



55 Oak Street
Hartford, CT 06106
860.549.1220
860.549.5131 (fax)

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
Tuesday, September 27, 2005

CONTACT: Andy Sauer
Executive Director
860.549.1220
860.539.6846 (cell)

First in a series

The sinking of the Bottle Bill

*\$700,000 in campaign contribution helped the beverage industry kill
an expansion of the bottle deposit law*

Executive Summary

The death of the Bottle Bill is a case study of how campaign contributions have corrupted the legislative process. Although lobbyists for opponents to the Bottle Bill banded and in a short period of time communicated their distaste for the legislation, their ability to raise large sums of campaign contributions contributed to their ability to derail the Bottle Bill. In fact, Connecticut Common Cause has determined that in the past four years opponents to the Bottle Bill contributed at least \$704,722 to political campaigns and political action committees.

Introduction

The fight over Connecticut's bottle and can deposit law is a perennial battle in the Connecticut General Assembly. Environmentalists aim to update the deposit law to include non-carbonated beverages (e.g. water, juice, sports drinks) and increase fees to keep pace with inflation. Opponents, which include the beverage industry and the supermarket and convenience store lobby, look to repeal the deposit law altogether.

In a typical session, the two forces negate each other and the law remains untouched. However, in the 2005 session, Senate President Pro Tem Don Williams took on the entrenched industry lobby and on April 20 led the Senate in passing legislation (a.k.a. "The Bottle Bill") that expanded Connecticut's beverage container deposit law to include bottled water, by far the largest

sector of the non-carbonated beverage market. The bill overwhelmingly passed the Senate by a 31 to 3 margin.

Opponents sprang into action. An all-points-bulletin was sent out to lobbyists representing the various interests and the State Capitol was inundated with roughly 30 lobbyists hoping to compel House leadership to bury the bottle bill.¹ At a time when the Legislature was grappling with issues such as the state budget, transportation, government ethics and campaign finance reform, all the talk outside the House, generated completely by lobbyists, centered on The Bottle Bill.

In the end, the legislation was never called by the House and the Bottle Bill died.

The death of the Bottle Bill is a case study of how campaign contributions have corrupted the legislative process. Although lobbyists for opponents to the Bottle Bill banded and in a short period of time communicated their distaste for the legislation, their ability to raise large sums of campaign contributions contributed to their ability to derail the Bottle Bill. In fact, Connecticut Common Cause has determined that in the past four years opponents to the Bottle Bill contributed at least \$704,722 to political campaigns and political action committees.

With a large amount of contributions going to legislative races or PACs formed on behalf of legislators (a.k.a. “leadership PACs”), it is easy to understand why state representatives would be wary calling, let alone voting on, the Bottle Bill. It does not take much money to destabilize a state House race, and no doubt House members were aware that those who fund their campaign could easily fund a competitor’s.

The Rationale of The Bottle Bill

When Connecticut residents purchase a carbonated beverage, they pay the beverage bottlers five cents deposit for every container they purchase. The hope is that by paying the bottler a five-cent deposit, consumers are more likely to return the containers and less likely to throw the container in the state’s roads or waterways as litter.

During the course of the past 25 years, Connecticut’s bottle deposit law has removed more than 20 billion bottles and cans from state landfills and other waste streams.

The law currently applies to carbonated beverage containers such as beer, soft drinks, and carbonated water but excludes water and flavored water bottles without carbonation — juices, iced teas and sports drinks — which at the time the law was passed, represented a small percentage of the beverage market.

Recently, the sale of bottled water has far outpaced soda and beer containers in Connecticut. According to the Container Recycling Institute, state vendors in 2002 sold 369 million non-carbonated plastic beverages two-thirds of which, or 244 million, were bottled water containers.

About 215 million of those were made of PET, or clear plastic, and are almost exactly the same containers as the soda bottle containers currently redeemable under the state's deposit law.

Changing Legislation

In response to changes in trends in consuming beverages and the high volume of water bottles being discarded, Sen. Williams proposed and the Connecticut General Assembly's Environment Committee debated a bill that would include bottled water in the five cent bottle deposit law.

As with so many environmental battles in the Legislature, the proposed legislation brought out both sides in force. A lobbyist representing the Connecticut Audubon Society, Betty McLaughlin, one of two environmental groups that aggressively advocated for the Bottle Bill, counted 27 different lobbying groups opposing the legislation.

