93-0354

CIFE DE OFTHE STATE AUDITOR

1992 FOUND GOVERNMENT LOBBYING EXPENDITURES

. .

> MARK B. DAYTON STATE AUDITOR

The Office of the State Auditor is a Constitutional Office which serves as a watchdog for Minnesota taxpayers and helps to assure integrity, accountability, and cost-effectiveness in government throughout the state.

Through financial, compliance, and special audits, the Office of the State Auditor helps to assure that local governments hold themselves to the highest standards of integrity. The Office works actively with local government officials to find more efficient and cost effective ways to spend tax dollars.

The Office performs approximately 320 audits per year. The State Auditor has oversight responsibilities for 4,300 units of local governments throughout the state. The local units of government include:

- 1803 townships
- 855 cities
- 429 educational districts
- 87 counties
- 703 police and fire relief association funds
- 145 housing and redevelopment authorities
- 22 port authorities
- 91 soil and water conservation districts
- 150 (approximate) special districts

Through its reports and research, the Office helps local governments to find new ways to provide essential services more economically and efficiently in order that they may respond to growing needs with limited financial resources.

The State Auditor serves on the State Executive Council, State Board of Investment, Land Exchange Board, Public Employee's Retirement Association Board, Minnesota Housing Finance Agency, and Rural Finance Administration Board.

1992 LOCAL GOVERNMENT LOBBYING EXPENDITURES

Prepared by the Research & Information Division Office of the State Auditor May 5, 1993

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Report on the lobbying expenditures of Minnesota counties, cities, school districts and metropolitan agencies is prepared in accordance with Minnesota Statute (1992) § 6.76. The statute requires local governments to report their lobbying expenditures to the Office of the State Auditor on an annual basis. The report also summarizes lobbying expenditures of various local government organizations that are funded through membership dues paid by local governments.

Many state policies established by the Minnesota Legislature have a direct impact on Minnesota's local governments. Therefore, it is appropriate that local governments work with the Legislature in the development of these laws. This Report is not intended to question the appropriate role of local governments in the state's legislative process. Instead, it is intended to inform Minnesota citizens on the amount spent by their local governments to influence the development of state policies.

A SUMMARY OF 1992 LOCAL GOVERNMENT LOBBYING EXPENDITURES

During 1992, Minnesota local governments reported \$2,111,709 in direct lobbying expenditures. A direct lobbying expenditure is the amount paid directly to a local government employee or a contract lobbyist for the purpose of lobbying the Legislature or a state administrative agency.

In addition to the direct lobbying expenditures of local governments, 23 organizations representing multiple local governments filed reports with the State Ethical Practices Board that disclosed lobbying expenditures ranging from \$500 to \$500,000 each. The cumulative total expenditures of these 23 organizations ranged from \$1,157,009 to \$3,050,000.¹ Therefore, the total amount of 1992 local tax dollars spent on lobbying the state Legislature by local governments and local governments are not required to report administrative overhead expenditures related to legislative lobbying, the actual cost of legislative lobbying by local governments may be much higher than what is reported here.

Fifty-five of Minnesota's cities, counties, school districts, special districts and metropolitan agencies have opted to directly employ staff and/or contract lobbyists to lobby the Legislature on their behalf. These 55 local government entities account for slightly less than 4 percent of the total number of cities, counties, educational districts, and special purpose districts throughout the state. Five of the 55 local governments reported over \$100,000 in lobbying expenditures, for a combined total of \$947,793 - accounting for nearly half of all direct lobbying expenditures by local governments.

¹The State Ethical Practices Board reporting requirement does not require lobbying organizations to report a specific expenditure amount. These organizations report their expenditures using broad ranges, and therefore, a precise amount of total lobbying expenditures for these organizations can not be determined.

Direct expenditures by local government entities for lobbying the Legislature included me use of hired contract lobbyists and local government employees. Approximately 53 percent (\$1,123,869) of the total direct lobbying expenditures were made to various contract lobbyists. The remaining 47 percent (\$987,840) of the expenditures were made to employees of 20 government entities to lobby on behalf of the local unit of government.

OTHER LOBBYING EXPENDITURES ON BEHALF OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

While 55 local government entities have opted to pay lobbyists directly to lobby on their behalf, most local governments rely on various local government organizations to represent them at the Legislature.

Twenty-three local government organizations reported lobbying expenditures to the State Ethical Practices Board. Total cummulative spending by these 23 organizations ranged from \$1,157,009 to \$3,050,000. Eleven of the 23 organizations represented the interests of school districts; five of the 23 organizations represented the interests of cities; four of the 23 organizations represented the interests of counties; and three organizations represented other local government interests.

SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS

While compiling data and conducting our analysis, we noted the following findings.

- o A large number of local government organizations represent local government interests at the Legislature. Local governments may want to evaluate the actual need for this many organizations representing their interests at the Legislature. With that many organizations speaking on behalf of local governments, it is important that, at a minimum, the organizations speak with a unified voice on those issues upon which they agree.
- O Reports on lobbying expenditures made by local government entities understate the actual amount of tax dollars spent by local governments for legislative lobbying. Lobbying expenditures that are not reported to the State Auditor include all administrative overhead, including the cost of support staff, rent, telephones, supplies and equipment and the assistance of other local government employees who are not required to be included in the local government's lobbying expenditures Report.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that Minnesota Statute § 6.76 be amended to require local governments to estimate, and report to the State Auditor, the amount of overhead expenditures they have relative to legislative lobbying activities. Furthermore, local government organizations should also be required to report their specific lobbying expenditures to the State Auditor. This new reporting requirement should reflect the reporting standard established for all units of local governments, thereby enabling the State Auditor to compile a report to the Legislature that identifies the actual total cost of Lobbying by local units of Government.

PREFACE

This Report on the lobbying expenditures of Minnesota counties, cities, school districts and metropolitan agencies is prepared in accordance with Minnesota Statute (1992) § 6.76. The statute states:

"LOCAL GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES FOR LOBBYISTS.

On or before January 31, 1990, and each year thereafter, all counties, cities, school districts, metropolitan agencies, regional railroad authorities, and the regional transit board shall report to the state auditor, on forms prescribed by the auditor, their estimated expenditures paid for the previous calendar year to a lobbyist as defined in section 10A.01, subdivision 11, and to any staff person not registered as a lobbyist but who spends over 25 percent of his or her time during the legislative session on legislative matters."

The Office of the State Auditor has collected and published this data for lobbying expenditures made by local governments during calendar years 1989 through 1991. This Report summarizes local government lobbying expenditures during calendar year 1992. Due to a change in methodology, the data in the 1992 Report is not comparable to data for prior years.

Data for this Report was collected from local governments by the Research and Information Division of the Office of the State Auditor. Data on lobbying expenditures of local government organizations was collected from reports filed by the organizations with the State Ethical Practices Board.

