual holdings of the mutual fund, and, therefore, it is improbable that an employee could effectuate any change in value of the mutual fund by his or her official act as a State employee.
- The provisions of §15-608 regarding attributable interests should be studied with the idea of reducing the burden caused by the disclosure requirements when a person has a small share in a large and diverse testamentary trust.
- Judicial candidates should be required to file financial disclosure in each year of their candidacy in the same way as other candidates for State office.
- In election years, improperly filed candidate's disclosure forms create unique enforcement problems. Before the Commission can find a violation and make it public, a variety of confidential administrative and adjudicatory processes have to occur. In most cases this process extends beyond the primary election and, likely, beyond the general election. This means that serious completion problems or even false disclosure could exist unknown to the voting public. A very large percentage of non-incumbent candidates have substantial financial disclosure statement completion problems. The General Assembly should review this matter and determine whether confidentiality should be eliminated at an earlier point in the enforcement process with regard to candidates' financial disclosure enforcement cases.
- Section 15-205(a)(5) should be revised by substituting a provision for review consistent with standards to be established by the Commission. The submission of documents requiring Commission review has expanded almost exponentially, and it is not possible that the current staff and resources would permit review of each document filed.

*Proposed Changes To The **Conflicts Of Interest** (Subtitle 5) Provisions*

The Commission has also reviewed Subtitle 5, **Conflicts of Interest** and suggests Legislative consideration of the following issues:

- Specific provisions should address membership by public officials on boards or directors of private corporations having sensitive business or regulatory involvement with the State.
- The post-employment provisions (§ 15-504) should be revised to more specifically address the problems that are common to higher-level management positions.
- The Commission should have some level of civil penalty assessment authority in conflict of interest matters in order to provide a formal alternative to expensive court proceedings. This would give the Commission equal authority in setting sanctions on conflict of interest issues as it presently has with regard to lobbying violations.
- Like legislators, legislative and other employees should be prohibited from lobbying for one legislative session after leaving their State employment.
- The law prohibiting misuse of confidential information should be extended to cover former

officials and employees as to confidential information acquired during their State service.

Proposed Changes To The **Local Jurisdictions** (Subtitle 8) Provisions

Subtitle 8 of the Public Ethics Law, which address local jurisdictions and boards of education, is also a priority. The Commission is looking at the following issues:

- The provisions covering school board ethics regulations need strengthening to assure that there are adequate sanctions for violations by board members, candidates for board membership and lobbyists.
- Local jurisdictions should be able to use lobbying registration and reporting with the State Ethics Commission as an alternative or substitute for local filing.
- The bi-county agency ethics regulations requirements should require that sufficient penalty provisions are provided and that the current ethics regulations of these agencies meet the intent of the Public Ethics Law.
- The Commission has informally determined that the bi-county agencies are to be treated as State or local agencies for the purposes of exemptions under the State lobbying registration requirements. The Law should be amended to specifically clarify their status under these provisions.
- In order to avoid uncertain and confusing application and administration of the Law, the special provisions of §15-807 making members of State boards funded in whole or in part by Baltimore County subject to the county disclosure law instead of the State Law should be considered for elimination, or at a minimum copies of these forms should be filed with the State Ethics Commission.
- Subsequent to the issuance of *Seipp v. Baltimore City Board of Elections, et al*, 377 Md. 362, 833 A.2d 551 (2003), which interpreted sections of subtitle 8 of the Public Ethics Law and determined the degree to which local jurisdiction ethics ordinances must be similar to the Public Ethics Law, the Commission seeks to replace the language requiring that the local ordinance language be similar or substantially similar to the Public Ethics Law with language requiring that the Commission's review of local ordinances be in accordance to law.

Proposed Changes To The **Lobbying** (Subtitle 7) Provisions

The Commission also supports and would seek an amendment to the lobbying provisions of the Public Ethics Law (subtitle 7) with regard to two of the reporting requirements in the HB2 legislation of 2001:

- §15-708 should be revised in order to more correctly reflect lobbyist spending for legislative meals and receptions. As the requirement reads now, the process is cumbersome and may inadvertently inflate the actual amount spent on lobbying legislators. The provision causes significant confusion as to what costs should be included and how the costs should be reported.
- §15-705 currently provides that regulated lobbyists must file a separate report disclosing the name of any State official of the Executive Branch or member of the immediate family of a State official of the Executive Branch who has benefited during the reporting period from gifts of meals or beverages from the regulated lobbyist, whether or not in connection with lobbying activities. The lobbyist must file this report accounting from Dollar One spent on a meal or beverage for an official of the Executive Branch or a member of the official's immediate family. This reporting requirement is difficult to administer and is not in keeping with other gift reporting requirements, which general require such a report only when the amount spent is \$20 or greater or \$100 cumulatively from one donor. This provision should be revised to require a report only when the amount spent is \$20 or greater or \$100 cumulatively from one donor.

Proposed Change To The **Enforcement** (Subsection 4) Provisions

The Commission and staff continually review the Public Ethics Law in order to determine if the administration and enforcement are consistent with the intent of the law and the mission of the Commission.

- The Commission recommends that it be granted civil penalty authority in conflict of interest matters in order to provide a formal alternative to expensive and time consuming contested case proceedings.