Bottle Bill opponents' efforts were more successful at first, and the Environment Committee added an amendment to the bill making Connecticut's inclusion of water bottles effective only when New York, Massachusetts and Rhode Island did same — an unlikely event since Rhode Island has no bottle deposit system at all.

However, when the bill was called in the Senate on April 20, Senate President Pro Tem Don Williams amended his legislation to its original version. The amendment passed, 27-7, and Senate Bill 871 passed as amended, 31-3, with two absent.

Senate Bill 871

The bill itself, SB 871, is fairly straightforward. It modifies the language of the previous bottle deposit bill, adding “noncarbonated one hundred per cent water” to beer and other malt beverages, soda and mineral waters, and carbonated soft drinks.²

Connecticut's current beverage container redemption law consists of five parts:

1. Retailers pay beverage distributors \$.05 for each beer or soft drink container that the distributors deliver;
2. Consumers pay retailers \$.05 for each beer or soft drink container
3. The retailer or redemption center pays back \$.05 to the consumer for each container returned;
4. The distributor reimburses the retailer or redemption center \$.05 for each beer and soda container, plus a handling fee of \$0.015 on each beer container and \$.02 on each soft drink container returned to the redemption center; and
5. The beverage distributor keeps \$.05 for each unclaimed deposit.³

SB 871 merely added bottled water containers to the process.

SB 871: Supporters' arguments

With the rise in popularity of bottled water, the Department of Environmental Protection has argued that the plastic water bottles are a significant part of the state's waste stream and litter problems, and thus the application of a deposit requirement for non-carbonated beverages would be an easy way to deal with these problems.

Environmental groups echoed the DEP's concerns.

- Connecticut Citizen's Action Group highlighted the legislation's potential to keep hundreds of millions of more containers from littering the state's beaches, filling landfills, and being incinerated in local communities.
- The Sierra Club pointed to the fact that bottled water makes up 71 percent of the state's non-carbonated beverage sales and the empty bottles are clean and easy to recycle when they are returned.
- The CT Recycler's Coalition focused on the shortage of recycled feedstock for the makers of carpet and other plastic-based products and how water bottles could help add to the supply of the recycled plastics industry.
- Municipalities, such as Mansfield, voiced their concerns over their curbside recycling program's ability to collect the increased number of plastic, metal and glass containers that town residents discard and taking water bottles out of the waste stream makes curbside programs more effective.
- The Connecticut Resources Recovery Authority supports the bottle deposit bill even though they would lose revenue from non-recycled water bottles. (CRRA advocated for the passage of HB 6417 which would divert some funds from unclaimed bottle deposits to the CRRA.)⁴
- The Connecticut Audubon Society, among the most avid supporters of SB 871, argued that curbside recycling of plastic containers costs an average of \$1,120 per ton while deposit systems using reverse vending machines (RVM) cost \$351 per ton, making curbside programs much more expensive. The Connecticut Audubon Society added that state residents redeem 70 percent of the beer and soda containers they buy, proving that residents support an expanded bottle redemption bill.⁵

From a policy standpoint, supporters of the Bottle Bill say 25 years of success and the facts speak for themselves: expanding the beverage deposit law would reduce pollution, assist recycling programs and save municipalities money.

SB 871: Opponents' arguments

A number of beverage distributors, food retail companies, and water utilities have all voiced their disapproval of the legislature's bottle bill expansion:

- The Grocery Manufacturers claimed that the new bottle bill would be very expensive and have only a small impact on the solid waste stream.
- The Connecticut Food Association expanded on these concerns, arguing that non-carbonated containers come in a variety of shapes and sizes which will be more expensive to handle and sort in a deposit system.
- Stop and Shop officials said that returning containers to supermarket redemption centers is less efficient than curbside programs and more of a hardship to the elderly, disabled, and parents with young children.
- The Connecticut Water Works Association raised concern that several local water utilities that bottle their own water for promotional and fundraising activities would face added costs with the passage of the bill causing these utilities to cease or reduce their bottling activities.
- The New England Convenience Store Association claimed they do not have enough room for the machines that automatically accept bottles, and expansion would reduce the amount of space they have for product storage.⁶

Although Bottle Bill opponents challenge the environmental effectiveness of expanding beverage deposit law, it would appear that the overriding concern focuses on the costs in implementing the expansion.

Subplot: Unclaimed Bottle Deposits

From the moment the beverage deposit legislation was proposed more than 25 years ago, the beverage lobby resisted its inception, complaining that they would lose money because of the handling fees paid to retailers to offset labor costs associated with sorting and storing beverage containers.