In December, a lobbying reporting form (See Appendix A) was mailed to all local governments that have reported lobbying expenditures during the past three years. A review of individual lobbyist registrations with the State Ethical Practices Board identified additional local governments that have paid individuals to lobby on their behalf during 1992. The lobbying expenditures are the amounts reported by the local governments; the Office of the State Auditor did not attempt to verify the accuracy of those amounts. We did cross-reference our data with data collected by the State Ethical Practices Board, which requires lobbyists, and organizations that pay lobbyists, to file periodic reports.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT LOBBYING IN 1992

INTRODUCTION

This Report on the lobbying expenditures of Minnesota counties, cities, school districts and metropolitan agencies is prepared in accordance with Minnesota Statute (1992) § 6.76. The Statute requires local governments to report their lobbying expenditures to the Office of the State Auditor on an annual basis.

The Report focuses on the amount paid directly to local government employees and contract lobbyists who lobby the Minnesota Legislature and administrative agencies. The Report also summarizes lobbying expenditures of various local government organizations that are funded through membership dues paid by local governments. While these organizations are not required to file lobbying expenditure reports with the State Auditor, the Office of the State Auditor was able to obtain summary expenditure data from the State Ethical Practices Board.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT LOBBYING IN 1992

Many state policies, appropriations and tax laws established by the Minnesota Legislature and state administrative agencies have a direct impact on Minnesota's local governments. Therefore, it is appropriate that local governments work with the Legislature and administrative agencies in the development of these laws and administrative rules. This Report is not intended to question the appropriate role of local governments in the state's legislative and administrative processes. Instead, it is intended to inform Minnesota citizens on the amount spent by their local governments to influence the development of state policies.

This Report will focus on the local government lobbying expenditures made during 1992. Specifically, the Report will:

- o summarize the total amount spent directly by local governments for lobbying the Legislature and administrative agencies, including a discussion of the number of local governments that recorded lobbying expenditures;
- o categorize the direct local government lobbying expenditures by the amount spent on contract lobbyists and the amount spent on local government employees who spend over 25 percent of their time during the legislative session on legislative matters;
- o identify the local governments that recorded the highest lobbying expenditures during 1992;
- o report the amount spent by local government organizations that lobby the Legislature on behalf of local governments; and

1

identify the amount collected by contract lobbyists who are hired directly by various local governments to lobby the Legislature on issues affecting those local units of government.

0

A SUMMARY OF 1992 LOCAL GOVERNMENT LOBBYING EXPENDITURES

During 1992, Minnesota local governments reported \$2,111,709 in direct lobbying expenditures.² A direct lobbying expenditure is the amount paid directly to a local government employee or a contract lobbyist for the purpose of lobbying the Legislature or a state administrative agency. Direct lobbying expenditures do not include dues and membership fees paid to local government organizations, even though the local government organizations spend a portion of those dues and membership fees for lobbying activities.

In addition to the direct lobbying expenditures of local governments, 23 local government organizations filed reports with the State Ethical Practices Board that disclosed lobbying expenditures ranging from \$500 to \$500,000 each. Based on the expenditure ranges reported to the Ethical Practices Board, the cumulative total expenditures of these 23 organizations during 1992 ranged from \$1,157,009 to \$3,050,000. Therefore, based on reports filed with the State Auditor and the State Ethical Practices Board, the total amount of 1992 local tax dollars spent on lobbying the state Legislature by local governments and local governments are not required to report administrative overhead expenditures related to legislative lobbying, the actual cost of legislative lobbying by local governments may be much higher than what is reported here.

DIRECT LOBBYING EXPENDITURES OF MINNESOTA LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Fifty-five of Minnesota's cities, counties, school districts, special districts and metropolitan agencies have opted to directly employ staff and/or contract lobbyists to lobby the Legislature on their behalf. The 55 local government entities included:

o twenty-two cities that reported a combined total of \$781,309 in direct lobbying expenditures;

o fourteen counties that reported a combined total of \$633,602 in direct lobbying expenditures;

2

² Due to an improved methodology in reporting local government lobbying expenditures, the 1992 expenditures are not comparable to lobbying expenditures reported in previous years. While the law requires local governments to report the total annual cost of salaries and benefits of employees who spend time on legislative issues, local governments contend that these figures artificially inflate their total lobbying expenditures. Therefore, this year local governments were asked to report the percentage of an employee's time spent on legislative issues. This percentage was then used to prorate the total annual salary and benefit expenditures of the employee as a means of determining the amount of their total compensation related to legislative issues. See Appendix B for the total amount of salaries and benefits paid to local government employees who spend more than 25 percent of their time during the legislative session on legislative issues.

- o nine school districts or other educational entities that reported a combined total of \$253,281 in direct lobbying expenditures;
- o six metropolitan agencies that reported a combined total of \$352,310 in direct lobbying expenditures; and
- o four special purpose districts that reported a combined total of \$91,207 in direct lobbying expenditures.

These 55 local government entities account for slightly less than 4 percent of the total number of cities, counties, educational districts, and special purpose districts throughout the state.

Five of the 55 local governments reported over \$100,000 in lobbying expenditures, for a combined total of \$947,793. These five local governments account for 44.9 percent of the total direct local government lobbying expenditures. The five local governments are:

Minneapolis (\$327,908)	Ramsey County (\$130,084)
Hennepin County (\$224,783)	Metropolitan Airports Commission (\$108,177)
Saint Paul (\$156,841)	

(See Table 1 on page 8 for a complete list of all local governments which reported direct lobbying expenditures to the State Auditor.)

Direct Lobbying Expenditures For Contract Lobbyists And Local Government Employees

Direct expenditures by local government entities for lobbying the Legislature included the use of hired contract lobbyists and local government employees. During 1992:

- o eleven local units of government hired contract lobbyists and used their employees for lobbying the Legislature;
- o nine local units of government relied entirely upon their employees to represent them at the Legislature; and
- o thirty-five units of government relied entirely upon contract lobbyists to represent them at the Legislature.

Approximately 53 percent (\$1,123,869) of the total direct lobbying expenditures were made to various contract lobbyists. The remaining 47 percent (\$987,840) of the expenditures were made to employees of 20 government entities to lobby on behalf of the local unit of government.

The \$1,123,869 expended by Minnesota local governments for contract lobbyists was received by 34 contract lobbyists or lobbying firms. Six lobbyists/firms received \$50,000 or more from local governments. These six lobbyists/firms received a combined total of \$483,394, accounting for 43 percent of all contract lobbying expenditures by Minnesota local governments.

The six contract lobbyists are:

Messerli & Kramer (\$184,282) Ronald A. Jerich & Associates (\$76,850) Ronald Soberg (\$62,650) Mary Gilbert (\$57,096) Barry Tilley (\$52,516) Best & Flanagan (\$50,000)

(See Tables 2 through 4 on pages 13 through 22 for more detailed information on the direct expenditures of the 51 local units of government that filed reports with the State Auditor.)

OTHER LOBBYING EXPENDITURES ON BEHALF OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

While 55 local government entities have opted to pay lobbyists directly to lobby on their behalf, most local governments rely on various local government organizations to represent them at the Legislature. These local government organizations charge membership dues to individual local governments throughout the state. The amount of resources spent by these organizations on lobbying varies substantially from one organization to another; however, all organizations are required to file reports with the State Ethical Practices Board that summarize the amount spent on lobbying activities.

