RESULTS OF THE 2002 SESSION

VICTORIES

✔ A resolution to restart and complete the environmental impact statement process for the Intercounty Connector (ICC) was approved by the General Assembly. See SB 8 on page 2 and HB 10 on page 6.

✔ A bill to levy a two percent premium tax on HMOs was defeated. See SB 10 on page 2.

✔ A bill to streamline the appeal process for air quality control permits was approved. See SB 248 on page 2 and HB 549 on page 6.

✔ An amendment to delay the final two percent of the state income tax rate cut was defeated. See SB 523 on pages 2 and 6.

✔ A bill to create an Energy-Saving Investment Fund through a surcharge to be paid by residential and retail users of electric and gas was defeated. See SB 543 on page 2.

✔ A bill to add impossibly vague language to the grounds for deeming a person from entering into a contract with the State was defeated. See SB 610 on pages 2 and 6.

✔ A bill to require businesses that use chemicals to change manufacturing processes or product designs was defeated. See SB 610 on page 2.

✔ A bill to duplicate the federal “Do not call” program with a state do-not-call database that adversely affects Maryland telemarketers was defeated. See SB 674 on page 2.

✔ A bill to require the Maryland Department of Environmental Programs to implement binding, spending affordability guidelines and other fiscal control measures that provide disciplined consistency in State spending. Solid fiscal management with proper controls is the key to success for the next administration, and vital to the overall economic and fiscal health of our State. It is a responsibility elected leaders must accept. And it is a responsibility Maryland businesses must demand. (See chart page 8.)

✔ A bill that requires chemical manufacturers to make unreasonable upgrades to the security of independently owned railroads adjacent to their facilities was defeated. See HB 1052 on page 6.

✔ A resolution to restart and complete the environmental impact statement process for the Intercounty Connector (ICC) was approved by the General Assembly. See SB 8 on page 2 and HB 10 on page 6.

✔ A bill to add impermissibly vague language to the grounds for deeming a person from entering into a contract with the State was defeated. See SB 610 on pages 2 and 6.

✔ A bill to require businesses that use chemicals to change manufacturing processes or product designs was defeated. See SB 610 on page 2.

✔ A bill to duplicate the federal “Do not call” program with a state do-not-call database that adversely affects Maryland telemarketers was defeated. See SB 674 on page 2.

✔ A bill to require the Maryland Department of Environmental Programs to implement binding, spending affordability guidelines and other fiscal control measures that provide disciplined consistency in State spending. Solid fiscal management with proper controls is the key to success for the next administration, and vital to the overall economic and fiscal health of our State. It is a responsibility elected leaders must accept. And it is a responsibility Maryland businesses must demand. (See chart page 8.)

✔ A bill that requires chemical manufacturers to make unreasonable upgrades to the security of independently owned railroads adjacent to their facilities was defeated. See HB 1052 on page 6.

VICTORIES

✔ A bill to require businesses that use chemicals to change manufacturing processes or product designs was defeated. See SB 610 on page 2.

✔ A bill to duplicate the federal “Do not call” program with a state do-not-call database that adversely affects Maryland telemarketers was defeated. See SB 674 on page 2.

✔ A bill to subvert the objective criteria used as the competitive sealed bidding method of procurement for state construction contracts was defeated. See HB 480 on page 6.

✔ A bill to establish a new tax on Maryland commercial real estate transactions was defeated. See HB 557 on pages 6 and 7.

✔ A bill that requires chemical manufacturers to make unreasonable upgrades to the security of independently owned railroads adjacent to their facilities was defeated. See HB 1052 on page 6.

DEFEATS

✖ A bill to establish a new tax on Maryland commercial real estate transactions was defeated. See HB 557 on pages 6 and 7.

✖ A bill to extend the Maryland Department of Environment to establish new fees on facilities that store or release hazardous substances in order to create a Community Rights-to-Know Fund was approved. See HB 291 on pages 6 and 7.

✖ A bill to require the Maryland Department of Environment to establish new fees on facilities that store or release hazardous substances in order to create a Community Rights-to-Know Fund was approved. See HB 291 on pages 6 and 7.

✖ A bill to extend the collective bargaining rights of local school employee organizations was approved. See SB 253 on pages 2 and 6.