APPENDIX A

EMPLOYER SPENDING **\$25,000** OR MORE - ALL REGISTRANTS ALL TYPES OF EXPENSES

November 1, 2003 - October 31, 2004

| | <u>\$ AMOUNT</u> | <u>EMPLOYER</u> |
|-----|-------------------------|--|
| 1. | 734,005.37 | MedChi, The Maryland State Medical Society |
| 2. | 415,769.94 | Maryland Jockey Club of Baltimore City/Pimlico Race Track |
| 3. | 403,055.12 | Magna Entertainment Corporation |
| 4. | 377,097.04 | CareFirst Blue Cross Blue Shield |
| 5. | 370,698.00 | Maryland Hospital Association. |
| 6. | 364,338.79 | Maryland Association of Realtors |
| 7. | 363,623.44 | Laurel Racing Association, Inc. |
| 8. | 337,531.35 | Maryland State Teachers Association |
| 9. | 335,648.36 | Verizon-Maryland, Inc. |
| 10. | 330,910.53 | MedStar Health |
| 11. | 321,174.00 | Baltimore Zoo/Maryland Zoological Society |
| 12. | 288,227.35 | Maryland Retailers Association |
| 13. | 282,750.00 | Greater Washington Board of Trade |
| 14. | 274,541.69 | Pepco Holdings, Inc. |
| 15. | 256,083.05 | Chimes, The |
| 16. | 248,905.57 | Allegany Racing LLC/Ocean Downs |
| 17. | 233,922.70 | Maryland Bankers Association |
| 18. | 230,581.37 | Maryland Trial Lawyers Association |
| 19. | 216,371.53 | Peterson Companies, The |
| 20. | 205,220.48 | Adventist Healthcare, Inc. |
| 21. | 201,663.21 | Medical Mutual Liability Insurance Society of Maryland |
| 22. | 200,711.00 | MAMSI (Mid-Atlantic Medical Services) |
| 23. | 200,269.90 | Centaur, Inc. |
| 24. | 199,394.25 | Johns Hopkins Medicine |
| 25. | 193,877.41 | Maryland Chamber of Commerce |
| 26. | 191,504.53 | Maryland Thoroughbred Horsemen's Association |
| 27. | 180,612.95 | Delaware North Companies |
| 28. | 174,901.09 | Norfolk Southern Corporation |
| 29. | 174,607.15 | State Farm Insurance Companies |
| 30. | 172,887.21 | ACS State & Local Solutions |
| 31. | 171,393.22 | Philip Morris USA by its service Corp. Altria Corporate Services, Inc. |

| | | |
|-----|------------|--|
| 32. | 158,700.00 | Law Offices of Peter G. Angelos |
| 33. | 156,529.30 | Luk Flats, LLC |
| 34. | 156,098.36 | American Cancer Society |
| 35. | 153,899.55 | League of Life and Health Insurers of Maryland |
| 36. | 149,051.68 | Dimensions Healthcare System |
| 37. | 148,504.81 | Mirant Mid-Atlantic, LLC |
| 38. | 147,180.25 | Maryland Independent College & University Association |
| 39. | 147,066.13 | Health Facilities Association of Maryland |
| 40. | 138,276.53 | Northwind Racing |
| 41. | 138,250.15 | Association of Maryland Pilots |
| 42. | 136,843.94 | Policy Studies, Inc. |
| 43. | 134,716.14 | Maryland New Car and Truck Dealers Assn. |
| 44. | 134,706.39 | Schaller Anderson of Maryland LLC |
| 45. | 131,499.48 | Cable Telecommunications Assn. Of MD.DE & DC |
| 46. | 123,173.00 | Progressive Maryland |
| 47. | 123,000.00 | Maryland State Builders Association |
| 48. | 122,720.11 | MAXIMUS |
| 49. | 120,708.10 | Multimedia Games, Inc. |
| 50. | 118,948.00 | Maryland State Bar Association |
| 51. | 115,699.00 | Maryland Citizens Health Initiative |
| 52. | 115,250.97 | Children's National Medical Center |
| 53. | 113,300.00 | Princeton Review K-12 Services, The |
| 54. | 113,198.09 | Perdue Farms, Inc. |
| 55. | 111,139.61 | Oberthur Gaming Technologies, Inc. |
| 56. | 110,925.26 | Northrup Grumman Corporation |
| 57. | 108,150.00 | Greenbelt Metropark L.L.C |
| 58. | 108,150.00 | Hawthorn Group, The |
| 59. | 106,732.98 | Service Employees International Union, MD/DC Council |
| 60. | 105,807.89 | Life Settlement Institute |
| 61. | 105,053.31 | Apartment & Office Bldg.Assn.of Metro Washington |
| 62. | 105,000.00 | Manufacturers' Alliance of Maryland |
| 63. | 103,076.08 | MCI World Com, Inc. |
| 64. | 102,644.00 | Lifebridge Health |
| 65. | 102,630.87 | Greater Baltimore Medical Center Healthcare, Inc. (GBMC) |
| 66. | 102,267.00 | IGT |
| 67. | 99,800.00 | Comcast Cable Communications |
| 68. | 99,097.61 | Property Casualty Insurers Association of America |
| 69. | 98,282.52 | Bearing Point |
| 70. | 97,305.77 | ESP, Inc. |