Twenty-three local government organizations reported lobbying expenditures to the State Ethical Practices Board.³ Total cummulative spending by these 23 organizations ranged from \$1,157,009 to \$3,050,000.⁴

o Eleven of the 23 organizations represented the interests of school districts;

o five of the 23 organizations represented the interests of cities;

o four of the 23 organizations represented the interests of counties; and

o three organizations represented other local government interests.

³The local government organizations identified in this report do not include various professional organizations, other than local government management associations, that lobby on behalf of specific professional occupations within local governments. For example, the Minnesota Education Association (MEA) is registered with the State Ethical Practices Board; however, since the organization does not specifically represent school districts, or school district management personnel, the MEA's lobbying expenditures are not included in this Report.

⁴The Ethical Practices Board requires organizations that lobby the Legislature to report their lobbying expenditures within a given range. Therefore, it is impossible to determine precisely how much was spent by these 23 organizations on legislative lobbying.

Among the 23 local government organizations that lobbied the Legislature on behalf of their local government members, five organizations reported lobbying expenditures in excess of \$150,000. These five organizations are:

The Association of Metropolitan Municipalities (\$150,001 to \$250,000) The Coalition of Greater Minnesota Cities (\$250,001 to \$500,000) The League of Minnesota Cities (\$250,001 to \$500,000) The Metropolitan Inter-County Association (\$150,001 to \$250,000) The Minnesota School Boards Association (\$150,001 to \$250,000)

(See Table 5 on page 23 for the complete list of the 23 local government organizations that filed lobbying expenditure reports with the State Ethical Practices Board, including the range of expenditures reported for each organization.)

SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS

While compiling data and conducting our analysis, the Office of the State Auditor noted the following findings.

o A large number of local government organizations represent local government interests at the Legislature. An analysis of the reports filed with the State Auditor, and the Ethical Practices Board records, identified 23 local government organizations and 55 local government entities that are lobbying on behalf of local governments. Local governments may want to evaluate the actual need for this many organizations representing their interests at the Legislature. With that many organizations speaking on behalf of local governments, it is important that, at a minimum, the organizations speak with a unified voice on those issues upon which they agree. The lobbying efforts of all local governments will be undermined if Legislators begin hearing conflicting messages from individual local government organizations.

 Reports to the State Ethical Practices Board do not require organizations to specifically report the amount they spend on lobbying. Instead, organizations are required to report their expenditures in broad spending categories. These categories are: \$500 to \$50,000; \$50,001 to \$150,000; \$150,001 to \$250,000; and \$250,001 to \$500,000. This reporting makes it impossible to provide a more precise cummulative total of lobbying expenditures by local government organizations.

o Reports on lobbying expenditures made by local government entities understate the actual amount of tax dollars spent by local governments for legislative lobbying. The Statute that requires local governments to report their lobbying expenditures to the State Auditor merely requires an accounting for amounts spent on employee compensation and expenses, and expenditures for contract lobbyists. Lobbying expenditures that are not reported to the State Auditor include all administrative overhead, including the cost of support staff, rent, telephones, supplies and equipment and the assistance of other local government employees who are not required to be included in the local government's lobbying expenditures Report. By

5

enacting a law requiring local governments to report their annual lobbying expenditures to the Office of the State Auditor, the Legislature clearly intended to inform itself and the public as to the amount being expended by their local governments on state lobbying activities. By omitting the administrative overhead expenses from the reporting requirement, local governments are not giving the public an accurate account of the total tax dollars spent on lobbying the Legislature.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that Minnesota Statute § 6.76 be amended to require local governments to estimate, and report to the State Auditor, the amount of overhead expenditures they have relative to legislative lobbying activities. Furthermore, local government organizations should also be required to report their specific lobbying expenditures to the State Auditor. This new reporting requirement should reflect the reporting standard established for all units of local governments, thereby enabling the State Auditor to compile a report to the Legislature that identifies the actual total cost of Lobbying by local units of Government.

DATA TABLES

NAME OF LOBBYIST/EMPLOYEE	TYPE	TOTAL COMPENSATION	TOTAL EXPENSES*	TOTAL SPENT
Aitkin County [1]				
John Ongaro	Employee	2,000	0	2,000
Anoka County				
Tammera Ericson	Employee	1,394	106	1,500
Charles R. Weaver	Lobbyist	5,000	0	5,000
Ronald A. Jerich & Assoc.	Lobbyist	30,000	0	30,000
Marcia Bennett	Employee	43,868	1,147	45,015
		82,262	1,253	<u> </u>
Anoka Co. Regional Railroad Authority				
Mary I. Richardson	Lobbyist	7,598	0	7,598
Anoka – Hennepin ISD 11				
Charles R. Weaver	Lobbyist	1,500	0	1,500
Brad Lundell	Lobbyist	18,000	0	18,000
Ronald A. Jerich & Assoc.	Lobbyist	24,100	0	24,100
Contron County [1]		43,600	0	43,600
Carlton County [1] John Ongaro	Employee	2,000	0	2,000
•			<u> Ango al a parte l'a dimenta postenga</u>	
City of Blaine	Tabbuint	6 000	0	6 000
Ronald A. Jerich & Assoc.	Lobbyist	6,000	0	6,000
City of Bloomington				
Messerli & Kramer	Lobbyist	3,763	72	3,835
Messerli & Kramer	Lobbyist	12,000	1,388	13,388
		15,763	1,460	17,223
City of Brooklyn Center				
Boland & Associates	Lobbyist	5,000	0	5,000
City of Brooklyn Park				
John Johnson	Lobbyist	30,000	0	
City of Burnsville				
Messerli & Kramer	Lobbyist	12,000	0	12,000
City of Duluth				
Bonnie Balach	Lobbyist	3,000	0	3,000
Richard Johnson	Lobbyist	13,870	Õ	13,870
Eugene J. Ranieri	Lobbyist	23,217	ŏ	23,217
	2.2009100	40,087	0	40,087
City of Eagan		<u></u>		<u>,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,</u>
John H. Herman/Steven L. Belton	Lobbyist	1,375	213	1,588
Messerli & Kramer	Lobbyist	1,375	1,388	13,388
MACSSCIII OC IMAIIICI	LOUDYISI	13,375	1,508	14,976
·		13,373	1,001	

Table 1 LOCAL GOVERNMENT LOBBYING EXPENDITURES FOR 1992

Note: [*] Total amount of expense reimbursements paid during 1992. [1] Contracts with St. Louis County for assistance from St. Louis County employee lobbyist.