✖ A bill to require businesses that use chemicals to change manufacturing processes or product designs was defeated. See SB 610 on page 2.

✖ A bill to duplicate the federal “Do not call” program with a state do-not-call database that adversely affects Maryland telemarketers was defeated. See SB 674 on page 2.

✖ A bill to subvert the objective criteria used as the competitive sealed bidding method of procurement for state construction contracts was defeated. See HB 480 on page 6.

✖ A bill to establish a new tax on Maryland commercial real estate transactions was defeated. See HB 557 on pages 6 and 7.

✖ A bill that requires chemical manufacturers to make unreasonable upgrades to the security of independently owned railroads adjacent to their facilities was defeated. See HB 1052 on page 6.

✖ A bill to establish a new tax on Maryland commercial real estate transactions was defeated. See HB 557 on pages 6 and 7.

✖ A bill to extend the collective bargaining rights of local school employee organizations was approved. See SB 253 on pages 2 and 6.

✖ A bill to duplicate the federal “Do not call” program with a state do-not-call database that adversely affects Maryland telemarketers was defeated. See SB 674 on page 2.

✖ A bill to subvert the objective criteria used as the competitive sealed bidding method of procurement for state construction contracts was defeated. See HB 480 on page 6.

✖ A bill to establish a new tax on Maryland commercial real estate transactions was defeated. See HB 557 on pages 6 and 7.

✖ A bill that requires chemical manufacturers to make unreasonable upgrades to the security of independently owned railroads adjacent to their facilities was defeated. See HB 1052 on page 6.
2002 Senate Vote Descriptions

**SB 247 – Administration**

Appplies highly restrictive provisions of the Chesapeake Bay Critical Area Protection Program and new restrictions to the Atlantic Coastal Bays area, which includes Assawoman, Isle of Wight, Sanepeague, Newport, and Chincoteague bays. The bill also requires the State to provide grants to local jurisdictions for costs associated with developing and implementing a local critical area protection program. This bill ultimately acts as a state-imposed zoning law. It seeks to limit growth in the coastal bay region by imposing setbacks, buffer requirements, and growth limits and prevents local governments from considering the need for economic growth when establishing local, zoning restrictions.

**SB 248 - Administration**

Environmental Standing - Judicial Review

Title V Operating Permits

Satisfies a federal mandate to expand the number of persons and groups that may oppose or legally challenge the issuance of air permits, and minimizes the time and cost to permit applicants by limiting the scope of the appeals. Air quality permits are essential to an array of Maryland businesses, including utilities, manufacturers, waste disposal, and processing firms. This bill enables Maryland businesses to obtain permits from the Maryland Department of Environment rather than going out-of-state to obtain air permits from EPA at greater expense and risk. This bill preserves Maryland’s local autonomy and prevents Maryland from becoming the only state to lose its air permitting program to the federal government.

**SB 253 – Administration**

Education - Negotiations Between Public School Employers and Employee Organizations

Authorizes local boards of education and local school employer organizations representing certificated and noncertificated employees to negotiate subjects that are currently prohibited, including the discipline and discharge of support staff for just cause. Under current law, only employees salaries, wages, hours, and working conditions must be negotiated and the negotiation of other subjects is prohibited. In addition, the bill expands the collective bargaining rights to noncertificated school employees in the nine Eastern Shore counties. This bill will increase state and local school expenditures by increasing administrative costs, salaries, fringe benefits, and retirement payments allowed by the state to local boards to union demands and the costs of noncertificated employees. In addition, this bill will displace collaborative education policy processes with adversarial contract negotiation processes.

**SB 247 – Administration**

Atlantic Coastal Bays Protection Act

Applies highly restrictive provisions of the Chesapeake Bay Critical Area Protection Program and new restrictions to the Atlantic Coastal Bays area, which includes Assawoman, Isle of Wight, Sanepeague, Newport, and Chincoteague bays. The bill also requires the State to provide grants to local jurisdictions for costs associated with developing and implementing a local critical area protection program. This bill ultimately acts as a state-imposed zoning law. It seeks to limit growth in the coastal bay region by imposing setbacks, buffer requirements, and growth limits and prevents local governments from considering the need for economic growth when establishing local, zoning restrictions.