| | | |
|------|-----------|--|
| 71. | 97,262.00 | AT & T |
| 72. | 96,999.47 | Discovery Communications, Inc. |
| 73. | 96,659.69 | St. Joseph Medical Center |
| 74. | 96,028.00 | AT & T Wireless Services, Inc. |
| 75. | 95,100.00 | Maryland Association of Community Colleges |
| 76. | 95,098.69 | Coalition for Tax Equity |
| 77. | 94,713.68 | American Heart Association |
| 78. | 94,049.43 | General Motors Corporation |
| 79. | 93,569.38 | Maryland Association of Mortgage Brokers |
| 80. | 93,325.00 | May Department Stores Company, The |
| 81. | 92,666.78 | Maryland Horse Breeders Association |
| 82. | 92,636.68 | Clark Enterprises, Inc. |
| 83. | 90,000.00 | Deloitte Consulting |
| 84. | 89,252.29 | Progressive Insurance Company |
| 85. | 87,903.10 | Maryland Tort Reform Coalition |
| 86. | 87,308.41 | Amerigroup Md. Inc. |
| 87. | 87,000.00 | Diebold Election Systems |
| 88. | 86,611.00 | Cloverleaf Enterprises, Inc. |
| 89. | 84,868.95 | Mid-Atlantic Lifespan |
| 90. | 84,339.26 | Baltimore Jewish Council & Maryland Jewish Alliance |
| 91. | 84,195.19 | NEXTEL Communications |
| 92. | 84,157.96 | Maryland Optometric Association |
| 93. | 84,100.00 | Americhoice Health Services, Inc. |
| 94. | 83,901.58 | American Petroleum Institute |
| 95. | 83,320.59 | Kaiser Foundation Health Plan of the Mid-Atlantic States, Inc. |
| 96. | 82,634.57 | Baltimore Building & Construction Trades Council, AFL-CIO |
| 97. | 82,000.00 | Community Education Partners |
| 98. | 81,245.83 | Maryland Community Health System LLP |
| 99. | 80,657.61 | Laidlaw Transit Services, Inc. |
| 100. | 80,429.99 | AFSCME Council 92 |
| 101. | 80,000.00 | Lorillard Tobacco Company |
| 102. | 80,000.00 | National Funeral Directors Association |
| 103. | 79,850.00 | Microsoft Corporation |
| 104. | 79,593.20 | Pharmaceutical Research & Manufacturers of America |
| 105. | 78,050.00 | Caremark RX, Inc. |
| 106. | 77,927.68 | CGI-AMS |
| 107. | 77,061.63 | Rite Aid Corporation |
| 108. | 77,000.00 | Chemical & Industrial Technology Alliance |
| 109. | 76,530.53 | Maryland Association of Boards of Education |

| | | |
|------|-----------|--|
| 110. | 76,472.00 | UST Public Affairs, Inc. |
| 111. | 76,228.60 | Chesapeake Bay Foundation |
| 112. | 76,149.99 | Washington Area New Automobile Dealers Association |
| 113. | 75,367.55 | Maryland Catholic Conference |
| 114. | 75,092.00 | Equality Maryland, Inc. |
| 115. | 75,050.00 | Mack Trucks |
| 116. | 75,050.00 | Volvo Trucks of North America, Inc. |
| 117. | 74,226.00 | Johns Hopkins University |
| 118. | 73,500.33 | CJ Systems Aviation Group |
| 119. | 72,829.79 | Valley Proteins, Inc. |
| 120. | 72,083.62 | Hudson Group |
| 121. | 71,283.28 | GTECH Corporation |
| 122. | 70,000.00 | Prince George's County Council |
| 123. | 69,860.77 | Maryland Citizens for Asbestos Reform |
| 124. | 69,622.92 | Limited Brands, Inc. |
| 125. | 69,343.76 | Cingular Wireless |
| 126. | 68,953.69 | Maryland Farm Bureau, Inc. |
| 127. | 68,722.80 | CH2M Hill |
| 128. | 68,000.00 | Harrah's Operating Co. |
| 129. | 67,793.29 | Suburban Hospital Healthcare System, Inc. |
| 130. | 67,409.61 | Cloverleaf Standardbred Owners Association |
| 131. | 66,700.00 | Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority |
| 132. | 66,425.00 | Maryland State Dental Association |
| 133. | 66,366.00 | MaryPIRG Citizen Lobby |
| 134. | 66,007.40 | Constellation Energy Group, Inc. |
| 135. | 65,407.42 | Maryland State and DC AFL-CIO |
| 136. | 64,812.59 | St. Agnes Health Care |
| 137. | 64,708.87 | Delmarva Poultry Industry, Inc. |
| 138. | 64,563.92 | Greater Capital Area Association of Realtors |
| 139. | 64,184.00 | Washington Gas |
| 140. | 64,083.44 | Rouse Company, The |
| 141. | 64,017.62 | Maryland State Fair & Agricultural Society, Inc. |
| 142. | 63,353.89 | Nationwide Insurance Company |
| 143. | 62,629.68 | Advocates for Children & Youth, Inc. |
| 144. | 62,500.42 | Variable Annuity Life Insurance Company, The (VALIC) |
| 145. | 62,198.85 | Allegheny Energy |
| 146. | 61,938.84 | MBNA America |
| 147. | 61,898.09 | HSBC-GR Corporation |
| 148. | 61,836.48 | National Federation of Independent Businesses |