Table 1 (continued) LOCAL GOVERNMENT LOBBYING EXPENDITURES FOR 1992

NAME OF LOBBYIST/EMPLOYEE	TYPE	TOTAL COMPENSATION	TOTAL EXPENSES*	TOTAL SPENT
City of Eden Prairie				
Messerli & Kramer	Lobbyist	12,000	500_	12,500
City of Edina		40.000	4.000	
Messerli & Kramer	Lobbyist	12,000	1.388	13,388
City of Fergus Falls Stan Breen	Labhriat	18,500	190	19 600
Stan Breen	Lobbyist	10,500		18,690
City of Minneapolis				
William J. Barnhart	Employee	14,381	243	14,624
Patty Holm	Employee	19,089	0	19,089
Richard Graves	Employee	34,060	400	34 ,46 0
Jim Casserli	Lobbyist	35,000	0	35,000
Andy Kozak	Lobbyist	42,000	0	42,000
Jeffrey A. Van Wychen	Employee	51,131	983	52,114
Andrea Hart Kajer	Employee	52,959	2,504	55,463
Mentor C. Addicks Jr.	Employee	73,486	1,672	75,158
		322,106	5,802	327,908
Minneapolis MCDA			_	
Bonnie Balach	Lobbyist	5,000	0	5,000
John Herman/Peter Bachman	Lobbyist	10,000	<u> </u>	10,000
Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board		15,000	0	15,000
David Johnson	Lobbyist	4,733	110	4,843
Joyce Nauman	Lobbyist	12,973	245	13,218
Brian Rice	Lobbyist	29,013	185	29,198
Dran Kic	Loooyist	46,719	540	47,259
City of Minnetonka				
Messerii & Kramer	Lobbyist	12,000	1,388	13,388
City of Moorhead				
Scott A. Hutchins	Employee	7,102	1,325	8,427
Briggs & Morgan	Lobbyist	10,031	0	10,031
		17,133	1,325	18,458
City of Plymouth Messerli & Kramer	Lobbyist	12,000	1,388	13,388
City of Richfield			<u>Act in a contraction of the co</u>	
Eugene J. Ranieri	Lobbyist	5,434	40	5,474
City of Rochester				•
James C. Erickson	Lobbyist	40,000	523	40,523
City of Roseville Messerli & Kramer	Lobbyist	10,048	1,172	11,220
City of Shoreview	<i>j</i>			
Messerli & Kramer	Lobbyist	7,474	<u>910</u>	8,384
		1000		

:		TOTAL	TOTAL	TOTAL
NAME OF LOB YIST/EMPLOYEE	TYPE	COMPENSATION	EXPENSES*	SPENT
City of St. Paul				
Bonnie Balach	Lobbyist	5,000	0	5,000
Patrick Boley	Employee	7,802	0	7,802
Darlyne Morrow	Employee	10,898	0	10,898
Larry Kitto	Lobbyist	19,400	0	19,400
Bonnie Balach	Employee	21,056	395	21,451
Julian Empson	Employee	32,064	255	32,319
Frank Ongaro	Employee	58,577	1,394	59,971
		154,797	2,944	156,841
City of Waconia				
Boland & Associates	Lobbyist	1,386	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
City of White Bear Lake				
Messerli & Kramer	Lobbyist	7,286	0	7,286
City of Woodbury				
Messerli & Kramer	Lobbyist	6,418	771	7,189
Cook County [1]	Employee	2.000	0	2 000
John Ongaro	Employee	2,000	0	2,000
Dakota County				
Barry Tilley	Lobbyist	50,000	2,516	52,516
Dakota County Technical College				
Roger J. Aronson	Lobbyist	13,333	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Duluth – ISD 709				
Ronald Soberg	Lobbyist	50,745	11,905	62,650
Hennepin County				<u></u>
Ronald F. Wiborg	Employee	8,926	636	9,562
Mary E. Davidson	Employee	44,089	785	44,874
Best & Flanagan	Lobbyist	50,000	0	50,000
Diane L Loeffler	Employee	56,962	954	57,916
James L. Stebler	Employee	61,711	720	62,431
	Linpioyee	221,688	3,095	224,783
Hennepin Technical College		2221,000		
Roger J. Arorson	Lobbyist	13,333	0	13,333
Itasca County [1]	•			
John Ongaro	Employee	2,000	0	2,000
	Employee	2,000		
Koochiching County [1]	. .	8 000	^	A A A A
John Ongaro	Employee	2,000	0	2,000
Lake County [1]				
John Ongaro	Employee	2,000	0	2,000

Table 1 (continued) LOCAL GOVERNMENT LOBBYING EXPENDITURES FOR 1992

Note: [*] Total amount of expense reimbursements paid during 1992. [1] Contracts with St. Louis County for assistance from St. Louis County employee lobbyist.

Table 1 (continued) LOCAL GOVERNMENT LOBBYING EXPENDITURES FOR 1992

NAME OF LOBBYIST/EMPLOYEE	TYPE	TOTAL COMPENSATION	TOTAL EXPENSES*	TOTAL SPENT
Metro Airports Commission				
David J. Dombrowski	Employee	52,115	1,134	53,249
Messerli & Kramer	Lobbyist	53,366	1,562	54,928
	•	105,481	2,696	108,177
Metro Council				
Janey Gohl	Employee	39,072	33	
				·····
Metro Sports Facilities Comm.	Tabbaiat	16 750	0	16 760
Ronald A. Jerich & Assoc.	Lobbyist Lobbyist	16,750	0	16,750
Lawrence Redmond	Lobbyist Lobbyist	33,250	0	33,250
Joseph O'Neill	Lobbyist	33,500	0	33,500
Metro Transit Commission		83,500	<u> </u>	83,500
Thomas H. Weaver	Employee	51 009	603	60 E01
Thomas FL. weaver	Employee	51,908	683	<u> </u>
Metro Waste Control Comm.				
Neil Haugerud	Lobbyist	1,035	0	1,035
Eunice Groschen	Employee	4,954	0	4,954
Neil Haugerud	Employee	7,350	0	7,350
	•••	13,339	0	13,339
Minneapolis Public Schools				
Linda Sandvig	Lobbyist	43,500	140	43,640
		and a substantiant of the second s		
New Prague – ISD 721	* abbalat	· •	1 000	4 000
Barb Baker	Lobbyist	0	1,082	1,082
N.E. Metro Intermediate School District 9	16			
Roger J. Aronson	Lobbyist	13,333	0	13,333
Olmsted County				
Amy Caucutt	Employee	12,742	<u> </u>	14,604
Ramsey County Board		· ·		
John Woedele	Employee	11,076	0	11,076
Wyman Spano	Lobbyist	36,348	ŏ	36,348
James Abts	Employee	39,018	ŏ	39,018
Terry Lindeke	Employee	41,842	1,800	43,642
Terry Landere	Linployee	128,284	1,800	130,084
Ramsey County Regional Rail Authority		160,609		
Wyman Spano/Sara Janacek	Lobbyist	5,000	0	5,000
Kathy DespiegeLaere	Employee	16,350	Ő	16,350
Turny Lospie German	Linpidyee	21,350	0	21,350
Region V Computer Service		<u> </u>	<u>`</u> _	
Roger J. Aronson	Lobbyist	5,214	0	5,214
		······································		<u></u>