**SB 248 - Administration**

Environmental Standing - Judicial Review

Title V Operating Permits

Satisfies a federal mandate to expand the number of persons and groups that may oppose or legally challenge the issuance of air permits, and minimizes the time and cost to permit applicants by limiting the scope of the appeals. Air quality permits are essential to an array of Maryland businesses, including utilities, manufacturers, waste disposal, and processing firms. This bill enables Maryland businesses to obtain permits from the Maryland Department of Environment rather than going out-of-state to obtain air permits from EPA at greater expense and risk. This bill preserves Maryland’s local autonomy and prevents Maryland from becoming the only state to lose its air permitting program to the federal government.

**SB 253 – Administration**

Education - Negotiations Between Public School Employers and Employee Organizations

Authorizes local boards of education and local school employer organizations representing certificated and noncertificated employees to negotiate subjects that are currently prohibited, including the discipline and discharge of support staff for just cause. Under current law, only employees salaries, wages, hours, and working conditions must be negotiated and the negotiation of other subjects is prohibited. In addition, the bill expands the collective bargaining rights to noncertificated school employees in the nine Eastern Shore counties. This bill will increase state and local school expenditures by increasing administrative costs, salaries, fringe benefits, and retirement payments allowed by the state to local boards to union demands and the costs of noncertificated employees. In addition, this bill will displace collaborative education policy processes with adversarial contract negotiation processes.
### MARYLAND SENATE VOTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Lower House</th>
<th>Upper House</th>
<th>Vote Description</th>
<th>MBRG Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999-2002</td>
<td>14 Robert H. Kellam (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2002</td>
<td>15 Jean W. Brewer (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2002</td>
<td>16 Brian E. Frosh (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2002</td>
<td>17 Christian J. S. Brown (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2002</td>
<td>18 Christopher Van Hollen, Jr. (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2002</td>
<td>19 Lesa L. Tolbert (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2002</td>
<td>20 Ma. Robin (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2002</td>
<td>21 Arthur Dorman (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2002</td>
<td>22 Paul G. Pinsky (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2002</td>
<td>23 Leo E. Greene (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2002</td>
<td>24 Nathaniel E. Young (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2002</td>
<td>25 Ulysses Currie (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2002</td>
<td>26 Gloria Leach (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2002</td>
<td>27 Thomas V. Mike Miller, Jr. (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2002</td>
<td>28 Thomas M. McMillen (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2002</td>
<td>29 Ray Beatty (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2002</td>
<td>30 John C. Aile (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2002</td>
<td>31 Philip C. Jimeno (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2002</td>
<td>32 Nancy Jacobs (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2002</td>
<td>33 Stuart M. Mayer (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2002</td>
<td>34 Nancy J. Jacobs (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2002</td>
<td>35 J. Robson Royer (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2002</td>
<td>36 Caroline, Cecil, Kent, Queen Anne’s, Talbot Counties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2002</td>
<td>37 Caroline, Dorchester, Talbot &amp; Wicomico Counties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2002</td>
<td>38 Somerset, Wicomico &amp; Worcester Counties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2002</td>
<td>39 Montgomery County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2002</td>
<td>40 Anna E. Leopold (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2002</td>
<td>41 Clarence W. Mitchell, Jr. (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2002</td>
<td>42 Barbara A. Hoffman (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2002</td>
<td>43 Peter J. Barnes (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2002</td>
<td>44 George W. Della, Jr. (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MBRG RATING SYSTEM

#### 2002 MBRG %: 2002 percentage is derived by dividing the number of "+" votes by the number of bills on which the legislator voted plus the number of "NV" marks.

#### 1999-2002 Percentile: In order to compare a legislator’s score with his or her colleagues, both Senate and House members have been ranked by percentiles. The percentile represents where a legislator’s 1999-2002 MBRG rating series in relation to other legislator’s ratings. For example, a Senator with a percentile ranking of 78 has a 1999-2002 MBRG rating greater than 78 percent of his or her colleagues for the time period.

#### Cumulative percentage is based on a legislator’s voting record since the year MBRG began rating the legislator, as early as 1999 or since that legislator’s first year in an earlier House seat, through 2002. The percentage is derived by dividing the total number of "+" votes by the total number of bills on which the legislator voted plus the number of "NV" marks. A short red dash (\_) in this column means a legislator is a freshman and therefore has no cumulative record.
Please refer to page 6 for a full description of each vote.