| | | |
|------|-----------|--|
| 149. | 61,734.06 | Spielo Manufacturing, Inc. |
| 150. | 61,422.59 | Prison Health Services, Inc. |
| 151. | 61,228.20 | Motorola, Inc. |
| 152. | 61,127.24 | ACCENTURE |
| 153. | 61,105.13 | Avatech Solutions |
| 154. | 60,483.88 | Buchart Horn, Inc. |
| 155. | 60,000.00 | CA One Services, Inc. |
| 156. | 60,000.00 | University of Phoenix |
| 157. | 59,799.10 | Government Affairs-Maryland |
| 158. | 58,894.56 | Lockheed Martin Corporation |
| 159. | 58,118.00 | Maryland Insurance Council |
| 160. | 58,057.00 | Maryland State Bar Association |
| 161. | 58,054.00 | Maryland Citizens Health Initiative Education Fund, Inc. |
| 162. | 58,019.00 | Marine Trades Association of Maryland |
| 163. | 57,507.00 | AARP |
| 164. | 56,723.00 | Johns Hopkins Institutions |
| 165. | 55,500.00 | Penn National Gaming, Inc. |
| 166. | 55,302.25 | Medco Health Solutions |
| 167. | 55,204.76 | Nortel Networks |
| 168. | 55,000.00 | Corrections Corporation of America |
| 169. | 54,783.13 | American Insurance Association |
| 170. | 54,434.07 | SCI Atlantic Region |
| 171. | 54,000.00 | Gaylord Entertainment |
| 172. | 53,925.00 | United Way of Central Maryland |
| 173. | 53,819.18 | Home Builders Association of Maryland |
| 174. | 53,727.57 | Concentra Medical Centers |
| 175. | 53,558.50 | USAA |
| 176. | 52,611.00 | GlobeGround North America, LLC |
| 177. | 52,600.00 | EPIC Pharmacies/Maryland Professional Pharmacies, Inc. |
| 178. | 52,480.43 | WMDP Service Station & Automotive Repair Assn. |
| 179. | 52,100.59 | Mettiki Coal Corporation |
| 180. | 52,050.00 | Dental Network, The |
| 181. | 51,534.55 | Abbott Laboratories |
| 182. | 51,456.47 | Magellan Health Services |
| 183. | 51,000.00 | Maryland Association of Chain Drug Stores |
| 184. | 50,957.77 | American Council of Engineering Companies/Maryland |
| 185. | 50,790.15 | MD/DC/DE Soft Drink Association |
| 186. | 50,700.00 | Fraternal Order of Police - Maryland State Lodge |
| 187. | 50,607.00 | Maryland Association of Non-Profit Organizations |

| | | |
|------|-----------|---|
| 188. | 50,598.10 | Pfizer, Inc. |
| 189. | 50,357.00 | Eli Lilly & Company |
| 190. | 50,256.98 | Long Term Care Pharmacy Alliance |
| 191. | 50,234.71 | Almost Family-Caretenders |
| 192. | 50,050.00 | Dell Corporation |
| 193. | 50,000.00 | Alcoa Eastalco Works |
| 194. | 50,000.00 | CSX Corporation |
| 195. | 50,000.00 | Service Employees International Union, District 1199 E-DC |
| 196. | 50,000.00 | Walmart Stores, Inc. |
| 197. | 49,912.36 | ACLU of Maryland (American Civil Liberties Union) |
| 198. | 49,806.64 | Catholic Charities |
| 199. | 49,614.85 | Medimmune, Inc. |
| 200. | 49,133.59 | Associated Builders & Contractors, Metro Washington Chapter |
| 201. | 48,634.59 | Maryland Taxicab, Sedan & Paratransit |
| 202. | 48,310.82 | Cellco Partnership, a Delaware Limited Partnership |
| 203. | 48,050.00 | AES Warrior Run |
| 204. | 48,018.02 | Association of Maryland Docking Pilots |
| 205. | 48,000.00 | R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Company |
| 206. | 47,950.00 | Mid-Atlantic Petroleum Distributors Association |
| 207. | 47,784.04 | Insurance Agents and Brokers of Maryland |
| 208. | 47,638.65 | Time Warner, Inc. |
| 209. | 47,093.87 | Carroll Hospital Center |
| 210. | 46,951.75 | CBIZ Benefits and Insurance Services |
| 211. | 46,855.20 | Maryland State Licensed Beverage Assn. |
| 212. | 46,737.32 | Drug Policy Alliance |
| 213. | 46,453.01 | Dominion Resources Services, Inc. |
| 214. | 46,125.00 | Owens Illinois, Inc. |
| 215. | 46,000.00 | Outward Bound |
| 216. | 45,000.00 | Allied Defense Group |
| 217. | 45,000.00 | Unitedhealth Group, Inc. |
| 218. | 44,843.06 | Grocery Manufacturers of America |
| 219. | 44,703.76 | Motion Picture Association of Maryland |
| 220. | 44,606.26 | City of Annapolis |
| 221. | 44,575.39 | Community Hospice of Maryland |
| 222. | 44,476.52 | Maryland Legislative Sportsmen's Foundation |
| 223. | 44,327.33 | National Association of Insurance & Financial Advisors-Maryland |
| 224. | 44,282.23 | Parsons Water & Infrastructure, Inc. |
| 225. | 43,572.85 | Maryland Chiropractic Association |
| 226. | 43,429.07 | Mental Health Association of Maryland |