Table 1 (continued) LOCAL GOVERNMENT LOBBYING EXPENDITURES FOR 1992

		TOTAL	TOTAL	TOTAL
NAME OF LOBBYIST/EMPLOYEE	TYPE	COMPENSATION	EXPENSES*	SPENT
Regional Transit Board				
Mike Robertson	Lobbyist	8,900	0	8,900
Sherry Munyon	Employee	46,608	50	46,698
•		55,508	90	55,598
Scott County	4			
Boland & Associates	Lobbyist		0	38,500
St. Louis County				
Harry Fisher	Lobbyist	22,116	0	22,116
John Ongaro	Employee	29,229	4,900	34,129
		51,345	4,900	56,245
St. Paul Public Schools				
Mary Gilbert	Lobbyist	57,000		57,096
Washington County				
Susan J. Ladwig	Lobbyist	23,240	115	23,355
TOTAL		2,058,401	53,308	2,111,709

Table 2

LOCAL GOVERNMENT LOBBYING EXPENDITURES FOR 1992 EMPLOYEE LOBBYISTS

	PRO-RATED			
	SALARY &	PERCENT	LOBBYING	TOTAL
NAME OF LOBBYIST	BENEFITS	OF TIME	EXPENSES	SPENT
Aitkin County [1]				
John Ongaro				2,000
Anoka County		. · · ·		
Marcia Bennett	43,868	63.2%	1,147	45,015
Tammera Ericson	1,394	100.0%	106	1,500
Anoka County Total	45,262	<u>NA</u>	1,253	46,515
Carlton County [1]				
John Ongaro				2,000
City of Minneapolis				
Andre - Hart Kajer	52,959	100.0%	2,504	55,463
Jeffrey A. Van Wychen	51,131	85.0%	983	52,114
Mentor C. Addicks Jr.	73,486	90.0%	1,672	75,158
Patty Holm	19,089	50.0%	. 0	19,089
Richard Graves	34,060	50.0%	400	34,460
William J. Barnhart	14,381	20.0%	243	14,624
City of Minneapolis Total	245,106	<u>NA</u>	5,802	250,908
City of Moorhead				
Scott A. Hutchins	7,102	11.6%	1,325	8,427
City of St. Paul			·	
Bonnie Balach	21,056	100.0%	395	21,451
Darlyne Morrow	10,898	25.0%	0	10,898
Frank Ongaro	58,577	67.0%	1,394	59,971
Julian Empson	32,064	60.0%	255	32,319
Patrick Boley	7,802	50.0%	0	7,802
City of St. Paul Total	130,397	NA	2,044	132,441
Cook County [1]				
John Ongaro				2,000
Hennepin County				
Diane L Loeffler	56,962	95.0%	954	57,916
James L. Stebler	61,711	80.0%	720	62,431
Mary E. Davidson	44,089	95.0%	785	44,874
Ronald F. Wiborg	8,926	15.0%	636	9,562
Hennepin County Total	171,688	<u>NA</u>	3,095	174,783

Note: [1] Contracts with St. Louis County for assistance from St. Louis County employee lobbyist.

Table 2 (continued) LOCAL GOVERNMENT LOBBYING EXPENDITURES FOR 1992 EMPLOYEE LOBBYISTS

	PRO-RATED SALARY &	PERCENT	LOBBYING	TOTAL
NAME OF LOBBYIST	BENEFITS	OF TIME	EXPENSES	SPENT
Itasca County [1]				
John Ongaro				2,000
Koochiching County [1]				
John Ongaro				2,000
				-
Lake County [1]				2.000
John Ongaro				2,000
Metro Airports Commission				
David J. Dombrowski	52,115	60.0%	1,134	53,249
Metro Council	20.032	88 0.01		20.102
Janey Gohl		55.0%	33	39,105
Metro Transit Commission				
Thomas H. Weaver	51,908	75.0%	683	. 52,591
		angingt a Windowski to at		
Metro Waste Control Comm.				
Eunice Groschen	4,954	10.0%	0	4,954
Neil Haugerud	7,350	10.0%	0	7,350
Metro Waste Control				
Commission Total	12,304	<u>NA</u>	<u> </u>	12,304
Olmsted County				
Amy Caucutt	12,742	33.0%	1,862	14,604
Ainy Caucut	169776			14,000
Ramsey County Board				
James Abts	39,018	50.0%	0	39,018
John Woedele	11,076	20.0%	0	11,076
Terry Lindeke	41,842	60.0%	1,800	43,642
Ramsey County Board Total	91,936	<u>NA</u>	1,800	<u>93,736</u>
Demons County Designed Dell Author	·			
Ramsey County Regional Rail Author Kathy DespiegeLaere	<u>16,350</u>	20.0%	0	16,350
Kathy DespiegeLacre	10_750			10,550
Regional Transit Board				
Sherry Munyon	46,608	80.0%	90_	46,698
St. Louis County				
John Ongaro	29,229_	45.0%	4,900	34,129
GRAND TOTAL	951,819	NA	24,021	987,840
				enter an individuality

Note: [1] Contracts with St. Louis County for assistance from St. Louis County employee lobbyist.

Table 3LOCAL GOVERNMENT LOBBYING EXPENDITURES FOR 1992CONTRACT LOBBYIST

	TOTAL	TOTAL	TOTAL
NAME OF LOBBYIST	COMPENSATION	EXPENSES*	SPENT
Anoka County Charles R. Weaver	5,000	0	5,000
Ronald A. Jerich & Assoc.	30,000	0	30,000
	35,000		
Anoka County Total		<u> </u>	35,000
Anoka Co. Regional Railroad Authority			
Mary I. Richardson	7,598	0	7,598
Anoka-Hennepin ISD 11			
Charles R. Weaver	1,500	0	1,500
Brad Lundell	18,000	0	18,000
Ronald A. Jerich & Assoc.	24,100	0	24,100
Anoka-Hennepin ISD 11 Total	43,600	0	43,600
City of Blaine	< 000	•	< 000
Ronald A. Jerich & Assoc.	6,000	0	6,000
City of Bloomington			
Messerli & Kramer	3,763	72	3,835
Messerli & Kramer	12,000	1,388	13,388
City of Bloomington Total	15,763	1,460	17,223
City of Brooklyn Center			
Boland & Associates	5,000	0	5,000
City of Brooklyn Bork			
City of Brooklyn Park	20.000	^	20.000
John Johnson	30,000	0	
City of Burnsville			
Messerli & Kramer	12,000	0	12,000
City of Duluth			
Bonnie Balach	3,000	0	3,000
Richard Johnson	13,870	0	13,870
Eugene J. Ranieri	23,217	0	23,217
City of Duluth Total	40,087	0	40,087
City of Eagan			
John Herman/Steven L. Belton	1,375	213	1,588
Messerli & Kramer	12,000	1,388	13,388
City of Eagan Total	13,375	1,601	14,976