MARYLAND HOUSE OF DELEGATES

Allegheny & Garrett Counties
1A George C. Edwards (D) - + + + - + - + - + 78% 70% 72 85%
1B Kevin Kelly (D) - + + + - + - + - + 50% 57% 65 69%
1C Casper R. Taylor, Jr. (D) - + + + - + - + - + 43% 43% 48 66%
Washington County
2A Walt K. McRae (R) - + + + - + - + - + 88% 72% 74 79%
2B Christopher Shank (R) - + + + - + - + - + 90% 89% 91 89%
2C John P. Donoghue (D) - + + + - + - + - + 67% 63% 69 67%
Frederick & Washington Counties
3 Joseph R. Bartlet (R) - + + + - + - + - + 78% 85% 82 85%
3A Sue Hecht (D) - + + + - + - + - + 44% 56% 66 64%
3B Louise S. Boothgrass (R) - + + + - + - + - + 83% 88% 91 88%
Carroll & Frederick Counties
4A David B. Shankley (R) - + + + - + - + - + 90% 91% 94 93%
4B Paul S. Nol (R) - + + + - + - + - + 89% 88% 89 90%
4C Donald B. Elliott (R) - + + + - + - + - + 89% 90% 92 85%

Baltimore & Harford Counties
5 Carmen Amedot (R) + + + + - + - + - + 90% 93% 95 93%
5 Joseph M. Gent (R) + + + + - + - + - + 100% 98% 98 94%
5 Nancy R. Stocksdale (R) + + + + - + - + - + 100% 99% 96 96%

Baltimore County
7 John S. Arrack (D) - + + + - + - + - + 67% 59% 59 59%
7 Joseph Mann (D) - + + + - + - + - + 63% 67% 67 67%
7 Joel J. Mehmoe (D) - + + + - + - + - + 22% 55% 50 50%

Baltimore City & Baltimore County
8 Katherine Kaimiser (D) - + + + - + - + - + 56% 74% 76 73%
8 James P. Peters, Jr. (D) - + + + - + - + - + 80% 90% 90 90%
8 Alfred W. Redmer, Jr. (R) - + + + - + - + - + 89% 90% 92 89%

Baltimore County
9A Wade Kach (R) - + + + - + - + - + 89% 88% 88 80%
9B Martha S. Slima (R) - + + + - + - + - + 100% 95% 96 89%
9C Emi P. Pellec (R) - + + + - + - + - + 100% 100% 100 98%

Baltimore City & Baltimore County
10 Emmett C. Burns, Jr. (D) - + + + - + - + - + 25% 45% 45 51%
10 Adrienne Jones (D) - + + + - + - + - + 13% 27% 15 15%
10 Shirley Nathan–Pallin (D) - + + + - + - + - + 11% 24% 4 53%

Baltimore County
11 Michael J. Faulfier (D) - + + + - + - + - + 15% 53% 13 55%
11 Dan K. Mortram (D) - + + + - + - + - + 22% 35% 20 44%
11 Robert A. Zolkic (ID) - + + + - + - + - + 22% 53% 13 55%

Baltimore & Howard Counties
12A James E. Malone, Jr. (D) - + + + - + - + - + 45% 54% 60 59%
12B Donald L. Murphy (R) - + + + - + - + - + 86% 86% 85 88%

Howard & Prince George’s Counties
13A Sharon Pendergrass (D) - + + + - + - + - + 33% 43% 43 47%
13B Frank S. Turner (D) - + + + - + - + - + 11% 31% 11 58%

Howard & Montgomery Counties
14A Ted Dooling Shire (D) - + + + - + - + - + 33% 28% 37 28%
14B Carl H. Bates (R) - + + + - + - + - + 100% 100% 100 99%
14C Robert L. Flanagan (R) - + + + - + - + - + 89% 85% 82 80%