| | | |
|------|-----------|--|
| 227. | 43,369.79 | Maryland State Funeral Directors Association |
| 228. | 42,829.63 | Republic Properties Corporation |
| 229. | 42,645.45 | HLR Service Corporation |
| 230. | 42,295.06 | American Lung Association of Maryland |
| 231. | 42,000.00 | Assurant Group |
| 232. | 42,000.00 | First Transit |
| 233. | 41,974.28 | Melwood Horticultural Training Center, Inc. |
| 234. | 41,810.00 | CTB Government Relations |
| 235. | 41,250.00 | CIGNA Corporation |
| 236. | 41,200.00 | Safe and Sound Campaign |
| 237. | 41,164.00 | First Health Services Corporation |
| 238. | 41,127.40 | Primedia Workplace Learning |
| 239. | 41,025.59 | Maryland Society of the American Institute of Architects, Inc. |
| 240. | 40,985.00 | Delaware-Md Synod, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America |
| 241. | 40,800.00 | Maryland Disability Law Center |
| 242. | 40,583.64 | Maryland Industrial Group |
| 243. | 40,352.00 | Spherix |
| 244. | 40,295.16 | Kennedy Kreiger Institute |
| 245. | 40,100.00 | Michael Company, The |
| 246. | 40,000.00 | Cigar Association of America, Inc. |
| 247. | 40,000.00 | Feld Entertainment Inc. |
| 248. | 39,709.71 | DMJM Harris |
| 249. | 39,668.00 | Sunoco, Inc. |
| 250. | 39,536.78 | ResCare, Inc. |
| 251. | 39,455.89 | AFT Maryland (American Federation of Teachers) |
| 252. | 38,955.75 | Anheuser-Busch Companies |
| 253. | 38,864.51 | Greater Baltimore Committee |
| 254. | 38,611.42 | Maryland Radiological Society |
| 255. | 38,548.02 | Maryland Association of Tobacco & Candy Distributors |
| 256. | 38,455.83 | Maryland Association of Certified Public Accountants |
| 257. | 38,448.00 | Yellow Transportation |
| 258. | 38,394.23 | Correctional Medical Services |
| 259. | 38,160.00 | Maryland Center for Community Development |
| 260. | 38,028.74 | Maryland Credit Union League |
| 261. | 38,000.00 | EDS (Electronic Data Systems Corporation) |
| 262. | 37,766.30 | MV Transportation |
| 263. | 37,750.24 | Maryland Aggregates Association, Inc. |
| 264. | 37,750.00 | Maryland Society of Eye Physicians & Surgeons |
| 265. | 37,541.73 | CASA of Maryland, Inc. |

| | | |
|------|-----------|---|
| 266. | 37,530.00 | EJ Krause & Associates, Inc. |
| 267. | 37,406.76 | Agency Insurance Company of Maryland |
| 268. | 37,108.00 | University of Maryland Medical System |
| 269. | 36,869.79 | Sempra Energy Global Enterprises |
| 270. | 36,758.00 | Common Cause |
| 271. | 36,720.00 | Maryland Motor Coach Association |
| 272. | 36,677.01 | Maryland Science Center |
| 273. | 36,512.95 | Advanced Geo Tech Systems |
| 274. | 36,500.74 | Golden Rule Insurance Company |
| 275. | 36,296.58 | Genesis Health Ventures |
| 276. | 36,259.46 | Indoor Tanning Association |
| 277. | 36,150.00 | Avaya, Inc. |
| 278. | 36,000.11 | Maryland Troopers Association |
| 279. | 36,000.00 | 7-11, Inc. |
| 280. | 36,000.00 | BAA USA |
| 281. | 36,000.00 | Quest Diagnostics |
| 282. | 36,000.00 | Supershuttle International, Inc. |
| 283. | 35,900.27 | National Rifle Assn. Institute for Legislative Action (Crimestrike) |
| 284. | 35,706.31 | Jai Medical Systems |
| 285. | 35,662.51 | Lilac Capitol, LLC |
| 286. | 35,648.79 | Maryland Society of Anesthesiologists |
| 287. | 35,636.30 | HMS Host Corporation |
| 288. | 35,467.07 | AAA Mid-Atlantic |
| 289. | 35,186.90 | United Healthcare of the Mid-Atlantic |
| 290. | 35,000.00 | Aetna U.S. Healthcare, Inc. |
| 291. | 35,000.00 | MeadWestvaco Corporation |
| 292. | 35,000.00 | Snack Food Association |
| 293. | 34,876.30 | General Electric |
| 294. | 34,588.00 | Maryland School for the Blind |
| 295. | 34,185.48 | Columbia Gas of Maryland, Inc. |
| 296. | 34,156.11 | Restaurant Association of Maryland |
| 297. | 34,149.64 | Multi-Housing Laundry Association |
| 298. | 34,082.61 | Maryland Motor Truck Association, Inc. |
| 299. | 34,037.21 | Teachers Insr. & Annuity Assoc-College Retirement Equities Fund |
| 300. | 34,028.12 | Scientific Games International |
| 301. | 33,785.00 | AFTRA (American Federation of TV & Radio Artists) |
| 302. | 33,670.35 | Maryland Free State Cemetery & Funeral Association |
| 303. | 33,666.22 | Symphony Health Services |
| 304. | 33,552.55 | Planned Parenthood of Maryland |