A compromise was reached during the passage of the legislation allowing distributors to keep the money from unclaimed deposits. This compromise has proved to be a profitable one as the beverage industry takes in an estimated \$25 million in unclaimed bottle deposits annually.

Not coincidentally, Connecticut often takes aim on this source of revenue, as Governor Rell's 2005 budget proposal did when it included the approximately \$20 million in bottle deposit money. With every plan to seize the revenue, the beverage lobby pours money in lobbying efforts to resist the state's efforts.

The biggest names in beverages hire the biggest lobbyists in Connecticut.

- Sullivan and LeShane, which represents several organizations opposed to the bottle deposit bill, receives \$7,350 a month from the Coca Cola Bottling Company of New England and an additional \$80,000 per year from the Coca Cola Bottling Company of New York — a total of \$168,200 per year to advance Coca Cola's legislative interests, easily the highest payout from a beverage industry company to a state lobbying firm.⁷ The Connecticut Ethics Commission has documented that Coca Cola NE has already compensated Sullivan and LeShane \$27,568 and Coca Cola NY compensated Sullivan and LeShane \$28,266.67 since January 2005.⁸
- Gaffney, Bennett and Associates receives \$50,000 a year from the Connecticut Pepsi Bottlers Association.⁹
- Brown, Rudnick, Berlack, Israels LLP receives \$7,825.20 per month from Anheuser-Busch Co.
- Roy and LeRoy is paid \$2,374.75 per month from Miller Brewing Company.

To date, the unclaimed bottle deposits remain unclaimed and in bottlers' bank accounts.

Although it would appear that retaining the unclaimed bottle deposits would be a priority for the beverage industry, expanding the deposit law would have a direct impact on the bottom lines of two of the largest soft drink manufacturers that have their own bottled water brands (Coca-Cola, Dasani; Pepsi, Aquafina.)

Other Interests And Their Lobbyists

Following the passage of Senate Bill 871 in the Senate, the response from lobbyists of clients opposing the Bottle Bill was swift. Using a combination of filings from the State Ethics Commission and observations at the State Capitol, Connecticut Common Cause was able to determine that the following interests were represented at the Capitol:

- Connecticut Water Works, which pays \$90,000 per year to the lobbying firm Elizabeth Gara and Associates. The Ethics Commission has also recorded that Connecticut Water Works has already paid Elizabeth Gara and Associates \$38,655.17 since January 2005.¹⁰

- The Connecticut Food Association and Grocery Manufacturers paid out new retainers to their lobbying firms, which happen to be the same firm, Capitol Strategies Group LLC. Capitol Strategies Group accepted a \$15,000 retainer from the CT Food Association and a \$10,000 retainer from the Grocery Manufacturers, which means they must be putting in 50 percent more effort to lobby for the CT Food Association. In addition to the retainers, Capitol Strategies is taking in \$15,000 per year representing the New England Convenience Store Association.
- The president of the CT Food Association, Grace Nome, is also the head of her own lobbying firm, Nome Associates, and chooses to additionally represent the CT Food Association as an in-house employer. In 2005, according to the State Ethics Commission, the CT Food Association has paid Nome \$23,085.
- Nestle Waters, which bottles Poland Spring among other beverages, has registered with the ethics commission that they have retained the firm Robinson and Cole, but it is unknown the terms of compensation.
- The Connecticut Beer Wholesalers Association is in a similar situation with Anheuser-Bush and Miller, as they are registered with the state ethics commission but it is unclear how actively involved they are in shaping the bottle bill debate. The CT Beer Wholesalers Association pays its firm, Sullivan and LeShane, \$148,968.48 per year.
- Wal-Mart Stores Inc., many of which contain grocery departments and their own bottled water line, retained Gaffney, Bennett and Associates to represent them on several bills for \$40,000 per year.
- There are also several companies which have been observed communicating with legislators inside the State Capitol but have not yet registered with the State Ethics Commission concerning their lobbying contractual arrangements. These companies and associations include the International Bottled Water Association, Kraft Foods, and Northeast Bottled Water Association. None of these organizations chose to submit comments into the public record at a legislative public hearing. It is possible that these groups have filed with the ethics commission and the records have not yet been made public.

Campaign contributions

Using databases provided by the Institute for Money in State Politics, Connecticut Common Cause examined the campaign contributions from 2002 to 2004 from individuals and companies believed to be involved in the fight over The Bottle Bill.