Montgomery County
15A John C. Croce (R) - + + + - + - + - + 67% 55% 62 70%
15B Richard A. La Vo (R) - + + + - + - + - + 100% 88% 88 90%
15C Mark S. Silver (D) - + + + - + - + - + 42% 51% 42 42%
16 William A. Bronson (D) - + + + - + - + - + 36% 36% 22 36%
16 Marilyn Goldwater (D) - + + + - + - + - + 25% 59% 51 48%
16 Susan Lee (D) - + + + - + - + - + 11% 13% 0 0%
17 Kumar P. Bave (D) - + + + - + - + - + 50% 45% 43 49%
17 Michael R. Gordon (D) - + + + - + - + - + 56% 49% 53 45%
17 Cheryl C. Kagan (D) - + + + - + - + - + 44% 46% 48 49%
18 Loevett Billings (D) - + + + - + - + - + 0% 18% 1 26%
18 Sharon Greshfield (D) - + + + - + - + - + 10% 20% 2 27%
18 John A. Hurson (D) - + + + - + - + - + 33% 53% 13 40%
19 Henry B. Heller (D) - + + + - + - + - + 25% 36% 22 42%
20 Adrienne A. Mandel (D) - + + + - + - + - + 36% 28% 7 37%
20 Carol S. Pensold (D) - + + + - + - + - + 40% 48% 51 51%
20 Dana Lee Dembrov (D) - + + + - + - + - + 20% 39% 51 44%
20 Peter Franchot (D) - + + + - + - + - + 44% 42% 39 58%
20 Sheila Ellis-Bisson (D) - + + + - + - + - + 25% 38% 27 41%

Prince George’s County
21 Barbara Frush (D) - + + + - + - + - + 24% 35% 20 57%
21 Pauline H. Menes (D) - + + + - + - + - + 10% 28% 7 54%
21 Brian R. Moe (D) - + + + - + - + - + 25% 29% 9 31%
22 Howard L. Gathan (D) - + + + - + - + - + 22% 22% 3 3%
22 Anne Healy (D) - + + + - + - + - + 33% 36% 22 58%
23 Barbara L. Ralston (D) - + + + - + - + - + 33% 38% 27 55%
23 Mark A. Gunney (D) - + + + - + - + - + 43% 43% 55 55%
23 James W. Huhudard (D) - + + + - + - + - + 11% 17% 1 25%
24 Joan P. Pitkin (D) - + + + - + - + - + 33% 29% 9 16%
24 Joanne C. Benson (D) - + + + - + - + - + 20% 36% 22 59%
24 Carolyn B. Bowler (D) - + + + - + - + - + 38% 38% 27 42%
24 Darren M. Swain (D) - + + + - + - + - + 36% 46% 53 46%
25 Anthony G. Brown (D) - + + + - + - + - + 50% 48% 53 46%
26 Derek Davis (D) - + + + - + - + - + 38% 45% 45 49%
26 Melody G. Griffith (D) - + + + - + - + - + 44% 43% 40 43%
26 Berry Hill (D) - + + + - + - + - + 50% 50% 50 50%
26 Obe Paterson (D) - + + + - + - + - + 53% 51% 11 58%
26 David M. Valderrama (D) - + + + - + - + - + 33% 41% 36 42%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anne Arundel, Calvert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harford County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecil &amp; Harford Counties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline, Dorchester, Talbot &amp; Wicomico Counties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset, Wicomico &amp; Worcester Counties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore City &amp; Baltimore County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore City &amp; Baltimore County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MARYLAND HOUSE OF DELEGATES**

Please refer to page 6 for a full description of each vote.

| Year | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 2002 MBRG | 1999-2002 MBRG % | 1999-2002 Percentile | MBRG Cumulative % |
|------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|
| .... |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |            |                   |                   |                  |

Maryland Business for Responsive Government
**2002 House Vote Descriptions**

**SB 235 - Administration Education - Negotiations Between Public School Employers and Employee Organizations**

See Senate Vote 3 on page 2 for a description of SB 235. A "+" indicates a vote against SB 235 and reflects MBRG's opposition to legislation that strengthens labor and weakens Maryland's public school education systems. Disagreeing with MBRG's position, the House approved SB 235, 120-17, on April 5, 2002 at 12:55 p.m.