| | | |
|------|-----------|--|
| 305. | 33,034.23 | Sheppard Pratt Health Systems |
| 306. | 32,536.00 | Recording for Blind & Dyslexic |
| 307. | 32,246.09 | Marriott International, Inc., The |
| 308. | 32,000.00 | Allstate Check Cashing |
| 309. | 32,000.00 | Maryland Standardbred Breeders Association |
| 310. | 32,000.00 | Valueoptions |
| 311. | 31,999.98 | RCP Development Company LLC |
| 312. | 31,852.68 | Maryland Chapter of the American College of Emergency Physicians |
| 313. | 31,748.28 | Maryland Podiatric Medical Association |
| 314. | 31,566.60 | Maryland Rental Car Coalition |
| 315. | 31,248.96 | Eastern Shore of Maryland Educational Consortium |
| 316. | 31,208.45 | Atlantic Bingo Supply, Inc. |
| 317. | 31,153.85 | Center for Poverty Solutions |
| 318. | 30,900.00 | CDR Financial Products |
| 319. | 30,833.32 | American Physical Therapy Association of Maryland, Inc. |
| 320. | 30,737.82 | Planned Parenthood of Metropolitan Washington |
| 321. | 30,685.38 | US Wind Force, LLC |
| 322. | 30,395.00 | Maryland Community Resource Center Coalition |
| 323. | 30,394.23 | Montgomery County Chamber of Commerce |
| 324. | 30,205.08 | Erickson Retirement Communities |
| 325. | 30,155.00 | Maryland Green Industries Council |
| 326. | 30,100.00 | Leucadia International Corporation |
| 327. | 30,100.00 | Winbak Farms |
| 328. | 30,000.00 | Jerome J. Parks Companies, Inc. |
| 329. | 30,000.00 | Medtronic Sofamore Danek |
| 330. | 30,000.00 | Prince George's County Association of Realtors |
| 331. | 30,000.00 | Sleep Services of America |
| 332. | 29,747.52 | City of Rockville |
| 333. | 29,500.00 | American Council of Life Insurers |
| 334. | 29,279.55 | National Association of Industrial & Office Parks (N.A.I.O.P) |
| 335. | 29,093.20 | Miller Brewing Company |
| 336. | 29,019.68 | Maryland Tourism Council |
| 337. | 29,000.00 | MD/DC/DE Press Association |
| 338. | 28,928.14 | Maryland Psychological Association |
| 339. | 28,882.72 | Chesapeake Ranch Water Company |
| 340. | 28,832.31 | Explore Information Services |
| 341. | 28,783.44 | Legal Aid Bureau, Inc. |
| 342. | 28,720.00 | Baltimore Orioles, Inc. |
| 343. | 28,704.00 | Anne Arundel Medical Center |

| | | |
|------|-----------|--|
| 344. | 28,632.13 | Columbia Association, Inc. |
| 345. | 28,593.97 | Trigen-Baltimore Energy Corporation |
| 346. | 28,542.88 | Ebay, Inc. |
| 347. | 28,500.00 | Maryland Agriculture Council, Inc. |
| 348. | 28,200.00 | Maryland Multi Housing Association |
| 349. | 28,153.40 | Cognos Corporation |
| 350. | 28,100.00 | Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers |
| 351. | 28,000.00 | Prince George's County Planning Board |
| 352. | 28,000.00 | Professional Firefighters of Maryland |
| 353. | 27,957.34 | Greater Bethesda Chevy Chase Chamber of Commerce |
| 354. | 27,867.97 | Maryland Highway Contractors Association |
| 355. | 27,800.00 | Baltimore Medical Systems, Inc. |
| 356. | 27,757.11 | Pro-Life Maryland, Inc. |
| 357. | 27,650.00 | Sprint Corporation |
| 358. | 27,600.00 | Hospice Network of Maryland |
| 359. | 27,500.00 | American Chemistry Council |
| 360. | 27,177.10 | Mid-Atlantic Association of Community Health Centers |
| 361. | 27,173.67 | Elder Health |
| 362. | 27,081.72 | Adoptions Together |
| 363. | 27,000.00 | Evercare |
| 364. | 27,000.00 | ISG |
| 365. | 27,000.00 | Waste Management, Inc. |
| 366. | 26,890.00 | State Law Enforcement Officers Labor Alliance |
| 367. | 26,829.93 | Maryland Dental Hygienists Association |
| 368. | 26,814.00 | Property Owners Association of Greater Baltimore, Inc. |
| 369. | 26,598.45 | Second Genesis Foundation, Inc. |
| 370. | 26,590.12 | AFSCME AFL-CIO |
| 371. | 26,464.16 | All Risks Limited |
| 372. | 26,400.00 | Schering-Plough External Affairs, Inc. |
| 373. | 26,052.00 | RVG Management and Development Co. |
| 374. | 26,003.16 | Hunters Brooke, LLC |
| 375. | 26,000.00 | Center for Energy and Economic Development (CEED) |
| 376. | 25,990.04 | Abilities Network |
| 377. | 25,819.86 | Maryland Association of Nurse Anesthetists |
| 378. | 25,720.09 | Maryland Mortgage Bankers Association |
| 379. | 25,519.17 | Mercer Ventures D/B/A/ Mercer Staffing |
| 380. | 25,500.00 | DCI Group LLC and AT & T |
| 381. | 25,200.00 | EIA/NSWMA |
| 382. | 25,050.00 | MIE Properties |

| | | |
|------|-----------|---|
| 383. | 25,050.00 | Multi-State Associates on behalf of Aventis Pasteur, Inc. |
| 384. | 25,049.99 | Investment Company Institute |
| 385. | 25,000.00 | Elevator Industry Work Preservation Fund |
| 386. | 25,000.00 | Hotel Employees & Restaurant Employees Union, Local 7 |
| 387. | 25,000.00 | Maryland Land Title Association |
| 388. | 25,000.00 | Maryland Self Storage Association, Inc. |