Table 3 (continued) LOCAL GOVERNMENT LOBBYING EXPENDITURES FOR 1992 CONTRACT LOBBYIST

NAME OF LOBBYIST	TOTAL COMPENSATION	TOTAL EXPENSES*	TOTAL SPENT
City of Eden Prairie Messerli & Kramer	12,000	500	12,500
City of Edina Messerli & Kramer	12,000	1,388	13,388
City of Fergus Falls Stan Breen	18,500	190	18,690
City of Minneapolis Jim Casserli	35,000 42,000	0 0	35,000
Andy Kozak City of Minneapolis Total	77,000	0	42,000
City of Minnetonka Messerli & Kramer	12,000	1,388_	13,388
City of Moorhead Briggs & Morgan	10,031	0	10,031
City of Plymouth Messerli & Kramer	12,000	1,388_	13,388
City of Richfield Eugene J. Ranieri	5,434	40	5,474_
City of Rochester James C. Erickson	40,000	523	40,523
City of Roseville Messerli & Kramer	10,048	1,172	11,220
City of Shoreview Messerli & Kramer	7,474_	910	8,384
City of St. Paul	5 000	•	6 000
Bonnie Balach Larry Kitto	5,000 19,400	0	5,000 19,400
City of St. Paul Total	24,400	0	24,400
City of Waconia Boland & Associates	1,386	0	1,386
TOTALIA OF VISSOCIATES	1,300	<u> </u>	1,.700

Table 3 (continued) LOCAL GOVERNMENT LOBBYING EXPENDITURES FOR 1992 CONTRACT LOBBYIST

NAME OF LOBBYIST	TOTAL COMPENSATION	TOTAL EXPENSES*	TOTAL SPENT
City of White Bear Lake Messerli & Kramer	7,286	0	7,286
City of Woodbury Messerli & Kramer	6,418	771_	7,189
Dakota County Barry Tilley	50,000	2,516	52,516
Dakota County Technical College Roger J. Aronson	13,333	0	13,333
Duluth – ISD 709 Ronald Soberg	50,745	11,905	62,650
Hennepin County Best & Flanagan	50,000	0	50,000
Hennepin Technical College Roger J. Aronson	13,333	0	13,333
Metro Airports Commission Messerli & Kramer	53,366	1,562	54,928
Metro Sports Facilities Comm.			
Ronald A. Jerich & Assoc.	16,750	0	16,750
Lawrence Redmond	33,250	0	33,250
Joseph O'Neill	33,500	0	33,500
Metro Sports Facilities Commission Total	83,500	0	83,500
Metro Waste Control Comm.			
Neil Haugerud	1,035	0	1,035
Minneapolis MCDA			
Bonnie Balach	5,000	0	5,000
John Herman/Peter Bachman	10,000	0	10,000
Minneapolis MCDA Total	15,000	0	15,000

Table 3 (continued) LOCAL GOVERNMENT LOBBYING EXPENDITURES FOR 1992 CONTRACT LOBBYIST

NAME OF LOBBYIST	TOTAL COMPENSATION	TOTAL EXPENSES*	TOTAL SPENT
Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board			
David Johnson	4,733	110	4,843
Joyce Nauman	12,973	245	13,218
Brian Rice	29,013	185	29,198
Minneapolis Park and			
Recreation Board Total	46,719		47,259
Miuneapolis Public Schools		·	
Linda Sandvig	43,500	140_	43,640
New Prague – ISD 721			•
Barb Baker	<u> </u>	1,082	1,082_
N.E. Metro Intermediate School District 9	16		
Roger J. Aronson	13,333	0	13,333
Ramsey County Board			
Wyman Spano	36,348	0	36,348_
Ramsey County Regional Rail Authority			
Wyman Spano/Sara Janacek	5,000	0	5,000
Region V Computer Service			
Roger J. Aronson	5,214	0	5,214_
Regional Transit Board			
Mike Robertson	8,900_	0	8,900
Scott County			
Boland & Associates	38,500_	0	38,500
St. Louis County			
Harry Fisher	22,116	<u> </u>	22,116
St. Paul Public Schools			
Mary Gilbert	57,000	96	57,096
Washington County			•
Susan J. Ladwig	23,240	115	23,355
GRAND TOTAL	1,094,582	29,287	1,123,869

Table 4 LOCAL GOVERNMENT LOBBYING EXPENDITURES FOR 1992 CONTRACT LOBBYIST Sorted by Lobbyist

NAME OF ENTITY	TOTAL COMPENSATION	TOTAL EXPENSES*	TOTAL SPENT
Andy Kozak			
City of Minneapolis	42,000	<u> </u>	42,000
Barb Baker			
New Prague – ISD 721	0	1,082	1,082
New Mugue 100 /21	······		1,002
Barry Tilley			
Dakota County	50,000	2,516	<u> </u>
Best & Flanagan			
Hennepin County	50,000	0	50,000
Tiennepin County		<u>_</u>	
Boland & Associates			
City of Brooklyn Center	5,000	0	5,000
City of Waconia	1,386	0	1,386
Scott County	38,500	0	38,500
Total for Boland & Associates	44,886	0	44,886
Bonnie Balach			
City of Duluth	3,000	0	3,000
City of St Paul	5,000	0	5,000
Minneapolis MCDA	5,000	õ	5,000
Total for Bonnie Balach	13,000	<u> </u>	13,000
Brad Lundell			
Anoka–Hennepin ISD 11	18,000	0	18,000
Brian Rice	20.012	105	20 109
Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board	29,013	185	29,198
Briggs & Morgan			
City of Moorhead	10,031	0	10,031
•			
Charles R. Weaver			
Anoka County	5,000	0	5,000
Anoka-Hennepin ISD 11	1,500	0	1,500
Total for Charles R. Weaver	6,500	0	6,500
David Johnson			
Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board	4,733	110	4,843

Table 4 (continued) LOCAL GOVERNMENT LOBBYING EXPENDITURES FOR 1992 CONTRACT LOBBYIST Sorted by Lobbyist

NAME OF ENTITY	TOTAL COMPENSATION	TOTAL EXPENSES*	TOTAL SPENT
Eugene J. Ranieri City of Duluth City of Richfield	23,217 5,434	0 40	23,217 5,474
Total for Eugene J. Ranieri	28,651	40	28,691
Harry Fisher St. Louis County	22,116	0	22,116
James C. Erickson City of Rochester	40,000	523	40,523
Jim Casserli City of Minneapolis	35,000	0	35,000
John Herman/Peter Bachman Minneapolis MCDA City of Eagan	10,000 1,375	0 0	10,000 1,588
Total for John Herman/Steven L. Belton/Peter Bachman	11,375	213	11,588
John Johnson City of Brooklyn Park	30,000	0	
Joseph O'Neill Metro Sports Facilities Comm.	33,500	0	33,500
Joyce Nauman Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board	12,973	245	13,218
Larry Kitto City of St. Paul	19,400	0	19,400
Lawrence Redmond Metro Sports Facilities Comm.	33,250	0	33,250
Linda Sandvig Minneapolis Public Schools	43,500	140	43,640
Mary Gilbert St. Paul Public Schools	57,000	96_	57,096
Mary I. Richardson Anoka Co. Regional Railroad Authority	7,598	0	7,598

Table 4 (continued) LOCAL GOVERNMENT LOBBYING EXPENDITURES FOR 1992 CONTRACT LOBBYIST Sorted by Lobbyist