Grocery stores and supermarkets

Because the collection of beverage container redemptions lies with primarily grocery stores, lobbyists and individuals representing groceries stores were some of the most outspoken interests against the Bottle Bill. Cumulatively, they contributed \$16,408 to political campaigns in 2004 and \$29,205 in 2002.

Bottled water companies

Although Coca-Cola and Pepsi are perennial opponents to the beverage container law, they each have bottled water brand (Coca-Cola, Dasani; Pepsi, Aquafina). They were the only two bottled water companies that made individual campaign contributions — a total of \$6,850 in 2004; \$22,175 in 2002.

While no other bottled water companies contributed to state races, they were represented by some of the most prominent lobbying firms.

Lobbyists

Although lobbyists have several, if not dozens, of clients and thus can be assumed that their campaign contributions cover a wide spectrum of special interests, their involvement in the Bottle Bill issue carries a lot of weight with legislators. First, a legislator is less inclined to estrange a lobbyist that can deliver large amounts of campaign dollars. Second, a prominent lobbyist's involvement in a particular issue increases awareness of the issue and may give legislators, who may have no particular stand on the issue, pause during internal caucus vote counts. The private caucus session often determines if a bill will be called for a floor vote.

Collectively, the lobbyists against the Bottle Bill contributed \$80,822 in 2004; \$131,230 in 2002.

Beer companies and distributors

Like Coca-Cola and Pepsi, beer companies and distributors are perennial opponents to any issue related to the beverage deposit law. From the time the law was enacted 25 years ago, the beer companies and distributors have maintained — right or wrong — that Connecticut residents are against what they call an inefficient recycling method. Expanding the beverage deposit law is antithetical to their goal of repealing the bottle deposit law. In the spirit of “the enemy of my enemy is my friend,” the beer companies and distributors with their respective lobbyists were among the opponents of the Bottle Bill.

Logically, it is reasonable for the beer companies to join in the fight against the the Bottle Bill. In every effort to strengthen, expand or repeal the bottle deposit law, lobbyists for beer distributors and bottlers make the same argument: “Curbside recycling is better.” If legislators can accept that argument, assisted in no small way by campaign contributions, perhaps the same argument can be used in repealing the deposit law.

Cumulatively, the beer industry contributed \$20,125 in 2004; \$98,827 in 2002.

Political Action Committees: Special interest PACs

Political Action Committees (PACs) are an additional way for special interests to contribute money to political campaigns. In addition to making individual contributions, contributors on behalf of any special interest can make contributions to a specific PAC, which can then make unlimited contributions to political campaigns. From the group of Bottle Bill opponents, there are three PACs: the Better Action for Connecticut PAC (Gaffney Bennett and Associates’ PAC), The Connecticut Food Association PAC, and the Alcoholic Beverage Wholesalers PAC (ABW). Collectively, these three PACs spent \$176,750 in 2004; and \$122,330 in 2002.

Political Action Committees: Legislative PACs

It has become common in Connecticut for legislators to have not only a candidate committee but a PAC commonly referred to as a “leadership PAC.” Leadership PACs have distinct advantages. In addition to making contributions to a candidate committee, an individual can make up to \$1,000 to a PAC per year. Corporations can spend \$250 a year on ad book purchases (as opposed to the candidate’s \$250 per cycle.) And, leadership PACs are permitted to make unlimited amount of contributions to political campaigns. Because no database of contributions and expenditures of Connecticut PACs exists, it is difficult to determine who and what organization may have contributed to PACs created on behalf of legislators. By examining the hard-copy paper filings of the state’s largest leadership PACs, Connecticut Common Cause was able to determine at a minimum what the beverage lobby was contributing. However, with hundreds of PACs in Connecticut, it is likely that actual total contributions from the opponents to the Bottle Bill is much higher.

Who received campaign contributions?

Although opponents to the Bottle Bill spread their contributions to a variety of races, ranging from House challengers to entrenched incumbents, they generally favored those in positions of power who were up for re-election. In 2002, which had statewide and legislative elections, contributions between the parties were almost evenly split with 50.87 percent going to Republicans

and 49.13 percent of contributions going to Democrats. In 2004, with only the legislative races at the polls, 65.44 percent of contributions went to Democrats and 34.56 percent went to Republican races.