APPENDIX B

LOBBYISTS RECEIVING \$50,000 OR MORE IN COMPENSATION ONE OR MORE EMPLOYERS

November 1, 2003 - October 31, 2004

\$ Amount

| | | |
|-----|--------------|----------------------------|
| 1. | 1,026,698.02 | Alexander, Gary R. |
| 2. | 857,628.75 | Rozner, Joel D. |
| 3. | 841,891.94 | Stierhoff, John R. |
| 4. | 815,190.95 | Rifkin, Alan M. |
| 5. | 745,813.86 | Cowen, Lee |
| 6. | 709,032.00 | Enten, D. Robert |
| 7. | 595,400.00 | Bereano, Bruce C. |
| 8. | 589,600.00 | Pitcher, J. William |
| 9. | 577,622.73 | Taylor, Casper |
| 10. | 577,122.00 | Schwartz, Joseph A., III |
| 11. | 576,100.25 | Johansen, Michael V. |
| 12. | 575,034.02 | Shaivitz, Robin F. |
| 13. | 565,593.47 | Tiburzi, Paul A. |
| 14. | 509,103.00 | McCoy, Dennis C. |
| 15. | 476,459.12 | Popham, Bryson F. |
| 16. | 454,398.00 | Rasmussen, Dennis |
| 17. | 408,109.78 | Burridge, Carolyn T. |
| 18. | 379,625.00 | Manis, Nicholas G. |
| 19. | 353,330.45 | Collins, Carville B. |
| 20. | 321,000.00 | Evans Gerard E. |
| 21. | 307,495.22 | Ornstein, Chantel |
| 22. | 305,000.00 | Pica, John A. Jr. |
| 23. | 283,820.33 | Wayson, Edward O., Jr. |
| 24. | 266,765.00 | Miedusiewski, American Joe |
| 25. | 256,907.02 | Doherty, Daniel T., Jr. |
| 26. | 255,350.00 | Hoffman, Barbara |
| 27. | 245,732.00 | Aery, Shaila |
| 28. | 226,000.00 | Arrington, Michael |
| 29. | 225,000.00 | Genn, Gilbert J. |
| 30. | 195,833.30 | Carroll, David H., Jr. |
| 31. | 194,102.01 | Levitan, Laurence |
| 32. | 193,500.00 | Boston, Frank |
| 33. | 190,050.00 | Burner, Gene L. |
| 34. | 185,833.30 | Johnson Robert C. |
| 35. | 182,500.00 | Rivkin, Deborah R. |
| 36. | 182,000.00 | Albert, David G. |

| | | |
|-----|------------|--------------------------|
| 37. | 173,313.19 | Brocato, Barbara Marx |
| 38. | 169,608.34 | Canning, Michael F. |
| 39. | 151,349.80 | Doolan, Devin John |
| 40. | 150,905.14 | Powell, Michael C. |
| 41. | 147,434.41 | Winstead, David |
| 42. | 145,814.25 | Harting, Marta D. |
| 43. | 142,998.00 | Binderman,Mindy Koplan |
| 44. | 141,966.00 | Goldstein, Franklin |
| 45. | 140,664.00 | Valentino-Benitez, Ellen |
| 46. | 128,020.28 | Douglas, Robert C. |
| 47. | 125,700.00 | Gisriel, Michael U. |
| 48. | 125,625.00 | Andryszak, John A. |
| 49. | 125,000.00 | Hill, Denise |
| 50. | 122,304.35 | Battle, J. Kenneth Jr. |
| 51. | 118,000.00 | Harris-Jones, Lisa M. |
| 52. | 117,509.80 | Lamb, Todd |
| 53. | 116,000.00 | DiPietro, Christopher V. |
| 54. | 115,870.00 | Gally, Eric |
| 55. | 114,724.19 | Wilkins, Barbara J. |
| 56. | 114,433.34 | Lanier, Ivan |
| 57. | 112,700.00 | Neil, John B. |
| 58. | 111,883.00 | McDonough, John P. |
| 59. | 108,974.55 | Cooke, Ira C. |
| 60. | 107,308.10 | Iacobazzi, Catherine F. |
| 61. | 106,589.00 | Larsen, Steven B. |
| 62. | 105,250.00 | Muir, Scott |
| 63. | 105,033.33 | Opara, Clay C. |
| 64. | 101,250.00 | Manis, George N. |
| 65. | 99,000.00 | Doyle, James J., Jr. |
| 66. | 94,500.00 | Cryor, Michael |
| 67. | 92,926.10 | Davis, Michael H. |
| 68. | 91,914.00 | Bryant, Eric Lee |
| 69. | 89,684.00 | Wyatt, Joseph Richard |
| 70. | 86,860.00 | Montgomery, Richard A. |
| 71. | 85,519.96 | Looney, Sean M. |
| 72. | 82,500.00 | Carter, W. Minor |
| 73. | 82,186.00 | Ciekot, Ann T. |
| 74. | 80,000.00 | Ranier, Edward M. |
| 75. | 79,000.00 | Foxwell, Leonard N. Jr. |
| 76. | 75,000.00 | Harris, Willie R. |
| 77. | 75,000.00 | Kinkel, Anthony G. |
| 78. | 74,800.62 | Hoover, Lesa N. |
| 79. | 74,671.14 | Saquella, Thomas S. |
| 80. | 73,000.00 | McHugh, Kathleen |
| 81. | 70,000.00 | Hawk, Wynnee Elizabeth |