NAME OF ENTITY	TOTAL COMPENSATION	TOTAL EXPENSES*	TOTAL SPENT
Messerli & Kramer	<u></u>		
City of Minnetonka	12,000	1,388	13,388
City of Plymouth	12,000	1,388	13,388
City of Roseville	10,048	1,172	11,220
City of Shoreview	7,474	910	8,384
City of Woodbury	6,418	771	7,189
City of Bloomington	12,000	1,388	13,388
City of Bloomington	3,763	72	3,835
City of Burnsville	12,000	Ĉ	12,000
City of Eagan	12,000	1,388	13,388
City of Eden Prairie	12,000	500	12,500
City of Edina	12,000	1,388	13,388
City of White Bear Lake	7,286	0	7,286
Metro Airports Commission	53,366	1,562	54,928
Total for Messerli & Kramer	172,355	11,927	184,282
Mike Robertson			
Regional Transit Board	8,900	0	<u> </u>
Neil Hausenid			
Neil Haugerud Metro Waste Control Comm.	1 025		1 025
Men-, waste Control Comm.	1,035	<u></u>	1,035
Richard Johnson			
City of Duluth	13,870	0	13,870
	<u></u>		
Roger J. Aronson			
Dakota County Technical College	13,333	0	13,333
Hennepin Technical College	13,333	0	13,333
N.E. Metro Intermediate School District 916		0	13,333
Region V Computer Service	5,214	0	5,214
Total for Roger J. Aronson	45,213	0	45,213
Ronald A. Jerich & Assoc.	20.000	0	30,000
Anoka County	30,000	0	24,100
Anoka-Hennepin ISD 11	24,100 6,000	0	6,000
City of Blaine	16,750	0	16,750
Metro Sports Facilities Comm. Total for Ronald A. Jerich & Assoc.	76,850	0	76,850
I OTAL IOF ROHAID A. JETICH & ASSOC.	/0,030	<u> </u>	/0,030
Ronald Soberg			
Duluth – ISD 709	50,745	11,905	62,650

Table 4 (continued) LOCAL GOVERNMENT LOBBYING EXPENDITURES FOR 1992 CONTRACT LOBBYIST Sorted by Lobbyist

NAME OF ENTITY	TOTAL COMPENSATION	TOTAL EXPENSES*	TOTAL SPENT
Stan Breen City of Fergus Falls	18,500	190	18,690
Susan J. Ladwig Washington County	23,240	115	23,355
Wyman Spano/Sara Janacek			
Ramsey County Board	36,348	0	36,348
Ramsey County Regional Rail Authority	5,000	0	5,000
Total for Wyman Spano/Sara Janacek	41,348	0	41,348
GRAND TOTAL	1,094,582	29,287	1,123,869

Table 5PRINCIPAL LOBBYING REPORT FOR 1992

NAME OF ASSOCIATION	LOBBYING	J EX	PENSES
ASSOCIATION OF STABLE & GROWING SCHOOL DISTRICTS	50,001	TO	150,000
ASSOCIATION OF METROPOLITAN MUNICIPALITIES	150,001	то	250,000
ASSOCIATION OF METROPOLITAN SCHOOL DISTRICTS	50,001	TO	150,000
ASSOCIATION OF MINNESOTA COUNTIES	50,001	то	150,000
COALITION OF GREATER MN CITIES	250,001	ТО	500 ,000
ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, VOCATIONAL REGIONAL MANAGEMENT INFORMATION CENTERS	500	то	50,000
INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL DISTRICTS	500	то	50,000
LEAGUE OF MINNESOTA CITIES	250,001	то	500,000
METROPOLITAN INTER-COUNTY ASSOCIATION	150,601	ТО	250,000
MINNESOTA ASSOCIATION OF COUNTY OFFICERS	500	то	50,000
MINNESOTA ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS	500	ТО	50,000
MINNESOTA ASSOCIATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS	500	то	50,000
MINNESOTA ASSOCIATION OF SMALL CITIES	500	то	50,000
MINNESOTA ASSOCIATION OF TOWNSHIPS	500	то	50,000
MINNESOTA ASSOCIATION OF URBAN COUNTIES	500	ТО	50,000
MINNESOTA EDUCATION DISTRICT NETWORK	500	ТО	50,000
MINNESOTA EDUCATIONAL COOOPERATIVE SERVICE UNIT ASSOCIATION	500	то	50,000
MINNESOTA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS ASSOCIATION	500	TO	50,000
MINNESOTA ORGANIZATION FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION	500	то	50,000
MINNESOTA REGIONAL RAILROADS ASSOCIATION	500	то	50 ,000
MINNESOTA SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION	150,001	то	250,000
NORTH METROPOLITAN MAYORS ASSOCIATION	50,001	то	150,000
RANGE ASSOCIATION OF MUNICIPALITIES & SCHOOLS	500	то	50,000

APPENDIX A

Office of the State Auditor Lobby Disclosure Form

<u>1992 L</u>		THE MINNESOTA T LOBBYING EXH (Please Print or Ty	PENDITURES REPORTING	<u>FORM</u>	
Name of Entity: City, Zip Code:			1 Completing Form:		
	ALL CONTRACT LO	OBBYISTS RETA	IND BY THE POLITICAL	SUBDIVISION	
NAME OF CONTRACT LOBBYIST	FIRM NAME/AI	DDRESS	TOTAL AMOUNT OF COMPENSATION PAID DURING 1992	TOTAL AMOUNT EXPENSE REIMB PAID DURING 19	URSEMENTS
			OVER 25 PERCENT OF T		
NAME OF EMPLOYEE	1992 ANNUAL SALARY	1992 ANNUAL EXPENSES	ESTIMATED ANNUAL (1992) COST OF EMPLOYEE'S BENEFITS	ESTIMATED PERCENT OF EMPLOYEE'S ANNUAL (1992) TIME SPENT LOBBYING	ESTIMATED AMOUNT OF EMPLOYEE'S 1992 EXPENSES RELATED TO LOBBYING

.

I hereby certify to the best of my knowledge the information provided on this form is accurate and complete.

Signature of The Senior Elected or Appointed Official:

1

Date:

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING 1992 LOCAL GOVERNMENT LOBBYING EXPENDITURES REPORTING FORM

The following instructions are intended to assist you in completing the 1992 Lobby Disclosure Reporting Form that is required by Minnesota Statutes § 6.76. You will note the reporting form has been modified this year to respond to concerns expressed regarding the required reporting of an employee's total annual salary and benefit costs, even though that employee may not spend 100 percent of her or his time lobbying state government. While we are asking that you continue to report the total annual salaries and benefits of individual employees who meet the criteria expressed in Chapter 6.76, we are also asking that you make a good faith effort to designate the percentage of the employee's time throughout the year that is spent on activities related to legislative matters.

REPORTING EXPENDITURES FOR CONTRACT LOBBYISTS

Please identify all contract lobbyists retained by your political subdivision and indicate the total amount paid to that individual or firm for lobbying the legislature and/or state administrative agencies, including the amount paid for expenses of that individual or firm. For purposes of this reporting form, a contract lobbyist is any individual or firm, excluding employees of the political subdivision, that meets the definition of a lobbyist as defined in Minnesota Statutes § 10A.01, subdivision 11 (see attached). Expenditures for Contract Lobbyists <u>do not include</u> dues paid to local government associations that are formed for purposes that extend beyond representing their membership before the legislature and state administrative agencies (e.g. League of Cities, Association of Counties, Minnesota School Boards Association, etc.).