The largest recipient of contributions in the past two elections was former Gov. John G. Rowland, who received \$82,025 in his 2002 re-election bid, followed by 2002 gubernatorial challenger Bill Curry, who received \$18,750. The largest recipient in the 2004 election cycle was the Senate Democrats 2004 PAC with \$13,200.

Conclusion

As the 2005 legislative wore on, it became apparent that the state House of Representatives would not call the Bottle Bill. As they have year after year, opponents to the Bottle Bill won again. It is clear that the beverage lobby is influential in the Capitol, skilled at disrupting important environmental efforts and the annual attempt to acquire the \$25 million in unclaimed beverage deposits. Campaign contributions give the beverage lobby the leverage it needs to derail any legislative effort that threatens its bottom line. This year's Bottle Bill was only more example of the corrosive influences of money in politics. The ability of Bottle Bill opponents to prevent a House vote, derived solely from excessive campaign contributions, on a bill that has overwhelmingly passed one chamber represents a corruption of the legislative process.

In 2004, Gov. John G. Rowland resigned amid speculation that he steered state contracts in exchange for personal gifts — gifts whose value was no more than \$33,000. Today, government grants special interests legislative favors for legal campaign contributions twenty times the value of Rowland's unethical gifts.

The corruption of the legislative process is prevalent, and the Bottle Bill demise is only one prominent example. Until there is comprehensive campaign finance reform that includes the public financing of political campaigns, similar scenarios will continue to play out year after year. Special interests will profit, elected officials will be re-elected with special interest dollars and the public will continue to see the same corrosive and corrupting influences that brought down a governor erode state government.

Methodology

Data on individual contributions to state campaign committees was obtained through a database provided by the Institute for State Money in Politics. Campaign contributions to political action committees that file with the Federal Elections Commission were tabulated from information provided by the Center for Responsive Politics through its Web site at opensecrets.org. Information on PAC contributions was obtained through the Secretary of the State's Office. Because to date

there is no digital database for the state's roughly 500 political action committees, Connecticut Common Cause input data from the state's largest political action committees in an effort to tabulate some level of money given to leadership PACs by opponents to The Bottle Bill. However, hundreds of PACs exist and many of them are leadership PACs. It is likely that the actual amount of campaign contributions from opponents to The Bottle Bill is significantly higher.

Acknowledgements

This report was prepared by Aaron Short, with the help of Karen Hobert Flynn and Andy Sauer. Special thanks to the Institute for Money in State Politics.

¹ Mark Pazniokas "Reform Effort Gains Steam" Hartford Courant. 12 May 2005 Pg. A1.

² Committee Bill No. 871. "An Act Expanding the Bottle Bill", www.cga.ct.gov General Assembly, January Session 2005, 2 pgs.

³ File No 345. OLR Bill Analysis. "SB 871: An Act Expanding the Bottle Bill" www.cga.ct.gov 14 Apr 2005, 3 pgs.

⁴ ENV Joint Favorable Report "Report on Bills Favorably Reported by Committee" www.cga.ct.gov Environmental Committee, 7 Mar 2005, 3 pgs.

⁵ Betty McLaughlin. Connecticut Audubon Society. Memo. "Connecticut Audubon Environmental Affairs" 4 May 2005, 2pgs.

⁶ ENV Joint Favorable Report "Report on Bills Favorably Reported by Committee" www.cga.ct.gov Environmental Committee, 7 Mar 2005, 3 pgs.

⁷ Connecticut Ethics Commission "Client Financials: Summary 2005" Online Reports. <https://www.lims.state.ct.us/public/reports.asp>; 2005. 149 pgs.

⁸ Connecticut Ethics Commission "Outside Communicators: Terms of Compensation." Online Reports. <https://www.lims.state.ct.us/public/reports.asp>; 2005-2006, 30 pgs.

⁹ Connecticut Ethics Commission "Outside Communicators: Terms of Compensation."