| | | |
|------|-----------|------------------------------|
| 82. | 69,906.25 | Proctor, Gregory S. |
| 83. | 69,876.29 | Murphy, Kathleen M. |
| 84. | 68,905.00 | Sheehan, Lorraine M. |
| 85. | 68,500.00 | Rehrmann, Eileen |
| 86. | 66,900.00 | Johnson, Deron A. |
| 87. | 66,835.67 | Richardson, Lawrence A., Jr. |
| 88. | 66,418.65 | Micucci, Paul |
| 89. | 64,600.00 | Albers, William E. |
| 90. | 64,500.00 | Miles, William R. |
| 91. | 63,454.41 | Antoun, Mary |
| 92. | 63,150.00 | Sammis, Elizabeth P. |
| 93. | 62,500.00 | Nathanson, Martha Dale |
| 94. | 60,609.00 | Kaufman, M. James |
| 95. | 60,000.00 | DeFrancis, Joseph A. |
| 96. | 60,000.00 | Townsend, Pegeen |
| 97. | 58,225.50 | Zellmer, Jeffrie |
| 98. | 58,000.00 | Jepson, Robert |
| 99. | 57,450.00 | Woolums, John R. |
| 100. | 55,497.63 | Wood, Paul G. |
| 101. | 55,000.00 | Counihan, Gene W. |
| 102. | 55,000.00 | Levitan, Susan |
| 103. | 54,700.00 | Cohen, Harold A. |
| 104. | 54,655.38 | Flanagan, Sean Patrick |
| 105. | 54,081.00 | Bellissimo, Toni A. |
| 106. | 54,000.00 | Komenda, Frank J. |
| 107. | 52,663.34 | Fowlkes, Lyle |
| 108. | 52,650.00 | Bjarekull, Tina M. |
| 109. | 52,102.06 | Esty, Susan |
| 110. | 51,065.18 | Saquella, Diana K. |
| 111. | 51,014.00 | Woodard, Mark D. |
| 112. | 51,000.00 | Crutcher, Mark |
| 113. | 51,000.00 | Fedder, Michaeline R. |
| 114. | 50,000.00 | Matricciani, Denise M. |
| 115. | 50,000.00 | Robbins, Earl H. Jr. |
| 116. | 50,000.00 | Thomas, David Wayne |

APPENDIX C

EXPENDITURES ON SPECIAL EVENTS

November 1, 2003 - October 31, 2004

| <u>Group Invited</u> | <u>Number of Times Invited</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------|
| All General Assembly | 126 | 1,072,303.01 |
| Senate Only | 2 | 3,785.35 |
| Anne Arundel County Delegation | 16 | 38,036.48 |
| Baltimore City Delegation | 12 | 11,968.26 |
| Baltimore County Delegation | 16 | 108,161.75 |
| Carroll County Delegation | 5 | 50,121.69 |
| Harford County Delegation | 6 | 94,307.55 |
| Howard County Delegation | 13 | 55,198.49 |
| Lower Eastern Shore Delegation | 7 | 3,160.77 |
| Upper Eastern Shore Delegation | 8 | 3,700.79 |
| Montgomery County Delegation | 21 | 149,751.40 |
| Prince George's County Delegation | 21 | 159,646.93 |
| Southern Maryland Delegation | 10 | 13,947.27 |
| Western Maryland Delegation | 7 | 8,130.56 |

HOUSE

| | | |
|--------------------------------|----|-----------|
| Appropriations | 13 | 14,906.23 |
| Health & Government Operations | 28 | 50,646.54 |
| Economic Matters | 17 | 37,224.31 |
| Environmental Matters | 11 | 11,122.84 |
| Judiciary | 15 | 30,689.48 |
| Ways and Means | 10 | 31,274.10 |

SENATE

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|----|-----------|
| Budget and Taxation | 23 | 43,772.02 |
| Education, Health & Environ. Affairs | 16 | 15,502.84 |
| Finance | 26 | 31,681.95 |
| Judicial Proceedings | 18 | 21,606.46 |

TOTAL: \$2,060,647.07

(NOTE: Where more than one committee was invited to the same event for the purposes of this report, there may be a proportionate allocation.)

APPENDIX D

LOBBYING FIRMS EARNING \$1,000,000 OR MORE

November 1, 2003 - October 31, 2004

| <u>Name of Firm</u> | <u>Amount of Compensation Reported</u> |
|---|--|
| Alexander & Cleaver, P.A. | \$ 2,724,651.02 |
| Rifkin, Livingston, Levitan & Silver, LLC | 2,661,981.96 |
| Funk & Bolton, P.A. | 1,717,116.06 |
| Piper Rudnick LLP | 1,252,735.89 |