**SB 522 - Delegate Bobo The Budget Reconciliation and Financing Act of 2002 - Amendment**

Amends SB 522 by delaying the maximum tax rate cut until tax years after December 31, 2002. In 1997, the State approved a 10 percent reduction in the personal income tax to be phased in over five years with the final two percent cut in 2002. The state income tax rate is a primary factor for businesses considering expansion or relocation, and predictability of the law is an essential element of a good business climate. A "+" indicates a vote against the amendment to SB 522 and reflects MBRG's opposition to legislation that increases the tax burden on Maryland's citizens and businesses and hinders Maryland's competitiveness with neighboring states. Agreeing with MBRG's position, the House rejected the amendment to SB 522, 24-108, on March 26, 2002 at 12:13 p.m.

**SB 610 – Senator Della Procurement - Debarment - Violations of Law**

See Senate Vote 8 on page 2 for a description of SB 610. A "+" indicates a vote against SB 610 and reflects MBRG's opposition to legislation that limits participation in the State procurement process. Agreeing with MBRG's position, the House Commerce and Government Matters Committee rejected SB 610, 6-20, on April 4, 2002.

**SB 856 Senator Hoffman Bridge to Excellence in Public Schools Act**

See Senate Vote 11 on page 7 for a description of SB 856. However, the house amended SB 856 to require the Maryland General Assembly to pass a joint resolution in the 2004 session to continue the appropriation of additional state aid to education. A "+" indicates a vote against SB 856 and reflects MBRG's opposition to punitive and excessive tax increases. Disagreeing with MBRG's position, the House approved SB 856, 91-49, on April 5, 2002 at 4:25 p.m.

**HJ 10 – Delegate Taylor State Highways - Intercounty Connector - Restart of Environmental Impact Statement Process**

See Senate Vote 1, SJ 8, on page 2 for a description of HJ 10. A "+" indicates a vote for HJ 10 and reflects MBRG's support for a resolution to explore ways to improve Maryland's transportation system. Agreeing with MBRG's position, the House approved HJ 10, 106-25, on March 20, 2002 at 11:54 a.m.

**HB 5 – Delegate Hurson Environmental Stewardship – Judicial Review - Title V Operating Permits**

See Senate Vote 5, SB 248, on page 2 for a description of HB 5, its companion bill. A "+" indicates a vote for HB 5 and reflects MBRG's opposition to legislation that limits costs and creates new regulatory compliance for Maryland business. Agreeing with MBRG's position, the House approved HB 5, 134-0, on January 22, 2002 at 10:17 a.m.

**HB 291 – Administration Community Right to Know Fund**

See Senate Vote 12 on page 7 for a description of HB 291. A "+" indicates a vote against HB 291 and reflects MBRG's opposition to legislation that unnecessarily duplicates federal laws and creates new fees. Disagreeing with MBRG's position, the House approved HB 291, 79-57, on April 3, 2002 at 12:57 p.m.

**HB 480 – Delegate Riley Procurement - Construction Contracts - Maryland Construction Quality Assurance Act**

Authorizes a subjective contracting method of procurement for construction contracts known as "competitive best value contracting." This bill awards contracts over $2.5 million using the following criteria and weights: (70%) cost performance; (15%) management plan; (5%) project staffing plan; and, fulfillment of minority business participation goals (7%). The best value contracting method will increase the cost of projects, prolong the procurement phase, and place small businesses with limited staff and financial resources at a disadvantage. Most importantly, best value contracting subverts the objective criteria used in the competitive sealed bidding method of procurement and awards construction contracts to companies that do not offer the lowest bid. A "+" indicates a vote against HB 480 and reflects MBRG's opposition to the procurement method. Agreeing with MBRG's position, the House Commerce and Government Matters Committee rejected HB 480, 841-2, on March 9, 2002.

**HB 495 – Delegate Branch Department of Human Resources – Welfare Reform and Child Support Enforcement – Repeal of Sunset**

See Senate Vote 13 on page 7 for a description of HB 495. A "+" indicates a vote for HB 495 and reflects MBRG's support for legislation that authorizes the privatization of government services. Agreeing with MBRG's position, the House approved HB 495, 85-14, on March 8, 2002 at 12:30 p.m.