REPORTING EXPENDITURES FOR EMPLOYEES OF THE POLITICAL SUBDIVISION

Please identify all employees of the political subdivision who spend more than 25 percent of their time during the legislative session on legislative matters. For each employee listed, please provide the employee's estimated <u>annual</u> salary, the employee's estimated <u>annual</u> expense reimbursements, and the estimated <u>annual</u> cost of benefits (health, dental and employer-paid life insurance and retirement benefits, including employer-paid FICA) for the employee. In addition to these estimates, please make a good faith effort to estimate the percent of the employee's <u>annual</u> time that is spent lobbying the state legislature and/or state administrative agencies. When estimating the percent of time spent lobbying, please include time spent preparing for legislative sessions, addressing legislative-related issues with local officials, legislators, state agency staff, other local government representatives, local citizens, and other interested organizations. Be sure to include in your estimate the time spent working with state administrative agencies on the development and implementation of administrative rules for programs and policies that affect local governments. Also, estimate the amount of employee expense reimbursements that are related to lobbying the legislature and/or state agencies.

REQUIRED SIGNATURE

Please have the form signed by the senior elected or administrative official of the political subdivision. This signature shall be used to certify that all information is accurate and complete. In addition to the signature of the senior elected or administrative official, please provide the name and phone number of the individual who should be contacted if we have questions relating to the information provided on this form.

Thank you for your assistance on this matter. Please make additional copies of this form if you need additional space to complete this form. If you submit more than one page of information, please indicate on each page the total number of pages submitted.

APPENDIX B

Actual Salaries And Benefits Paid To Local Government Employees Who Lobby On Behalf Of Local Governments

LOCAL GOVERNMENT LOBBYING EXPENDITURES FOR 1992 EMPLOYEE LOBBYISTS

	ANNUAL	EMPLOYEE
NAME OF LOBBYIST	SALARY	BENEFITS
Anoka County		
Marcia Bennett	60,009	9,402
Tammera Ericson	1,290	104
Anoka County Total	61,299	9,506
City of Minneapolis		
Andrea Hart Kajer	45,864	7,095
Jeffrey A. Van Wychen	50,000	10,154
Mentor C. Addicks Jr.	69,769	11,882
Patty Holm	32,410	5,768
Richard Graves	57,840	10,280
William J. Barnhart	60,928_	1,075
City of Minneapolis Total	316,811	46,254
City of Moorhead		
Scott A. Hutchins	50,436	10,791
City of St. Paul	•	·
Bonnie Balach	16,779	4,277
Darlyne Morrow	34,736	8,855
Frank Ongaro	69,669	17,759
Julian Empson	42,585	10,855
Patrick Boley	15,603	0
City of St. Paul Total	179,372	41,746
Hannaria County		
Hennepin County Diane L Loeffler	57 169	7 703
James L. Stebler	52,168	7,792
	68,068	9,071
Mary E. Davidson	41,209	5,200
Ronald F. Wiborg	8,926	7,740
Hennepin County Total	<u> </u>	29,803
Metro Airports Commission		
David J. Dombrowski	71,916	14,942
Metro Council		
Janey Gohl	53,997	17,043
Metro Transit Commission		
Thomas H. Weaver	60,000	9,211
		<u> </u>

LOCAL GOVERNMENT LOBBYING EXPENDITURES FOR 1992 EMPLOYEE LOBBYISTS

	ANNUAL	EMPLOYEE
NAME OF LOBBYIST	SALARY	BENEFITS
Metro Waste Control Comm.		
Eunice Groschen	57,647	15,853
Neil Haugerud	38,857	10,686
Metro Waste Control		
Commission Total	96,504	26,539
Olmsted County		
Amy Caucutt	30,890	7,723
Ally Calcult		<u> </u>
Ramsey County Board		
James Abts	68,070	9,966
John Woedele	46,211	9,171
Terry Lindeke	60,020	9,717
Ramsey County Board Total	174,301	28,854
Ramsey County Regional Rail Authority		
Kathy DespiegeLacre	70,412	<u> </u>
Regional Transit Board		
Sherry Munyon	48,310	9,950
St. Louis County		
John Ongaro	53,815	11,139
GRAND TOTAL	1,438,434	274,840

RECENT REPORTS FROM THE OFFICE OF THE STATE AUDITOR RESEARCH AND INFORMATION DIVISION

- Case Studies of City Spending: Explaining Differences in Per Capita City Expenditures This study explains how some cities operate with much lower expenditures per capita than similar cities. It is based on in-depth interviews with 19 Minnesota cities. April 30, 1993
- 1992 Criminal Forfeitures in the State of Minnesota
 This annual report describes the amount of property and cash seized by law enforcement agents in
 1992 criminal forfeitures and what happens to the forfeited items. April 26, 1993
- What is Minnesota Getting for its Tax Dollars? Public Assistance Programs This report, one in a series on how Minnesota spends public dollars, examines what the state is getting for its above-average spending on health care programs, such as Medicaid, and income maintenance, such as Aid to Families with Dependent Children. April 22, 1993
- Revenues, Expenditures and Debt of the Towns in Minnesota February 29, 1992
 This annual report lists the sources and amounts of revenues, expenditures and outstanding debt for Minnesota towns for the most recent fiscal year. April 15, 1993
- A Guide to City and County Fund Balances
 This annual report provides an overview of Minnesota cities' and counties' fund balances. It defines
 "fund balance" and identifies fund-balance trends. April 8, 1993
- Revenues, Expenditures and Debt of Minnesota Counties December 31, 1991
 This annual report lists the sources and amounts of revenues, expenditures and debt for Minnesota counties during the most recent fiscal year. It includes income and expense analyses of counties' enterprise operations, such as hospitals. April 6, 1993
- How is Minnesota Spending Its Tax Dollars? Elementary and Secondary Education This report, one in a series on how the state and local governments spend public dollars, examines spending for elementary and secondary education. It compares Minnesota's educational spending, as well as the results of that spending, with other states. January 21, 1993
- Revenues, Expenditures and Debt of Minnesota Cities December 31, 1991
 This annual report lists the sources and amounts of revenues, expenditures and outstanding debt for Minnesota cities during the most recent fiscal year. It is divided into two reports, one for cities over 2,500 population and the other for cities under 2,500. It includes income and expense analyses of cities' enterprise operations. December 4, 1992
- An Analysis of Minnesota's Municipal Liquor Store Operations in 1991 This annual report details the sales and profits of Minnesota's 276 municipally-owned and operated liquor stores. November 20, 1992
- 1990 Per Capita Spending of Minnesota's Counties This study details the 1990 spending patterns of Minnesota counties. October 7, 1992
- Minnesota's Economic Growth 1980-1990
 This report discusses the shift in Minnesota's economic condition in the 1980s. July 30, 1992.

If you would like to receive one or more of these recent reports published by the Office of the State Auditor please call 612/296-7001.