¹⁰ Connecticut Ethics Commission "Client Financials: Summary 2005"

Table 1: Top recipients of campaign contributions from the beverage lobby

Source: The Institute of Money in State Politics, Conn. Secretary of the State's office

	Name	Notes	2002	2004
RETAIL	CT Food Association		\$6,975	\$4,793
	Markets		\$14,110	\$6,440
	Convenience stores		\$500	\$250
	Grace Nome	<i>President of CT Food Association</i>	\$7,620	\$4,925
	SUBTOTALS		\$29,205	\$16,408
H2O	Pepsi		\$9,575	\$2,850
	Coca-Cola		\$12,600	\$3,750
	CT Water Works			\$250
	SUBTOTALS		\$22,175	\$6,850
BEER	Distributors		\$74,925	\$12,725
	Package Store Assoc.		\$1,650	\$2,400
	Anheuser Bush		\$3,000	\$1,750
	CT Beer and Wine Wholesalers		\$19,002	\$2,750
	Misc. beer Companies		\$250	\$500
	SUBTOTALS		\$98,827	\$20,125
LOBBYISTS	Sullivan and LeShane	Coca-Cola, CT Beer Wholesalers	\$14,250	\$24,222
	Capitol Strat. Group	Grocery manufacturers, Convenience		
			\$18,700	\$13,725
	Gaffney Bennet	Pepsi	\$22,050	\$14,900
	Roy and LeRoy	Miller	\$11,250	\$3,750
	Brown Rudnick	Anheuser-Busch	\$25,050	\$4,425
	Robinson-Cole	Nestle Waters	\$38,105	\$17,775
	Elizabeth Gara and Associates	<i>Connecticut Water Works</i>	\$1,825	\$2,025
	SUBTOTALS		\$131,230	\$80,822
	PACS	Better Action for Connecticut PAC		\$97,684
CT Food Association PAC			\$24,646	\$28,596
ABW				\$18,664
SUBTOTALS			\$122,330	\$176,750
TOTALS			\$403,767	\$300,955
			Cumulative	\$704,722

Table 2: Top 50 recipients of campaign contributions from the beverage lobby

Source: *The Institute of Money in State Politics, Conn. Secretary of the State's office*

	Recipient	Amount
1	ROWLAND, JOHN (Gov.)	\$74,975
2	JEPSEN, GEORGE (Gov.& Lt. Gov.)	\$16,075
3	Senate Democrats 2002	\$13,200
4	Senate Republican Vision 21	\$12,750
5	Senate Democrats 2004	\$11,750
6	House Democrats Campaign Committee	\$10,650
7	Senate Republican Campaign Committee	\$9,700
8	Senate Republican Golf Tournament Fund	\$9,700
9	Connecticut Democratic State Centrl Cmte (FED)	\$8,725
10	Connecticut Republican Party (State)	\$8,255
11	Leadership for Connecticut (House Dems.)	\$8,040
12	BYSIEWICZ, SUSAN (SS)	\$7,575
13	RELL, JODI (Lt. Gov.)	\$7,050
14	Connecticut Republican Campaign Cmte (FED)	\$7,000
15	MCDONALD, ANDREW J	\$6,800
16	WYMAN, NANCY	\$6,250
17	COLAPIETRO, TOM	\$5,400
18	House Republican Campaign Committee	\$5,250
19	Connecticut Democratic Leadership Coalition (House Dems)	\$5,050
20	BYSIEWICZ, SUSAN (G)	\$4,925
21	People for Excellence in Government (Senate Dems)	\$4,475
22	DAILY, EILEEN M	\$4,450
23	SULLIVAN, KEVIN B	\$4,400
24	Democrats United (Senate Dems)	\$4,000
25	ANISKOVICH, WILLIAM A	\$3,825
26	GAFFEY, THOMAS P	\$3,625
27	NAPPIER, DENISE L	\$3,325
28	CAPPIELLO, DAVID J	\$3,125
29	AMANN, JAMES A	\$3,100
30	DELGOBBO, KEVIN M	\$3,100
31	CURRY, BILL	\$2,675
32	CAFERO, LAWRENCE F	\$2,275
33	CRISCO, JOE	\$2,200
34	HARRIS, JONATHAN A	\$2,200
35	LEBEAU, GARY D	\$2,175
36	HARTLEY, JOAN V	\$2,150
37	MARTINEZ, JOHN S	\$2,075
38	LOONEY, MARTIN M	\$2,050
39	STILLMAN, ANDREA L	\$2,000
40	BACKER, TERRY	\$1,950
41	DEFRONZO, DONALD J	\$1,950
42	GREEN, KENNETH	\$1,775
43	BLUMENTHAL, RICHARD	\$1,750
44	DELUCA, LOUIS C	\$1,650
45	FREY, JOHN H	\$1,650
46	KISSEL, JOHN A	\$1,650
47	CIOTTO, BIAGIO BILLY	\$1,638
48	COOK, CATHY WELLES	\$1,625
49	KLARIDES, THEMIS	\$1,500
50	MURPHY, CHRISTOPHER S	\$1,390