**HB 521 – Delegate Krysiaik Property and Casualty Insurance – Use of Credit History – Prohibition**

Prohibits an insurance company from using the credit history of applicants or existing customers to cancel, refuse to renew, or refuse to underwrite or rate a personal lines property and casualty insurance risk. The bill applies to policies and contracts issued, delivered, or renewed on or after July 1, 2002. This bill creates one of the most restrictive statutes in the country on insurer use of credit information. Insurers use credit history to help make fair and objective underwriting decisions. By preventing insurers from accurately predicting future losses, this bill unnecessarily restricts an insurer's ability to appropriately price its products to fairly allocate the cost of coverage based on a consumer's claim potential. A "+" indicates a vote against HB 521 and reflects MBRG's opposition to legislation that eliminates a requirement that insures must use underwriting information to set rates. Disagreeing with MBRG's position, the House approved HB 521, 118-19, on March 22, 2002 at 1:42 p.m. Subsequently, the Senate approved HB 521 with amendments, and the bill was signed into law on May 16, 2002.

**HB 557 – Delegate Healey Recordation and Transfer Taxes - Transfers of Controlling Interests**

See Senate Vote 14 on page 7 for a description of HB 557. A "+" indicates a vote against HB 557 and reflects MBRG's opposition to legislation that creates new taxes and places Maryland's commercial real estate business at a competitive disadvantage with neighboring states. Disagreeing with MBRG's position, the House approved HB 557, 90-99, on March 25, 2002 at 8:02 p.m.

**HB 1052 – Delegate Zirkin The Chemical Security Act**

Requires chemical manufacturers and railroads to install fences, walls, cameras, patrols, or other facility monitoring technologies or services to secure hazardous materials within their facilities. After analyzing the security of their facilities and implementing improvements, these businesses are required to submit safety improvement reports every three years to the Maryland Department of Environment (MDE). Violations may result in formidable civil administrative, and/or criminal penalties as well as the suspension, revocation, or denial of MDE permits. Federal laws such as the Clean Air Act and the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act already require owners and operators of facilities storing hazardous materials to prepare risk management plans, to design and maintain a safe facility, and to take appropriate protective measures when shipping hazardous materials. The requirements established by this bill will greatly increase costs for Maryland businesses compared to competitors in other states. A "+" indicates a vote against HB 1052 and reflects MBRG's opposition to legislation that exceeds federal standards and overregulates an industry. Disagreeing with MBRG's position, the House Judiciary Committee approved HB 1052, 37-21, on March 19, 2002. However, the bill was jointly assigned to the House Environmental Matters Committee, which took no action on the bill.

Del. Van T. Mitchell (D)

As of veteran Democrats (at least four years service) in this Carroll County Republican achieved the highest MBRG cumulative score (94) of all 188 legislators.
A Message to Our Legislators
Before introducing or voting on legislation, we encourage legislators to consider the following questions:

1. Would the legislation increase the cost of doing business for companies in Maryland?
2. Would the legislation and subsequent regulations be more stringent than, or contradictory to, federal law and regulations, or would it give Maryland a competitive disadvantage with other states?
3. Would the legislation discourage companies from adding new jobs or keeping current jobs in Maryland?
4. Would the legislation discourage individuals and/or businesses from investing, building, owning or renting property, or selling and buying goods and services in Maryland?
5. Would the legislation interfere in the competitive market by imposing legal, economic and/or regulatory burdens, taxes, or costs?
6. Is there another way to solve the problem or address the issue without legislation?
7. Would merely introducing the bill send a negative message about Maryland’s business climate?
8. Would the legislation discourage individuals from purchasing products or services in Maryland?
9. Would the legislation discourage businesses from investing, building, owning or renting property, or selling and buying goods and services in Maryland?
10. Would the legislation impose a substantial tax burden on a small percentage of Maryland citizens in order to help fund a $1.5 billion increase in education funding over the next five years.
11. In effect, it will actually reduce tobacco tax revenues, because it will reduce the number of smokers and/or drive cigarette purchasers out of state. It also makes a promise to education that the Maryland General Assembly has no means of keeping.
12. A “+” indicates a vote against SB 856 and reflects MBRG’s opposition to legislation that overburdens and benders the competitiveness of many Maryland businesses. Agreeing with MBRG’s position, the Senate Finance Committee rejected SB 856, 5-5, on March 14, 2002.
13. The bill was signed into law on May 16, 2002. A “+” indicates a vote against HB 291 and reflects MBRG’s opposition to legislation that unnecessarily duplicates federal laws and creates new fees. Disagreeing with MBRG’s position, the Senate approved HB 291, 36-11, on April 3, 2002 at 11:08 a.m. Subsequently, the House approved SB 856 with amendments and the bill was signed into law on May 6, 2002.
14. The bill extends the tax to transactions that do not affect land record or title to property. The new tax applies to transactions such as the issuance of equity interests by a real estate entity, stockholders or partner buyouts, and other ordinary business transactions among businesses and persons owning real estate.

To Order Additional FREE copies of Roll Call
Wide distribution helps hold our elected officials accountable to business!
To distribute Roll Call to your employees, members, customers, or friends, simply complete and return the following information:

Name ______________________________
Company ___________________________
Address* ___________________________
City, State, Zip ______________________
Telephone __________________________

Please return to MBRG, 10 Light Street, Suite 300B, Baltimore, MD 21202 or fax to 410-539-3126. Or send your request via email to: MBRG@erols.com.

* A street address is required to accommodate UPS delivery.

2002 Senate Vote Descriptions (continued from page 2)
How the Bills Are Selected

To determine an accurate picture of the Maryland legislature's collective and individual attitudes toward business and economic growth, MBRG's 25-member State Advisory Council selects those bills from the last General Assembly session having practical or philosophical importance to the widest possible range of Maryland businesses, trade associations, and chambers of commerce.

In order to arrive at the most accurate measure of the legislature's position on business matters, we include bills taken from different stages of the legislative process: final (third reader) votes, committee votes, and votes on amendments and critical motions. We may at times omit a particular piece of legislation due to the lack of a strong consensus about it in the business community.

Although this evaluation process summarizes a legislative system which involves weeks of debate, amendment, and compromise, voting records remain the best indicator of a legislator's inclination. MBRG neither gives pass/fail scores nor expressly or implicitly endorses or rejects any incumbent on the basis of certain selected votes.

A complete evaluation of the positions of all members of the General Assembly should be made by examining committee and floor votes, and unrecorded matters as performance on subcommittees and constituent service.

As it has since 1986, MBRG includes bills in Roll Call that also are prominent in the Maryland Chamber of Commerce's annual Business Agenda. By incorporating this additional information, Roll Call can depict which bills were defined clearly to legislators as important business legislation. Although not all of the votes on Business Agenda bills appear in this evaluation, those that do are shaded in yellow and are weighted equally with other floor and committee votes.

Roll Call is intended to foster an environment for successful economic enterprise, based on responsible growth, in the belief that this pursuit underlies all other social progress.

A Word About MBRG

MBRG's purpose is to inform Maryland's business community, elected officials, and the general public about the political and economic environment needed to foster economic development and job creation in Maryland.

Annual evaluations of the voting records of Maryland's state and federal legislators enable MBRG to hold politicians accountable for the state's economic well-being like no other organization.

MBRG is a statewide, nonpartisan political research and education organization supported by corporations, trade associations, chambers of commerce, and individuals.

MBRG Membership Application

Please photocopy and mail.

Name__________________________
Title__________________________
Company_______________________
Address________________________
City________________ State________ Zip Code_____
Phone__________________________ Fax________________
E-Mail________________________

Please consider the following criteria in selecting an appropriate level of membership: gross revenues, net earnings, number of employees, presence in state, and commitment to MBRG's purpose.

☐ Trustees' Circle $15,000  ☐ President $2,500  ☐ Supporter $1,000
☐ Director $10,000  ☐ Leadership $1,500  ☐ Member $250
☐ Chairman $5,000  ☐ Benefactor $1,000  ☐ Contributor $50-249

Enclosed is a check in the amount of $________________________

For more information visit our web site: http://www.mbrg.org or call 410-547-1295.

 Contributions and dues to MBRG are not tax-deductible as charitable contributions; however, they may be tax-deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses.
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Since Governor Glendening took office during FY1995, Maryland's operating budget grew by more than $8 billion, reflecting a 61 percent increase.

*Maryland's fiscal year runs from July 1 to June 30.